

**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 2007-08**

**OREGON**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**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* (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- 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 V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

## **PART I**

Part I of the CSPR 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 the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **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.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

## **PART II**

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 19, 2008**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 27, 2009**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2007-08 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 SY 2007-08 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).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report  For  State Formula Grant Programs  under the  Elementary And Secondary Education Act  as amended by the  No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2007-08 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2007-08		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Oregon Department of Education		
Address: 255 Capitol St. NE Salem, Oregon 97310		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Tryna Luton		
Telephone: 503-947-5922		
Fax: 503-378-5156		
e-mail: tryna.luton@state.or.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Tryna Luton		
		Friday, March 13, 2009, 3:28:29 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *NCLB* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon revised its K-8 Mathematics standards in 2007 and these were adopted by the Oregon State Board of Education in December 2007. The high school mathematics standards are scheduled for adoption in March 2009. The new standards will begin implementation in the 2008-09 school year and phased in to provide students with the opportunity to learn prior to the revised state assessment in 2013.

Oregon is revising its Science content standards in 2008 and these are scheduled for adoption in March 2009. The new standards will begin implementation in the 2009-10 school year and phased in to provide students with the opportunity to learn prior to the revised state assessment is in place.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the general assessment, based on the revised 3-8 Mathematics content standards adopted in 2007, in Fall 2009 Oregon will conduct new standard setting in preparation for the 2010-11 school year. To ensure a stable transition for the accountability system, student's opportunity to learn has been achieved and that Oregon can provide a sufficiently large item bank necessary implement an adaptive assessment with 3 opportunities for each student aligned to grade level standards, the standard setting and subsequent test specifications will assess the 2002 and 2007 standards with common content and the content in the 2002 standards that have been moved to a later grade in the 2007 standards. Assessment of new 2007 content is anticipated to begin in 2013-14. Oregon anticipates submitting evidence to peer review in Winter 2010.  
For the alternate assessment, ODE will analyze the alignment of that alternate assessment to the 2007 grade level standards and determine after reducing the standards by depth, breadth and complexity whether there is sufficient cause to conduct standard setting again.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon submitted additional science evidence for peer review in October 2008 and is anticipating approval. Science content standards are anticipated to be adopted in Spring 2009. Oregon will establish the assessment revision timeline after analyzing the final changes. However, we anticipate that the revised assessment will be implemented no earlier than 2011-2012.
--

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State *NCLB* assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for *NCLB* mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with *NCLB*. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	299,849	296,817	99.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,327	6,219	98.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,206	14,078	99.1
Black, non-Hispanic	8,918	8,760	98.2
Hispanic	50,610	50,120	99.0
White, non-Hispanic	207,173	205,202	99.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,682	43,640	97.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,430	31,157	99.1
Economically disadvantaged students	136,707	135,537	99.1
Migratory students	5,900	5,851	99.2
Male	153,733	151,964	98.8
Female	146,116	144,853	99.1

**Comments:** Beginning LEP students are counted as participants if they take the English Language Proficiency Assessment. These students do not have performance levels on the state mathematics test.

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (*IDEA*) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	24,766	56.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	14,718	33.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,156	9.5
Total	43,640	

**Comments:** Performance counts do not include first year LEP students. However, students are counted as participants if they take the math assessment or the English Proficiency assessment for Reading.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	299,903	297,249	99.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,324	6,227	98.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,196	14,110	99.4
Black, non-Hispanic	8,918	8,771	98.4
Hispanic	50,632	50,196	99.1
White, non-Hispanic	207,206	205,480	99.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	44,648	43,677	97.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,427	31,215	99.3
Economically disadvantaged students	136,693	135,685	99.3
Migratory students	5,880	5,834	99.2
Male	153,748	152,160	99.0
Female	146,155	145,089	99.3

**Comments:** First Year LEP students are eligible to take the English Language Proficiency Assessment instead of the Reading/Language Arts Assessment. All students must take the Mathematics Assessment.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	25,423	58.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	13,533	31.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,714	10.8
Total	43,670	

**Comments:** First Year LEP students are eligible to take the English Language Proficiency Assessment instead of the Reading/Language Arts Assessment. All students must take the Mathematics Assessment.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	129,018	125,159	97.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,784	2,618	94.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,083	5,940	97.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3,851	3,596	93.4
Hispanic	20,524	19,811	96.5
White, non-Hispanic	90,955	88,485	97.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	17,907	16,875	94.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,501	11,095	96.5
Economically disadvantaged students	54,796	53,069	96.8
Migratory students	2,330	2,262	97.1
Male	66,100	63,896	96.7
Female	62,918	61,263	97.4

**Comments:** Beginning LEP students are counted as participants if they take the English Language Proficiency Assessment. These students do not have performance levels on the state mathematics test.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	10,734	63.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,749	28.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,392	8.2
Total	16,875	

**Comments:** Beginning LEP students are not included for proficiency.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State *NCLB* assessments.

