

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program).*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2005-06 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

STATE RESPONSE

In April 2001, the Oregon Board of Education adopted challenging academic standards in science for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10. The process to develop these standards included extensive background research and analysis of NAEP, National Research Council, and American Association for the Advancement of Science standards. Broad stakeholder review included a) regular analysis of drafts of these standards prior to adoption by a Superintendent appointed advisory group made up of K-12 teachers selected to represent diverse school environments and serving diverse populations as well as geography and grade level, b) twelve educator and public input sessions, c) public hearing, and d) draft readings of the standards by the State Board of Education.

The next scheduled revision of science standards will be in 2009.

The process is summarized in a primer on Academic Content Standards: Creating Consistency Across Oregon, which is on the web at <http://www.ode.state.or.us/pubs/eii/academiccontentstandardsprimer.pdf>.

Oregon Administrative Rule 329.045 (3) requires all schools offer students instruction in science that meets these academic standards.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

Oregon has assessments for Students in grades 3-8 and 10 for testing in Reading/Literature and Mathematics, and students in grades 5, 8, and 10 are tested in Science, using Oregon's Knowledge and Skills tests. Students in grades 4, 7, and 10 are tested in Writing, using the Performance Assessment. All are state-developed, criterion-referenced tests (writing is a performance based assessment) designed to align to the content standards and measure what students should know and be able to do in each subject and at each grade level.

Oregon also has in place an alternate assessment of Reading/Literature, Mathematics, Science and Writing for grade 3-8 and 10. Based on U.S Department of Education review, the alternate assessment is undergoing substantial revision to link to grade level content standards. The alternate assessment will be available for implementation in March, 2007. The alternate assessment is comprised of performance tasks which have been developed based on links to the state content standards. The alternate assessment will be administered and scored by state trained proctors. The state will conduct a reliability evaluation of the proctor scoring of the alternate assessment as part of operational administration in Spring, 2007.

Oregon is unique in the involvement educators have had in the development and maintenance of the Oregon Statewide Assessment. Unlike most states, Oregon has not relied extensively on testing contractors to develop, administer, score, and report on the assessments. Consequently, Oregon has a long history of extensive stakeholder involvement. Input from education stakeholders is one of the three primary components of Oregon's standards review and revision process. Education stakeholders include teachers, administrators, higher education (both in departments of education and content area departments), industry, business, parents, and other citizens.

The State has a Content and Assessment Panel for each of the eight legislatively mandated subject areas. Thirty-two educators comprise each panel in English language arts, mathematics and science. These educators represent approximately 27 K-12 teachers and each geographic region of the State. In addition, there are representatives from higher education, school districts, and education service districts. Beginning in 2005, representatives will also be included with expertise in special education, limited English proficiency, and career pathways.

Additionally, Oregon educators provide input into the quality, content, and match between test items and the academic content standards, via participation in Content and Assessment Committees. Teachers contribute invaluable by writing items specifically to measure the objectives and specifications of the content standards. The many different contributors to the item writing and review process contribute to the validity of the assessments. Educators score the state Writing tests and Extended Assessments, and they assist with evaluating the juried assessments. Oregon educators are also involved in Bias and Review committees and in committees confirming the accuracy and consistency of translations.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

In December 2006, Oregon will be conducting a review of its achievement standards in Reading/Literature, Mathematics and Science. 11 panels comprised of 15 educators and 3 members of the public will review the achievement standards at grades 3,5,8 and 10 based on achievement level descriptors developed in consultation with Oregon teachers through the content and assessment panels. Panelists will be chosen based on their familiarity with the content area and balanced according to ethnicity and geography. In addition the panels will contain representation from the areas of special education and language acquisition. The panels will use the bookmarking approach to arrive at consensus regarding the cut-scores for the assessments. These recommendations will then be used by a cross grade panel that will confirm the interpolation of cut scores for grades 4,6, and 7 and also evaluate the overall vertical articulation of the achievement standards. These recommended cut-scores will be presented for public review at 7 public meeting sites across the state of Oregon. Based on these recommendations, the state board will adopt cut-scores in March, 2007.

The state shifted the assessment of writing to grades 4, 7 and 10 beginning with the 2004-05 assessment. To prepare for this process, in December, 2003, the state convened a panel of educators to select anchor papers based on the newly-adopted writing content standards using the criteria presented in an aligned scoring guide. The selected papers were posted on the web for statewide feedback, results were tabulated, and the final versions of the anchor papers were posted on the web in early 2004. The state board adopted the revised writing performance standards in Spring, 2004.

The state will sponsor a test-based standard setting panel in March of 2007 for the alternate assessment. The panel will be comprised of educators familiar with the academic content of the assessment and who have expertise in the instruction and assessment of students with significant cognitive disabilities. The panel will review the assessment materials, items, and content in detail and will establish a consensus based on the previously established alternate achievement level descriptors regarding the appropriate alternate achievement standards. The panel will re-convene in June, 2007 to review and to verify the standards in light of 2006-2007 student data. The outcome of this session will be recommended to the state board for adoption.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	294888	98.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	6399	98.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	13475	99.20
Black, non-Hispanic	8739	98.10
Hispanic	45136	98.80
White, non-Hispanic	211624	98.90
Students with Disabilities	42843	97.70
Limited English Proficient	34407	99.10
Economically Disadvantaged	130461	99.10
Migrant	8720	99.30
Male	150979	98.60
Female	143909	99.00

Comments: 1.2.1 is done based on SpEdFg on student record (would include students identified after December 1.)
1.2.2 is match of Spring Membership to SECC Child Count, so the numbers in 1.2.2 will be lower than 1.2.1.1

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	295192	98.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	6411	98.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	13510	99.30
Black, non-Hispanic	8764	98.40
Hispanic	45128	98.80
White, non-Hispanic	211975	99.00
Students with Disabilities	43137	97.80
Limited English Proficient	34483	99.30
Economically Disadvantaged	130552	99.10
Migrant	8652	99.20
Male	151117	98.80
Female	144075	99.10

Comments: 1.2.1 is done based on SpEdFg on student record (would include students identified after December 1.)
1.2.2 is match of Spring Membership to SECC Child Count, so the numbers in 1.2.2 will be lower than 1.2.1.2

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment		
	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	32061	78.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	4661	11.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	2906	7.10
Comments: 1.2.2 is match of Spring Membership to SECC Child Count, so the numbers in 1.2.2.1 will be lower than 1.2.1 which is done based on SpEdFg on student record (would include students identified after December 1.)		

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment		
	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	44233	76.20
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	6648	11.40
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4907	8.40
Comments: 1.2.2 is match of Spring Membership to SECC Child Count, so the numbers in 1.2.2.2 will be lower than 1.2.1 which is done based on SpEdFg on student record (would include students identified after December 1.)		
<p>Note: In 2005-2006, ELA included a reading assessment for each student in grades 3 - 8 and 10 and a writing assessment for each student in grades 4, 7, and 10. The totals above reflect duplicate numbers for students in grades 4, 7, & 10 who took both the reading and writing assessments. The unduplicated numbers of students for all grades tested in reading in the three categories above are: 30629 (75.2%); 5535 (13.6%); and 3551 (8.7%) respectively. The unduplicated numbers of students for all grades tested in writing in the three categories above are: 13604 (78.4%); 1113 (6.4%); 1356 (7.8%) respectively.</p>		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	40623	86.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	819	80.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1882	89.70
Black, non-Hispanic	1246	78.70
Hispanic	6921	73.80
White, non-Hispanic	28205	89.60
Students with Disabilities	6521	65.20
Limited English Proficient	5786	70.70
Economically Disadvantaged	19771	79.70
Migrant	1287	69.20
Male	20616	86.50
Female	20007	86.00