#### 1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State *NCLB* assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### 1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,144	32,505	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	838	552	65.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,940	1,644	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,308	830	63.5
Hispanic	7,613	4,541	59.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,344	23,298	82.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,774	3,451	50.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,145	3,178	51.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,993	14,127	67.3
Migratory students	896	454	50.7
Male	21,648	16,812	77.7
Female	20,496	15,693	76.6
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,155	35,380	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	843	667	79.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,938	1,735	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,306	977	74.8
Hispanic	7,607	5,301	69.7
White, non-Hispanic	28,360	24,897	87.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,766	3,638	53.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,750	3,494	60.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,989	16,056	76.5
Migratory students	897	536	59.8
Male	21,654	17,643	81.5
Female	20,501	17,737	86.5
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science not assessed at Grade 3			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,149	32,367	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	886	614	69.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,958	1,621	82.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,221	778	63.7
Hispanic	7,635	4,510	59.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,504	23,340	81.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,028	3,467	49.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,569	2,683	48.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,876	13,932	66.7
Migratory students	898	454	50.6
Male	21,551	16,701	77.5
Female	20,598	15,666	76.1
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,158	34,911	82.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	889	683	76.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,959	1,704	87.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,221	924	75.7
Hispanic	7,644	5,046	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,514	24,915	87.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	7,017	3,634	51.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,239	2,768	52.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,877	15,474	74.1
Migratory students	890	493	55.4
Male	21,559	17,462	81.0
Female	20,599	17,449	84.7
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science not assessed at Grade 4.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,829	32,072	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	856	571	66.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,969	1,688	85.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,247	759	60.9
Hispanic	7,319	4,564	62.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,553	23,037	80.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,867	3,144	45.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,098	2,583	50.7
Economically disadvantaged students	20,218	13,480	66.7
Migratory students	844	454	53.8
Male	21,190	16,215	76.5
Female	20,639	15,857	76.8
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,846	31,532	75.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	856	553	64.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,968	1,597	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,251	739	59.1
Hispanic	7,321	4,027	55.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,567	23,157	81.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,869	2,824	41.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,825	1,775	36.8
Economically disadvantaged students	20,227	12,828	63.4
Migratory students	837	343	41.0
Male	21,191	15,489	73.1
Female	20,655	16,043	77.7
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,563	30,957	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	832	546	65.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,965	1,514	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,236	674	54.5
Hispanic	7,281	3,666	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	28,378	23,117	81.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,789	3,474	51.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,045	1,737	34.4
Economically disadvantaged students	20,068	12,570	62.6
Migratory students	843	317	37.6
Male	21,041	16,198	77.0
Female	20,522	14,759	71.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,163	29,635	70.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	903	557	61.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,974	1,636	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,202	643	53.5
Hispanic	7,147	3,701	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,093	21,777	74.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,456	2,250	34.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,384	1,574	35.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,833	11,478	57.9
Migratory students	813	374	46.0
Male	21,616	15,117	69.9
Female	20,547	14,518	70.7
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,174	30,910	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	900	591	65.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,973	1,592	80.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,203	728	60.5
Hispanic	7,149	3,732	52.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,096	22,876	78.6
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	6,467	2,295	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,119	1,274	30.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,835	12,030	60.7
Migratory students	813	357	43.9
Male	21,622	15,055	69.6
Female	20,552	15,855	77.1
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science not assessed at Grade 6.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,247	31,339	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	900	598	66.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,905	1,623	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,260	770	61.1
Hispanic	6,839	4,056	59.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,621	23,022	77.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,993	2,138	35.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,717	1,581	42.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,862	11,831	62.7
Migratory students	751	401	53.4
Male	21,642	15,751	72.8
Female	20,605	15,588	75.7
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,254	31,186	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	896	586	65.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,905	1,512	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,266	763	60.3
Hispanic	6,835	3,610	52.8
White, non-Hispanic	29,630	23,429	79.1
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,991	2,066	34.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,427	938	27.4
Economically disadvantaged students	18,863	11,482	60.9
Migratory students	746	309	41.4
Male	21,640	15,145	70.0
Female	20,614	16,041	77.8
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Science not assessed at Grade 7			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,015	28,874	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	922	526	57.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,907	1,552	81.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,239	598	48.3
Hispanic	6,534	3,207	49.1
White, non-Hispanic	29,779	21,883	73.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,575	1,547	27.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,409	1,109	32.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,010	9,969	55.4
Migratory students	688	297	43.2
Male	21,663	14,943	69.0
Female	20,352	13,931	68.5
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	42,014	27,436	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	919	497	54.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,905	1,368	71.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,237	612	49.5
Hispanic	6,541	2,634	40.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,773	21,224	71.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,574	1,391	25.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,156	522	16.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,013	9,001	50.0
Migratory students	693	215	31.0
Male	21,661	13,456	62.1
Female	20,353	13,980	68.7
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,470	28,662	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	901	527	58.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,903	1,380	72.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,211	549	45.3
Hispanic	6,453	2,752	42.6
White, non-Hispanic	29,384	22,342	76.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5,429	2,020	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,356	740	22.1
Economically disadvantaged students	17,722	9,658	54.5
Migratory students	679	222	32.7
Male	21,344	15,441	72.3
Female	20,126	13,221	65.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,194	22,020	52.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	886	320	36.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,948	1,325	68.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,199	296	24.7
Hispanic	5,783	1,741	30.1
White, non-Hispanic	31,126	17,698	56.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,806	654	13.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,835	447	15.8
Economically disadvantaged students	15,116	5,309	35.1
Migratory students	666	193	29.0
Male	21,560	11,398	52.9
Female	20,634	10,622	51.5
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,483	27,524	64.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	895	474	53.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,952	1,301	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,197	480	40.1
Hispanic	5,809	2,260	38.9
White, non-Hispanic	31,352	22,173	70.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,849	1,077	22.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,543	359	14.1
Economically disadvantaged students	15,192	7,350	48.4
Migratory students	655	198	30.2
Male	21,701	13,339	61.5
Female	20,782	14,185	68.3
<b>Comments:</b> Students who decline to report ethnicity are not included in racial/ethnic group counts			

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	41,387	23,713	57.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	875	409	46.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,918	1,184	61.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,120	343	30.6
Hispanic	5,607	1,707	30.4
White, non-Hispanic	30,665	19,386	63.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	4,619	1,041	22.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,694	339	12.6
Economically disadvantaged students	14,703	6,087	41.4
Migratory students	628	160	25.5
Male	21,115	13,012	61.6
Female	20,272	10,701	52.8
<b>Comments:</b> Assessed at Grade 10			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,240	780	62.9
Districts	196	81	41.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	564	412	73.0
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	374	268	71.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	190	144	75.8
<b>Comments:</b> Given that the target went up to 60%, we know that the warning is reasonable. There were a lot more schools that did not make AYP this year as compared to the previous year.			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
174	60	34.5
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**Note:** DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

#### 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

##### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))<sup>1</sup>
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	8
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement**

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon is continuing its development of a Statewide System of Support for schools and districts in improvement. This system is a partnership between the Oregon Department of Education and the Oregon Association of Education Service Districts that places school improvement facilitators in each school to both assist the district and school in its improvement efforts. These facilitators provide data analysis, professional development, and other resources. In many cases, they serve as brokers of information in order to connect the districts and schools with necessary improvement resources.