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	40625	87.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	817	85.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1883	90.40
Black, non-Hispanic	1251	82.10
Hispanic	6909	75.10
White, non-Hispanic	28216	90.10
Students with Disabilities	6576	60.00
Limited English Proficient	5783	71.10
Economically Disadvantaged	19767	80.90
Migrant	1282	70.00
Male	20618	84.80
Female	20007	89.50

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41290	88.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	856	83.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1910	92.40
Black, non-Hispanic	1237	80.90
Hispanic	6788	77.50
White, non-Hispanic	29000	91.10
Students with Disabilities	6847	66.90
Limited English Proficient	5463	75.00
Economically Disadvantaged	19876	82.70
Migrant	1308	71.90
Male	21165	88.20
Female	20125	88.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41278	86.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	857	84.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1906	91.30
Black, non-Hispanic	1238	81.00
Hispanic	6766	73.30
White, non-Hispanic	29005	89.80
Students with Disabilities	6911	58.90
Limited English Proficient	5451	68.10
Economically Disadvantaged	19866	79.80
Migrant	1302	63.10
Male	21158	84.10
Female	20120	89.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41291	84.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	923	76.80
Asian or Pacific Islander	1797	90.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1309	74.20
Hispanic	6494	71.80
White, non-Hispanic	29368	87.70
Students with Disabilities	6617	57.80
Limited English Proficient	5080	68.40
Economically Disadvantaged	19361	77.00
Migrant	1249	67.00
Male	21051	84.60
Female	20240	84.50

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41278	82.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	921	79.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1796	85.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1303	75.10
Hispanic	6488	66.00
White, non-Hispanic	29391	86.90
Students with Disabilities	6655	51.10
Limited English Proficient	5074	58.30
Economically Disadvantaged	19345	74.20
Migrant	1230	56.70
Male	21038	80.80
Female	20240	85.00

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41173	77.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	903	71.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	1790	84.60
Black, non-Hispanic	1222	63.00
Hispanic	6231	60.30
White, non-Hispanic	29643	81.40
Students with Disabilities	6077	40.50
Limited English Proficient	4476	53.10
Economically Disadvantaged	18719	66.40
Migrant	1183	57.30
Male	21150	77.40
Female	20023	77.30

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41171	80.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	905	74.10
Asian or Pacific Islander	1792	85.70
Black, non-Hispanic	1223	68.00
Hispanic	6222	62.10
White, non-Hispanic	29701	84.40
Students with Disabilities	6107	42.00
Limited English Proficient	4473	51.70
Economically Disadvantaged	18719	69.90
Migrant	1179	55.70
Male	21164	77.80
Female	20007	82.90

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41931	71.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	923	62.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1876	82.80
Black, non-Hispanic	1273	53.70
Hispanic	6088	50.30
White, non-Hispanic	30478	75.40
Students with Disabilities	5928	32.40
Limited English Proficient	4202	44.30
Economically Disadvantaged	18360	58.40
Migrant	1147	45.40
Male	21546	70.10
Female	20385	71.90

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	41862	72.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	930	65.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	1873	78.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1271	60.00
Hispanic	6052	49.90
White, non-Hispanic	30435	77.80
Students with Disabilities	5943	31.70
Limited English Proficient	4190	38.50
Economically Disadvantaged	18324	60.20
Migrant	1137	38.50
Male	21493	68.80
Female	20369	77.10

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43286	65.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	1001	53.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	1891	77.80
Black, non-Hispanic	1280	44.50
Hispanic	5877	42.80
White, non-Hispanic	32027	70.10
Students with Disabilities	5731	25.60
Limited English Proficient	3826	35.70
Economically Disadvantaged	17974	50.30
Migrant	1196	38.60
Male	22154	65.00
Female	21132	65.90

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	43255	65.60
American Indian or Alaska Native	995	53.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	1887	71.20
Black, non-Hispanic	1276	49.50
Hispanic	5856	39.20
White, non-Hispanic	32025	71.00
Students with Disabilities	5733	23.30
Limited English Proficient	3814	25.10
Economically Disadvantaged	17947	49.70
Migrant	1186	29.60
Male	22131	61.20
Female	21124	70.30

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42448	44.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	946	27.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1889	61.50
Black, non-Hispanic	1104	20.00
Hispanic	4838	21.40
White, non-Hispanic	32542	48.70
Students with Disabilities	4941	10.50
Limited English Proficient	2751	14.40
Economically Disadvantaged	14188	28.50
Migrant	944	18.20
Male	21820	46.00
Female	20628	43.60

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts		
	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	42732	55.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	958	42.40
Asian or Pacific Islander	1912	58.30
Black, non-Hispanic	1125	31.60
Hispanic	4848	27.40
White, non-Hispanic	32817	60.10
Students with Disabilities	5014	15.20
Limited English Proficient	2736	12.20
Economically Disadvantaged	14276	37.70
Migrant	924	19.10
Male	21953	51.00
Female	20779	59.30

Comments: ODE checked the data that was validated for submission to EDEN for 2004-05 and we included both students meeting and exceeding and the students not met in the file. We can confirm that the data was sent, but the final copy of the 2004-05 CSPR has the wrong information. The data in EDEN for both 2004-2005 and for 2005-2006 is correct.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1256	855	68.00

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	196	72	37.00

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	595	518	87.00

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	179	59	33.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

1.Statewide system of support: School Support Teams in liaison with Northwest Regional Education Lab are the Regional School Improvement Coordinators who work intensively in self-selected schools identified as in need of improvement [both Title I-A funded and non-funded schools].

2.Publication of Resource Manual for Schools in Title I-A Improvement status

3.Publication of School Improvement Handbook

4.One-to-one Technical Assistance at the District and School level as required

5.Annual series of video conferences on School Improvement Plan development

6.Continuous improvement planning and implementation for all schools and districts in Oregon

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

1. One-to-one Technical Assistance to each district as appropriate focused on reason identified for DI status

2. Focused, formal review of revised District Continuous Improvement Plan with district leadership team.

3. Continuous Professional Development on areas identified statewide that need improvement at the district level:

a. Planning process

b. Data analysis and writing SMART goals

c. Monitoring and evaluation strategies

d. Creating coherence in planning

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	28
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	43
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	652
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	13511
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments: ODE has not tracked items 6 and 7.	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	15
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	1331
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	7184
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	0
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	67654	61869	91.40
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	3709	3497	94.30
Low-Poverty Schools	3652	3485	95.40
All Elementary Schools	14901	14164	95.10
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	10213	8990	88.00
Low-Poverty Schools	17515	16355	93.40
All Secondary Schools	52151	47337	90.80

Comments: The 602 classes with the 368 taught by highly qualified teachers that were not included in the elementary and secondary breakouts did not have either an elementary or secondary designation. Therefore, without a designation we were unable to include them in one of the categories. Some of these classes were part of programs and not schools and therefore were not included in the data. They also do not have poverty data and therefore we were unable to determine if they fit in the low or high poverty category.

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	37.40
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	30.10
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	32.50
d) Other (please explain)	
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	48.60
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	13.20
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	14.30
d) Other (please explain)	23.90
Comments: Teachers from out of state who were highly qualified in their state of origin, but not considered HQ by Oregon licensure.	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	64.00	31.60
Poverty Metric Used	Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	
Secondary Schools	54.10	28.30
Poverty Metric Used	Percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	97.40

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The English Language Proficiency Standards were developed by ESOL educators from around the state. The standards were reviewed by a content panel, a different group of educators from around the state. The final document was presented and approved by the State Board of Education at their regularly scheduled meeting on June, 2004.

The SEA conducted regional trainings to introduce the ELP standards during school year 2004-2005. One set of workshops was designed for curriculum directors and school administrators. The second set of workshops was designed for practitioners.

The SEA has also sponsored a two year institute in the teaching of English Language Development, using the ELP standards as the basis for the training. This training institute started in school year 2005-2006 and is continuing this current school year, 2006-2007. District teams have been meeting three times a year for a two-day workshop which will culminate in about 100 staff being certified to train other staff in their districts or nearby districts on a Focused Approach to Teaching English.