The Department monitors compliance with NCLB improvement regulations through reporting mechanisms collected by school improvement facilitators as well as on-site monitoring. Schools and districts are required to report annually on progress in improvement through reports directly to the Oregon Department of Education.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08</b>
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	4
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	1	1
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	08/22/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2007-08.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the **SY 2007-08 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the **SY 2006-07 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	109,325	107,779
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	79,687	71,766
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	72.9	66.6
Total number of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	83,347	79,652
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	76.2	73.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	575	
<b>Comments:</b> Total number of students that received assistance includes only the grades that were assessed. (grades 3 through 8 and 10)		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	413
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	13
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that <b>did not make adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2007-08	152
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies**

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
3		35	4	31	D	Change in teacher behaviors.
<b>Comments:</b>						

Column 1 Response Options Box
1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.
4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.
5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.
8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box
A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells
B = Increased teacher retention
C = Improved parental involvement
D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.



**1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon Department of Education is disseminating information through the school improvement facilitator website maintained by the Willamette ESD. The website can be found at: [http://www.wesd.org/osif/osif\\_home.asp](http://www.wesd.org/osif/osif_home.asp).

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 1.1 %

**Comments:** Reservation falls short of 4% because of hold harmless provision

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools**

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.  
Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance**

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon Department of Education's (ODE) method of distributing Section 1003 (a) funds to schools identified for improvement is currently decided by a formula of a base allocation and ADM. Decisions related to the base allocation for schools in improvement is calculated based on the federal priorities: serving lowest achieving schools, greatest need, and commitment to meeting school targeted progress goals.

Schools identified for improvement are requested to work with their districts to develop a School Improvement Plan (SIP) focusing on improving the specific areas that resulted in the school being identified as needing improvement. Each SIP is aligned to the district Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), a comprehensive document that coordinates district planning for state and federal programs. ODE requires that districts develop and implement a CIP every two years. When a school does not meet AYP they are asked to evaluate and assess themselves through a seven step school improvement process to revise their SIP and explain how they will address the specific academic issues that caused them to be identified.

ODE has developed and implemented a statewide system of support that provides Oregon School Improvement Coordinators (OSIF) to assist schools in improvement. Many schools utilize OSIFs to help facilitate the school improvement process, collect and analyze school data, investigate curriculum and instructional strategies, and coordinate professional development sessions to focus on the student performance problems. Schools and districts work in teams to focus on the academic areas that need improvement and create action plans to implement and monitor their work.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other than regular set-asides required under NCLB, no other funds were put forth to school in improvement status.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

**Note:** New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	15,090
Applied to transfer	1,854
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,854

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>Yes</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 645,542
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	9
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.<sup>3</sup>
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	3,943
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,340
Received supplemental educational services	1,270
<b>Comments:</b> Data collection procedures used in the past have proved unreliable. We have revised these procedures and improved training for data reporters. This will provide more reliable data moving forward.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 1,428,630
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	66,156	60,514	91.5	5,642	8.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	3,722	3,563	95.7	159	4.3
Low-poverty schools	4,312	3,941	91.4	371	8.6
All elementary schools	16,127	15,125	93.8	1,002	6.2
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	9,979	9,021	90.4	958	9.6
Low-poverty schools	15,316	14,382	93.9	934	6.1
All secondary schools	49,491	45,240	91.4	4,251	8.6
<b>Comments:</b> Some schools included in the All schools count are not considered either an elementary or secondary school. We have rerun the data for high and low poverty elementary schools and it is accurate. High poverty % is higher than the low poverty %.					

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary classes are counted as one class.
--

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/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.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded 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]
- c. *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% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *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.
- f. *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 the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

### 1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
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	73.1
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	5.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	10.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.7
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Includes teachers with provisional licenses from other countries and states. Districts make the determination as to which of the above criteria is the most applicable and in some cases they have determined that the choices did not apply so they selected Other.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	71.2
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	4.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	9.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	14.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Includes teachers with provisional licenses from other countries and states. Districts make the determination as to which of the above criteria is the most applicable and in some cases they have determined that the choices did not apply so they selected Other.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	<b>High-Poverty Schools</b> (more than what %)	<b>Low-Poverty Schools</b> (less than what %)
Elementary schools	64.7	31.1
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch.	
Secondary schools	52.9	28.9
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch.	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.
- b. *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 through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
<u>Yes</u>	Dual language	Spanish/Russian/Chinese
<u>Yes</u>	Two-way immersion	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Developmental bilingual	Spanish
<u>Yes</u>	Heritage language	Native American
<u>Yes</u>	Sheltered English instruction	
<u>Yes</u>	Structured English immersion	
<u>No</u>	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
<u>Yes</u>	Content-based ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Pull-out ESL	
<u>Yes</u>	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of *ESEA* in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	65,314
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	56,546
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	50,626
Russian	2,729
Vietnamese	1,795
Fante or Fanti spoken in Ghana	1,502
Chinese	1,099

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Korean 776; Ukrainian 709; Somali 606
---------------------------------------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	60,677
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,637
Total	65,314
<b>Comments:</b> There are several reasons for LEP not having a valid score: a) 96 students not resolved due to duplicated Secured Student Identification number; b) 300+ students had partial tests where we did not give them credit for completing the test; c) 106 students were not enrolled during the district's testing window; d) 24 had IEP's in all reporting categories; e) 1 student was not tested due to medical emergency. Also, 4535 listed no valid reason for not having taken the test. The State is requesting LEAs that have not tested every LEP to submit an assessment plan with multiple district testing windows to allow every LEP access to the English Language Proficiency assessment. Numbers not tested include tests that were considered partial tests.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	5,287
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	8.1
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency**

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	60,284
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,584
Total	64,868
<p><b>Comments:</b> There are several reasons for LEP not having a valid score: a) 96 students not resolved due to duplicated Secured Student Identification number; b) 300+ students had partial tests where we did not give them credit for completing the test; c) 106 students were not enrolled during the district's testing window; d) 24 had IEP's in all reporting categories; e) 1 student was not tested due to medical emergency. Also, 4535 listed no valid reason for not having taken the test. The State is requesting LEAs that have not tested every LEP to submit an assessment plan with multiple district testing windows to allow every LEP access to the English Language Proficiency assessment.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	18,677	41.8
ELP attainment	5,154	10.4
<p><b>Comments:</b> These results are directly from AMAO Title III institutions.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *NCLB* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
none
<b>Comments:</b> Not applicable.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One** = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two** = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total** = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
3,014	5,337	8,351
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics**

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
35,153	14,342	40.8	20,811
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
33,863	12,544	37.0	21,319
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
13,276	3,280	24.7	9,996
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

##### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note:** Do not include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	61
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	58
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	3
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	7
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	2
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	47
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	45
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

##### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b> State met all three Title III AMAOs	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

##### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u>No</u>
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

#### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

##### **Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled** = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program** = 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. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants** = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
2,397	2,387	1

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note:** Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,952
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **# Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in PD activities.

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	45	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	14	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	12	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	14	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	36	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	19	0
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	34	0
PD provided to principals	9	0
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	1	0
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	0	0
PD provided to community based organization personnel	14	0
Total	77	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Number of Participants information was not collected.  
Other: English Language Development (ELD).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities**

This section collects data on State grant activities.

**1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process**

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

**Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation** = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees** = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution** = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/07	11/21/07	144
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees**

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Also, the business rules for the Spring NCLB LEP collection have improved greatly. It is our hope that the verification window for data submitted to that collection can be reduced to early July. The State uses the data reported to LEP collection which is aligned to the State funding reports and the State English Language Proficiency Assessment database as the basis for TIII Allocations.

The business rules for the Spring NCLB LEP collection have improved greatly. It is our hope that the verification window for data submitted to that collection can be reduced to early July. The State uses the data reported to LEP collection which is aligned to the State funding reports and the State English Language Proficiency Assessment database as the basis for TIII Allocations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	71.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.2
Black, non-Hispanic	68.1
Hispanic	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	84.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	66.5
Limited English proficient	72.5
Economically disadvantaged	73.9
Migratory students	0.0
Male	0.0
Female	0.0
<b>Comments:</b> Data not available by Migratory, Male, and Female groupings.	

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

- a. *What is the graduation rate?* 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.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates?* 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.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

**1.8.2 Dropout Rates**

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Student Group</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
All Students	4.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	3.0
Black, non-Hispanic	7.1
Hispanic	7.6
White, non-Hispanic	3.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	5.4
Limited English proficient	4.5
Economically disadvantaged	4.7
Migratory students	0.0
Male	4.6
Female	3.7
<b>Comments:</b> We do not currently calculate dropout rates for migrant students.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is 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.

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	157	147
LEAs with subgrants	40	40
Total	197	187
<b>Comments:</b> Not all LEAs without subgrants submitted (ten out of 197 did not submit).		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)**

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	0
K	409	667
1	507	676
2	517	695
3	521	701
4	504	666
5	508	661
6	425	648
7	431	661
8	428	631
9	466	711
10	508	747
11	563	834
12	789	965
Ungraded	0	0
Total	6,576	9,263
<b>Comments:</b> Did not collect "Ungraded" data in 07-08.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	642	1,178
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,767	6,325
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	659	1,298
Hotels/Motels	508	462
Total	6,576	9,263
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	355
K	593
1	632
2	664
3	639
4	613
5	623
6	610
7	637
8	590
9	673
10	741
11	752
12	885
Ungraded	89
Total	9,096
<b>Comments:</b> Most Ungraded were in Voc Ed or GED programs.	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,418
Migratory children/youth	1,054
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,262
Limited English proficient students	1,588
<b>Comments: Voc Ed - 370, TAG - 60</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	16
Expedited evaluations	17
Staff professional development and awareness	38
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	20
Transportation	29
Early childhood programs	7
Assistance with participation in school programs	38
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	29
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	26
Coordination between schools and agencies	38
Counseling	13
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	25
Clothing to meet a school requirement	28
School supplies	38
Referral to other programs and services	37
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	25
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	0
School Selection	0
Transportation	0
School records	0
Immunizations	0
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for *NCLB*.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	485	343
4	445	272
5	437	235
6	407	187
7	414	194
8	391	133
High School	312	100
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State *NCLB* mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	482	290
4	448	240
5	439	254
6	402	175
7	425	198
8	395	157
High School	323	59
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: *CSPR & EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 *Quality Control Processes*.

**Note:** In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.

*How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,575
K	1,215
1	1,176
2	1,288
3	1,131
4	1,105
5	986
6	1,030
7	1,011
8	925
9	1,007
10	897
11	825
12	681
Ungraded	145
Out-of-school	1,500
Total	17,497

**Comments:**

Source – Initially populated from *EDFacts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & *EDFacts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon identification and recruitment efforts were steady for the performance year 2007-2008. We are optimistic that the changes in the regulations, effective August 28, 2008 would open the door a fraction to qualify those families who were found ineligible because of the stricter regulations.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	434
K	512
1	539
2	545
3	487
4	476
5	379
6	308
7	291
8	199
9	173
10	176
11	154
12	87
Ungraded	65
Out-of-school	0
Total	4,825
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED*Facts*. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED*Facts* Data Crosswalk.