Additionally, the ELP standards have been included in the state's Resources for Educational Achievement and Leadership (REAL) web site. This on-line database allows access by all Oregon educators to all academic standards including the ELP standards. They can view the standards by grade and proficiency and download them in an excel document to use in their classrooms.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The State's English Language Proficiency Standards have been aligned to the English Language Arts content Standards in the following manner:

- 1.The State's English Language Arts standards are listed on the 6th column of the ELP standards and are identified as the proficient level. Five other levels of proficiency are also identified as : Beginning, Early Intermediate, Intermediate, Early Advanced, and Advanced.
- 2.ELP standards are aligned to the state's ELA standards in reading, writing, listening and speaking.
- 3.Next to each ELA standards there are five other columns, one per proficiency standard. These ELP standards delineate the work that LEP students would be expected to be able to know and perform.
- 4.Additionally, when applicable, interim standards were written to prepare LEP students for an ELA standard which required some initial preparation.
- 5.Also, where the English language art standard requires highly specialized language use requiring at least an intermediate level of language proficiency or higher, it is indicated on the proficiency document as not available. In this manner, beginning proficiency level students are not expected to perform before they have acquired some proficiency in English.

Please example below.

The state's mathematics standards will be aligned to the ELP standards by language function and forms. Below is an example for one strand in 5th grade and two proficiency levels:

STATISTICS AND PROBABILITY

5TH grade -

Compare two related sets of data using measures of center (mean, median, and mode) and spread (range).

Sample frames for generating oral and written speech at three levels of proficiency using language function for comparison and contrast:

Intermediate level of proficiency -

>A _____ is _____-er than a _____.

>They both have _____, but _____ have _____.

>_____ is _____, but _____ is _____. They are both _____.

Early Advanced

>A _____ is _____ compared to a _____.

>_____ and _____ are similar because they both _____. They are different because _____-are/have _____.

>The way they are alike is that they both are/have _____, but what's different is that _____ are/have

LEP aligned to ELA:

Reading 1:

Beginning: Uses appropriately familiar vocabulary in reading.

Early Intermediate: Uses appropriately familiar and content-related vocabulary in reading.

Intermediate: Uses appropriately content-related vocabulary in discussions and reading. Uses expanded vocabulary and descriptive words and paraphrasing for oral and written responses to texts.

Early Advanced: Recognizes words that sometimes have multiple meanings in literature and texts in content areas (e.g., present (gift), present (time)).

Advanced: Recognizes that words sometimes have multiple meanings and applies this knowledge consistently.

Proficient: None available.

Reading 2:

Beginning: Uses pictures and observations to meet basic needs in social and academic settings (e.g., locations, greetings, classroom objects).

Early Intermediate: Uses knowledge of English morphemes, phonics, and syntax to decode and determine the meaning of unfamiliar words in simple sentences.

Intermediate: Uses reading knowledge of English morphemes, phonics, and syntax to decode, determine and interpret the meaning of unfamiliar words in written texts.

Early Advanced: Uses reading knowledge of English morphemes, phonics, and syntax to decode, determine and interpret the meaning of unfamiliar words with 50% accuracy.

Advanced: Determines meaning of words using knowledge of root words, affixes, suffixes and contextual clues with 75% accuracy.

Proficient: Determine meanings of words using contextual and structural clues.

Reading 3:

Beginning: None available

Early Intermediate: None available

Intermediate: None available

Early Advanced: Following pattern provided by teacher, determines unstated ideas and concepts, noting and analyzing evidence that supports those unstated ideas such as images, patterns, or symbols in the text.

Advanced: Using instructional guide, determines unstated ideas and concepts, noting and analyzing evidence that supports those unstated ideas such as images, patterns, or symbols in the text.