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's category 2 counts remained steady from last year (September 1, 2006 to August 31, 2007) to this reporting period (September 1, 2007 to August 31, 2008). We had a slight influx during the summer. The migrant camps were at the maximum capacity all over the state and our traditional migrant families continue to migrate to The Dalles to pick cherries and return home to California.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

**1.10.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS.net) to generate the 2007-08 child count Category 1 and category 2 child counts.

Yes, Oregon used OMSIS to generate the 2006-07 child count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data are first collected on paper using the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). All eligible children that fit the definition for the MEP are listed on the COE; the COE is then forwarded to the local MEP offices for input onto the OMSIS.net. Once the student's record exists on the OMSIS he/she is eligible for MEP services for up to three years from the QAD date. A child's record cannot exist on OMSIS.net without a valid COE. The COE is used to document a new qualifying move and also used as an enrollment form to enter on OMSIS.net. Other enrollment forms used to update a child's school enrollment on OMSIS.net are; 1) the Mass Enrollment Form and 2) the Change of Residency/School Form (CRSF). The two forms are used to document changes to the child's enrollment status that are not related to a new qualifying move (e.g. re-enrollment for a new school year, transfer of school, or a move to a new address.)

Evidence of students' enrollments are verified each school year and followed-up by completing the appropriate re-enrollment form. These two forms are checked for accuracy before the information is entered onto OMSIS.net. When the (CRSF) form is used to enroll a student onto OMSIS.net, it must be accompanied by a COE. The OMSIS validates all dates for any conflicts. Enrollments with date conflicts detected by the system are rejected.

The enrollment type field on OMSIS has two acceptable values; "S" and "R". Enrollment type "S" is for summer school and enrollment type "R" could be interpreted in two ways; Regular school year enrollment or Out-of-School (OOS). The logical value in the OOS field determines if the child is an out-of-schooler or not.

a. What data were collected?

The OMSIS system collects the following data: Student demographics; Student enrollment history; Enrollments and withdrawals; ELL, special education, medical alert; Supplemental instructional and support services; Language assessment; Reclassification flag and date; Days enrolled and present; Education Interruption flag; Oregon Statewide Assessment data; and Health immunizations. etc.

b. What activities were conducted to collect the data?

Activities conducted to compile data on OMSIS.net for the child count involves; 1) identification, 2) enrollments, 3) withdrawals, and 4) identifying service delivered.

Identification Oregon provides extensive training to recruiters on the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG), on MEP eligibility criteria and determination, and on the completion of Oregon's COE. Newly hired recruiters are engaged in a full-day, six-hour COE/eligibility training in which they are taught the eligibility criteria, interviewing techniques (role playing), proper completion of the COE, receive a review of the information in the NRG, etc. Veteran recruiters must undergo a refresher course on I&R and eligibility rulings. Recruiters are trained to collect necessary information required on the COE in order to establish eligibility for the MEP. This initial and necessary information is then entered onto OMSIS.net by the local data specialists.

Types of data collected at the initial enrollment are: student's demographics, eligibility data, parent/guardian data, mailing address, and phone number. The combination of the data will establish a unique identifier for each student.

Enrollments Enrollments are collected on three different forms; 1) COE, 2) Change of Residency/School Form (CRSF), and 3) mass enrollment list.

The COE documents the family's qualifying move and the child(s) enrollment status as of the date of the interview.

The CRSF documents a change to the child(s) enrollment as a result of a transfer of school and/or a change of address.

The mass enrollment list is generated at the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) and forwarded to the local districts at the beginning of the school year or at the beginning of summer school session. The list identifies all eligible migrant students as of September 1 for the regular school year; or for summer, the first day of summer school. Recruiters/HSCs use the mass enrollment list as an enrollment tool to record a transfer of school, to record a new enrollment date, and to record a new grade level for a student.

Re-enrolling out-of-school (OOS) children The process for re-enrolling out-of-school children requires the recruiters and/or the local data specialists to call or make home visits to verify the student's residency in the district as of September 1; and also to identify a potential new qualifying move.

Re-enrolling of children two years old turning three years old The process for re-enrolling this group of children requires the recruiter/HSC to make a phone call or visit the family's residence after the child's third birthday. To assist the local districts with this re-enrollment process, the OMSC provides the local districts with a running list of those children who turn three years of age, three times a year.

Withdrawal and identifying service delivered Local districts employ necessary staff to provide supplemental instructional and support services to students in need of extra academic services or social services. Staff is trained to document all Title I-C funded services provided to migrant students; and document those services on the Title I-C Withdrawal form. Other information requested on the form includes the language proficiency data, withdrawal date, days enrolled/present, ELL and SPED flagged, etc. The Title I-C Withdrawal Form is completed when the student withdraws from school or at the end of the school year, whichever comes first.

All of the above information and forms are given to the local data specialists for processing on the OMSIS.net.

c. When were the data collected for use in the student information system?

The OMSIS.net is the statewide web-based migrant student information system for Oregon. This system is continuously updated and made available every day, 24 hours a day, to users of all access levels in Oregon and for participating states. Data on migrant students are collected and updated on the system on a daily basis

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Eligible migrant student data are entered on the OMSIS.net by the local data specialists at each regional office. Oregon has 18 regional MEP offices throughout the state. Each regional office is required to hire or assign an OMSIS data specialist. The OMSIS data specialist works along-side the local recruiters, home school consultants, instructional assistants, teachers, school secretaries, and local MEP coordinators. All have the responsibility of making sure that migrant student records are up-to-date on OMSIS.net. They are also identified as the MEP liaison between USDA coordinators, insurance claim processors, and OMESC.