Proficient: Determine unstated ideas and concepts, noting and analyzing evidence that supports those unstated ideas, such as images, patterns, or symbols in the text.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

Oregon has developed an assessment of English Language Proficiency (ELPA) for students in grades k-12. The first operational administration of the test occurred in 2005-06. The test items are written by directly Oregon educators with expertise in the instruction of English language learners and who are familiar with the Oregon's standards for English language proficiency and the content standards. The process used for item writing ensures alignment because each item is written specifically to measure Oregon's standards. A content panel of Oregon educators is convened to review each item to ensure a high degree of quality and alignment to standards. In 2006-07 new field test items will be imbedded in the operational test and will be evaluated for technical adequacy as part of the item life stage process that Oregon has developed for both its academic assessments and the ELPA.

The process Oregon uses to ensure all eligible students are tested for English Proficiency is comprehensive. Oregon has contracted with Multnomah ESD to provide help-desk and ELPA administration support to Oregon schools. In addition, Oregon's testing contractor has developed user guides, online tutorials and reference guides that provide step-by-step directions on how to administer the assessments. The testing window is open from mid January to mid May which supports the assessment of all LEP students. In addition, Oregon requires an independent data submission in June that serves as a census of all identified LEP students that were enrolled in the previous school year. Any student identified as LEP for whom Oregon does not have an ELPA assessment record will be identified in the database as a non-participant. Districts will then have to provide information as to why the student was not tested.

The ELPA is delivered online via a web based system. The test is comprised of multiple choice and constructed response items. All of the items are scored centrally by Oregon's contractor. The constructed response speaking and writing items are scored centrally by trained raters who are consistently evaluated for reliability and fidelity to the anchor papers and rubrics. This central administration and scoring process ensures that each student is assessed on the domains of reading, writing, speaking and listening. The domain of comprehension is assessed based on the combination of reading and listening. In addition, the central scoring of the constructed response ensures a degree of scoring reliability that is difficult to achieve when tests are scored by test administrators in the field.

As noted above, the items for the ELPA are written by Oregon educators specifically to measure Oregon's English Proficiency standards. The item writing process includes a comprehensive set of item specifications, item-writer training, item documentation of alignment to standards, review by agency staff and contractors, review by Oregon educator content panel, and review for sensitivity and bias. Oregon intends to conduct an independent alignment study after it completes the 2006-07 field test process.

Because the ELPA is relatively new, Oregon only has preliminary data regarding the technical quality of the ELPA. Currently, we are refining the scale as part of the standard setting process that will be conducted on December 11th, 2006. As part of that evaluation, Oregon is reviewing each of the resulting item characteristics and fit statistics. Once the performance levels are established, Oregon will conduct a series of technical reviews including classification consistency, consistency of classification with teacher judgments and multi-trait/method correlation evaluations to help ensure that the test is measuring the ELP construct rather than other construct irrelevant variance. Finally, Oregon has awarded a contract to AIR to develop its technical manual for the ELPA. This document will delineate the purpose and intended use of the test, item and test development processes, test specifications as well as statistics

from the operational administration. We expect that the manual will be complete by July 2007 and will contain data from the 2005-06 administration. Subsequently, Oregon will update the manual to incorporate data from future administrations of the ELPA.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	37402	78.00
2. Russian	2746	5.70
3. Vietnamese	1476	3.10
4. Ukranian	763	1.60
5. English, Native American	607	1.30
6. Korean	524	1.10
7. Chinese, Yue	508	1.10
8. Romanian	438	0.90
9. Hmong	376	0.80
10. Chinese, Mandarin	292	0.60
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
2655	352	1

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

The number of immigrant children and youth remains about the same. The state has not had sudden increases and the new immigrant children and youth and generally attending districts with larger population of LEP students and who have experience serving immigrant children and youth.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

State's definition of "proficient" in English

English Language proficiency is demonstrated through the mastery of reading, speaking, listening and the writing system. (Hakuta, 1999)