To maintain the consistency and integrity of the data on OMSIS.net, only the OMSIS data specialists have full access to the system. Staff development for OMSIS data specialists are especially important, therefore Oregon requires that they undergo a full day Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) training and a full day OMSIS.net application training. In addition they must attend the annual veteran I&R training and attend all OMSIS meetings and attend the annual Statewide OMSIS training.

All inputting and updating of student records is done at the local MEP office. A local data specialist checks all COEs and other enrollment forms before they are entered onto the OMSIS.net. The system validates and authenticates the user account on OMSIS.net. All local OMSIS data specialists have full access to their district's student records.

When a new COE is completed and handed to the local data specialists, the data specialists review the COE for completeness and accuracy and then search the system for a match. If there is a match then there is already an OMSIS ID. The OMSIS ID is then recorded on the COE. If the student doesn't exist, the data specialist takes the necessary steps to thoroughly search the system before creating a new record on the system. OMSIS.net allows two types of searches; users may search for a record by the parent/guardian names or by the student's names. In the student search there is a search engine called "search full text" that users can use to search for a student with two last names. Example, when searching for Jose Gonzalez-Martinez, under the search full text, the user would enter Jose Martinez and the system will return a listing of all students named Jose Martinez with the Martinez in front or behind the hyphen. This search engine helps expedite the search process, especially when searching for students with double last names.

The State OMSIS system follows these steps for validation:

Step 1: Validating for authorized region IDs and users: The system checks to verify that the site transmitting the data is a valid region and has the correct user names, user ID and password.

Step 2: Validating new student's last name, first name, date of birth, and mother's maiden name for duplicate student record: If record exists, the system will display a message on the screen saying "Student already exists".

Step 3: Validating of dates: All dates are automatically validated (date of birth, end of eligibility date, enrollment date, residency date, out-of-school date, qualifying arrival date).

Step 4: OMSIS data specialists are trained to search for all possible spellings of names and to perform cross-tabulation of names on the OMSIS.net browse screen before they request a new OMSIS ID for a student.

Specific crosswalk or tabulation are:

English cognates: (e.g., James/Jaime, Francisco/Frank, Pedro/Peter); Similar spellings or misspellings: (e.g., Sanchez vs. Sanches, Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names.(e.g., Yesenia vs. Jesenia, Evelia vs. Ebelia, Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names: (e.g., Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez, Sanches-Rodrigues, ; Sanches- Rodriguez, Sanchez vs. Sanches, Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues, Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double first names: (e.g., Juan vs. Juan Carlos, Jose vs. Jose Luis, Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names: (Rodriguez, Maria, 01/01/84 vs. 10/01/84.); Last names that can be written with or without spaces: (e.g., A la Torre vs. Alatorre, De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated: (e.g., Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus)

Step 5 Step 5: There are several databases created to store student data. OMSIS.net is a relational database. A relational database such as OMSIS contains many records which pertain to a given student, arranged in different data tables. All databases are related using two key elements; Student key and enrollment key. The two keys combined identify a specific student and enrollment period.

A student is identified in the OMSIS data tables by their OMSIS ID number which is also called the primary key. This OMSIS ID is a key value, which is unique to the student. The OMSIS ID is the primary key which uniquely identifies those records in the different tables which provide the relational profile of the student. The OMSIS ID is assigned when the student is first enrolled on OMSIS.net. This primary key can never be assigned to another student, and follows the student everywhere he/she attends school in Oregon.

In the School History, Supplemental Services, and Language Assessments table the primary key is used with a school level enrollment ID to establish a school level profile of the student. This allows supplemental services and language assessments to be profiled per school

enrollment as well as specific school enrollment detail.

Step 6 Step 6: On a monthly basis, the OMESC provides the 18 regional MEPs with counts of eligible migrant students in their districts. Counts are broken down by 0-21 years and 3-21 years.

Step 7 Step 7: OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a list of qualifying migrant children who turned 3 years old between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008. This list is produced three times a year. Some local programs generate this report once a month to quickly locate families that fall under this category. Families are contacted by either the telephone or with a home visit by the recruiter to verify eligibility.

Step 8 Step 8: Local MEPs were given October 1, 2008 as the deadline date for processing all 2007-2008 regular school year and 2008 summer enrollments and withdrawals. All reporting is done on the Title I-C withdrawal form.

Step 9: State category 1 and category 2 counts were generated on October 23, 2008. Numbers from both counts are produced along with a hard copy print-out of all student names. Manual checking and cross-tabulation are done by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found will be carefully analyzed and subtracted from the final count.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon category 1 and category 2 were generated using the same system - OMSIS. For category 2 explanation see the above response.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In OR all eligible children (0-21) are listed on the COE and all qualifying children (children who move with, to join, or on own, etc.) are entered on OMSIS.net. When COEs are processed on OMSIS, each child is assigned a unique OMSIS ID number. Before OMSIS appends the record, the system validates the student's age and qualifying arrival date. The system filters out children who were born after the qualifying arrival date, children who are age 22 or over as of the enroll date or OOS date, or with qualifying arrival dates before 09/01/04 for the year 09/01/07-08/31/08.

When the Cat. 1 and 2 counts are generated, all students between the ages of 0-2 as of the enroll date or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned three years old between 09/01/07 and 08/31/08, OMSIS checks the latest enrollment line ID and validates the enroll or OOS date against the date of birth to verify it is three years after the date of birth. Before generating the final count, OMESC generates the 2 Turning 3 Report three times during the year and distributes it to the programs for follow-up and updating the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters/local data specialists contact the families to verify the residency of the child. Once residency at age three is established the recruiter/data specialist re-enrolled the child back on the system with the contact date as the new enrollment or OOS date. The contact date must be a date that is prior to the child's third birthday. The data special also changes the grade level to P3 and checks the "2-Turning 3" box on OMSIS.

The system automatically creates a database which stores all records that justify both counts. The databases are checked manually by OMESC staff, including checking single last names against double last names, similar spelling of both first/last names, etc. If a conflicting record is identified, OMESC staff research the differences and take corrective action. Records are corrected on OMSIS and counts are adjusted on the child count report.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligible period (09/01-08/31): Recruiters verify students' residency in their programs before completing a COE, mass enrollment list, or CRSF form for input onto OMSIS. Students are not automatically re-enrolled on OMSIS. Verifying a child's residency can be done face-to-face, telephone, checking the LEA student information system, or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children is done with the aid of the mass enrollment list, which lists all OOS children identified the previous school year and are eligible for the new school year. Before re-enrolling OOS children for a new school year, the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the mass enrollment list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move, a new COE is completed. Nothing is done if the family cannot be found or moved out of the area.

Children who - in the case of Cat.2 - received an MEP-funded service during the summer(SS)or intersession term: OR's Cat.2 count includes every child enrolled in a Title I-C funded SS program and who received supplemental instructional/support services. Like the RSY program, recruiters complete one of the 3 enrollment forms to enroll and enter the information on OMSIS. Students must be eligible and 3 years old as of the first day of SS. SS enrollments entered on OMSIS are flagged with an enrollment type "S" to distinguish from RSY enrollments. Oregon does not have intersession programs. SS programs are required to complete a "Summer Title I-C Withdrawal Form" for each student enrolled. The form captures withdrawal dates, days enrolled/present, and supplemental instructional/support services the student received. This form is completed at the end of the SS and forwarded on to the data specialist to be input; information is stored in the Enrollment and Supplemental Services databases. The enrollment database is compared against the supplemental services database to verify all students enrolled have two or more services reported. Records with no services are excluded from the Cat.2 count.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category: Before enrollment is accepted on OMSIS, the following is verified for each student: (1)enrollment or OOS date is greater than or equal to the QAD date;(2)age is less than 22 as of the enrolled or OOS date;(3) previous school history line does not contain a reclassification flag of G/graduated, E/received GED or D/deceased; (4)and is 3 years old and has an enrollment or OOS date on or after their third birthday.

Cat.1-Information is verified in two databases for the Cat.1 count: the Student Information database and the Enrollment database. The Student Information database has the primary key (OMSIS ID), student names, and demographics. The primary key is coded with a unique index command. With a unique index command the same value cannot be contained within that field (OMSIS ID). This ensures there is only one OMSIS ID for each student. The Enrollment database contains information on each student's enrollments and withdrawals, and stores all enrollment history line IDs for separate enrollment periods and types. These two database have the OMSIS ID in common which allows the relation of the two database.

The criteria for determining the Cat.1 count are as follows: student must be enrolled or OOS between 09/01/07-08/31/08; student must be between the age of 3-21 during the period of 09/01/07-08/31/08; student who turns 3 between 09/01/07-08/31/08 must have a new enrollment line ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3 years greater than student's date of birth and there must be a check in the 2 turning 3 box; student must have a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrollment date, or OOS date) between start date and end date. The start date is 09/01/07; the end date would be the run date, 10/23/08; student must have a QAD on or after 09/01/04; student must have a residency date on or before 08/31/08; student enrolled after 09/01/08, must have a residency date earlier than 08/31/08; and for a student whose regular school year started in August 2007, the 2007-08 enrollment line must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/08. All eight conditions must be met for a child to be counted as Cat.1. Coding results are written to a database, 200708\_FederalRegularCount.dbf, where information is manually scanned by OMESC staff for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and deducted from the category 1 count.

Cat.2: For Cat.2 we use the two database used for Cat.1 plus an additional database, the Supplemental Services database. The Supplemental Services database contains instructional and support services provided during regular and summer programs.

Using the two database used for Cat.1, the criteria below are coded in: student is enrolled between 05/15/08 and 08/31/08; student is 3 as of the enrolled date; student is less than 22 as of the enrolled date; student has a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 05/15/08 and 08/31/08; student enrollment type must be (S-summer); student previous enrollment lines do not have a value of G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased; and, must have in the Supplemental Services database at least two instructional services codes.

All 7 conditions must be met for a student to be included in the Cat.2 count. The coding result is written to a database, 20072008\_FederalSummer.dbf, where it is manually scanned by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are deducted from Cat.2. OR does not operate on Intersession. The two files 200708 FederalRegularCount.dbf and 20072008 FederalSummer.dbt are trans. to the SEA to populate EDEN.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon category 2 were generated using the same system as Category 1 - OMSIS.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) created a Quality Control Plan for the State, based on the Quality Control recommendations in Chapter III of the 2003 Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The Plan is shown below:

#### I. Training for Recruiters

Draft NRG, Ch. III, A13.1: Training for recruiters on various aspects of the job.

State Actions: OMEC certifies new recruiters based on required training, job-shadowing, and written practice of information from the state's I&R Manual (done monthly); OMEC provides one day of training for experienced recruiters and all data entry specialists in the fall and a half-day in the spring (done Fall and Spring); OMEC provides extra training upon request (done as needed); and OMEC provides training for Lead Recruiters (done quarterly).

#### II. Designated Reviewer for each COE

Draft NRG, Ch. III, A12.2: A designated reviewer for each COE to verify that, based on the recorded data, the child is eligible for MEP services.

State Actions: SEA requires regional programs to identify/assign a designated reviewer, usually the regional coordinator (designated in August).

#### III. Process for Resolving Eligibility Questions

Draft NRG, Ch. III, A13.3: A formal process for resolving eligibility questions raised by recruiters and their supervisors and for transmitting responses to all local operating agencies in written form.

State Actions: SEA requires that regional programs identify/assign a Lead Recruiter (October); OMEC trains and offers technical support for Lead Recruiters (Quarterly meetings); OMEC maintains regular contact with Lead Recruiters to gather eligibility questions from the field (ongoing); OMEC's COE Team meets monthly to review questions and make eligibility rulings for the State (monthly); OMEC emails all rulings to Regional Coordinators and data entry specialists immediately; and provides Regional Coordinators, data entry specialists, and recruiters with written copy of all rulings once a year (annually).