Linguistic proficiency is an indication that proficient students are ready to understand or comprehend (listen to) oral instruction in English. It also indicates that the student can comprehend and obtain information (reading) from content area textbooks, as well as write and speak about what the student is supposed to know and be able to demonstrate. English language proficiency, however, is not a guarantee of academic success. It is a predictor of the student's ability to benefit from the language used in the mainstream classroom. (Scarcella, Robin, April 2003)

Generally speaking, LEP students should be prepared to demonstrate English language proficiency to be able to communicate concepts through the application of rules of syntax to vocabulary unique to the English language and that represent these concepts, encoded through phonological systems or conventions of writing. (Gary Hargett, SEA meeting, August 2003)

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

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

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have been made to the state's definition of making progress.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

State's definition of cohort(s)

Cohort is defined as a group of LEP students sharing the same level of English language proficiency. The proficiency levels in the ELP standards have been defined to include a five-year English language development program as follows. Beginning (5-6 months), Early intermediate (5-6 months), Intermediate (2 years), Early Advanced (1 year), Advanced (1 year).

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 85.00	# 17677	% 47.00	# 9919	% 20.00	# 6259	% 12.00	# 3772

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	85.00	9806	48.00
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		10758	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	20.00	3683	12.00
TOTAL		30836	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	114
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	14
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	38
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	26
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	24
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	51
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	32
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	74
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	80
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	359	92.50
4	434	94.40
5	508	90.20
6	453	86.30
7	420	73.00
8	267	50.50
H.S.	164	26.90

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	348	89.90
4	428	93.50
5	512	90.90
6	420	79.90
7	390	67.60
8	308	57.90
H.S.	166	22.00

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	1

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

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

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	81.70
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	90.30
Black, non-Hispanic	69.40
Hispanic	63.90
White, non-Hispanic	85.10
Students with Disabilities	61.90
Limited English Proficient	59.30
Economically Disadvantaged	82.60
Migrant	0.00
Male	79.80
Female	83.60
Comments: Migrant-N/A	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	4.20
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.20
Black, non-Hispanic	6.00
Hispanic	8.10
White, non-Hispanic	3.50
Students with Disabilities	4.30
Limited English Proficient	8.60
Economically Disadvantaged	2.80
Migrant	0.00
Male	4.50
Female	3.80
Comments: Migrant-N/A	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

175 equivalent days membership between July 1 and June 30

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	154	139
LEAs with Subgrants	43	43

Comments: LEAs with subgrants number is within 21 subgrants

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	382	499
1	434	612
2	462	559
3	404	585
4	418	571
5	397	589
6	394	593
7	356	624
8	367	603
9	399	670
10	408	650
11	400	550
12	494	739

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	478	1770
Doubled-up	3730	4328
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	669	1271
Hotels/Motels	438	475
Unknown	0	0

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	318
1	500
2	632
3	570
4	599
5	608
6	608
7	616
8	652
9	619
10	682
11	638
12	697

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

342

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

1131

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

1059

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	1358
English Language Learners (ELL)	1198
Gifted and Talented	84
Vocational Education	281

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	21
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	20
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	21
Transportation	21
Early childhood programs	9
Assistance with participation in school programs	21
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	21
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	20
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	21
Coordination between schools and agencies	21
Counseling	17
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	21
Clothing to meet a school requirement	21
School supplies	21
Referral to other programs and services	21
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	22
Other (optional)	8

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School selection	0
Transportation	5
School records	2
Immunizations or other medical records	0
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
0	0
0	0
0	0

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	378	279
Grade 4	Yes	414	290
Grade 5	Yes	404	265
Grade 6	Yes	382	212
Grade 7	Yes	368	172
Grade 8	Yes	347	111
Grade 9	Yes	109	18
Grade 10	Yes	219	66
Grade 11	Yes	48	<n
Grade 12	Yes	39	10

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	384	262
Grade 4	Yes	415	303
Grade 5	Yes	408	288
Grade 6	Yes	386	199
Grade 7	Yes	373	161
Grade 8	Yes	349	115
Grade 9	Yes	119	15
Grade 10	Yes	209	33
Grade 11	Yes	91	13
Grade 12	Yes	43	8

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.