#### IV. Process to Validate Eligibility Determinations

Draft NRG, Ch. III, A13.4: A process for the SEA to validate that eligibility determinations were properly made.

Draft NRG, Ch III, A16: Review eligibility determinations at least annually, including: an examination by qualified individuals at the SEA level of a representative sample of COEs for sufficiency of the written documentation; a process for improvement, as needed, to eliminate the causes of common errors on COEs...; and a process for corrective action if the SEA finds COEs that do not sufficiently document a child's eligibility.

Draft NRG, CH III, A17: Re-interviewing parents or guardians from a representative sample of COEs on an annual basis should be part of an SEA's quality control system. SEAs are encouraged to use an outside contractor to perform this task at least once every 3 years.

State Actions: OMEC examines a 100% sample of COEs for sufficiency of the written document (ongoing); OMEC provides semi-annual reports to the regional programs on the accuracy levels of their COEs (quarterly); OMEC revises training agendas for recruiters based on frequent problems on COEs (annually); OMEC returns copies of insufficient COEs to regional data entry specialists with a form explaining what is missing and communicates with regional staff to resolve those problems (ongoing); OMEC re-interviews a 1% sample of all new COEs statewide (monthly); OMEC has a process to remove any non-eligible students from the child count (ongoing); and OMEC provides a report of re-interview results to ODE and Regional Coordinators (quarterly).

#### V. Monitor I&R Practices of Recruiters

Draft NRG, CH. III, A13.5: Monitor, at least annually, the identification and recruitment practices of individual recruiters.

State Action: SEA will review general recruiter practices during monitoring of LEAs (during regular school year).

#### VI. Document QC System and Actions Taken to Improve

Draft NRG: Ch. III, A13.6: Documentation that supports the SEA's implementation of this quality control system and a record of actions taken to improve the system where periodic reviews and evaluations indicate a need to do so.

State Actions: OMEC maintains electronic and paper records of actions taken by OMEC (ongoing) and SEA monitors programs on a regular schedule and keeps records (ongoing).

#### VII. Process to Implement Corrective When Needed

Draft NRG, Ch. III, A13.7: A process for implementing corrective action in response to internal audit findings and recommendations.

State Action: SEA makes findings on the regional I&R plans and follows the corrective process (annually).

All training relating to ID&R and the Oregon Migrant Student Information System is done by State trainers. This ensures that information is delivered in a consistent manner. Oregon continues to work with Lead Recruiters, who receive additional training in quarterly meetings. The Lead Recruiters will support other recruiters in the field by reviewing COEs in group meetings and helping to answer eligibility questions. They will also lead the development of local I&R Action Plans.

The SEA provides recruiters with a copy of Chapter II (Child Eligibility) of the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance published by OME, and an

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State of Oregon quality control and re-interview processes are as follows:

When a regional program hires a new recruiter, that recruiter must go through an extensive training on the eligibility criteria for qualifying migrant children. After the recruiters are trained by the State program trainer, the regional programs provide additional support to the new recruiter by mentoring them and shadowing their work. The regional program's lead recruiter reviews the new recruiter's COEs and interviewing techniques. When needed, the regional programs call on the statewide recruiter at the OMESC to provide additional mentoring. This process assures quality control procedures are met prior to the COE being entered onto OMSIS. The COE and its contents are reviewed by several staff members at the regional office before it is entered onto OMSIS and then sent to the OMESC for additional review.

At the OMESC a report is generated every month of all COEs generated for that month. The state re-interviewer randomly selects 1 of every 100 COEs to conduct a re-interview. The quality control manager then contacts the local regions to notify them that the state re-interviewer will be conducting a re-interview in their area and that the originating recruiter is requested to accompany the state re-interviewer. The name of the family is not released to the regional program coordinator or the local recruiter until the day of the interview. The state re-interviewer contacts the family to arrange an appointment to validate the information on the COE. The local recruiter accompanies the state re-interviewer and they go together to the family's home. The local recruiter introduces the state re-interviewer but is not allowed to speak or establish communication with the family until the end of the re-interview.

Upon completion of the re-interview, the state re-interviewer consults with the quality control manager and reviews the results of the re-interview. Any discrepancies are discussed with the OMSIS data analyst, OMESC director and the state coordinator. A detailed investigation is made by reviewing the guidance and the procedures if a consensus does not occur between the people involved. If the re-interview is found to be successful and the information on the COE is accurate and eligible then the OMESC director makes the final decision and the quality control manager sends the final report to the regional program coordinator, with a copy to the recruiter.

If the family is found to be ineligible, the following steps are taken:

1. A letter is sent to the regional program coordinator informing him/her of the negative results. The regional program then has 30 days to contest the re-interview findings.
2. The regional program sends sufficient information to contest the re-interviewer's findings.
3. The OMESC COE Group (OMSIS data analyst, quality control manager, state re-interviewer/recruiter, and the OMESC director) analyzes the additional information sent in by the regional program and makes a decision.
4. After the review, if the family is found to be ineligible, the OMESC notifies the regional program and removes the child's information from the OMSIS system.

Number of re-interviews conducted: 23

Number of eligible COEs: 20

Number of ineligible COEs: 1

Numbers of COEs that needed to be corrected: 2

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a running total of migrant children identified in their local region on a monthly basis. Corrective actions are taken immediately in the local regions when discrepancies are found. After the October 1, 2008 deadline, OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs additional validations and cross-tabs of information and checks for human errors, i.e. names misspelled, etc. This year, category 1 and category 2 were generated October 23, 2008.

Oregon does several quality control checks after the data is entered onto OMSIS:

Local projects are given a deadline of October 01, 2008 to enroll and withdraw migrant students on OMSIS. Following the deadline, the OMESC staff runs a query to confirm all withdrawals for students enrolled in a K-12 institution. Local projects are notified if data is missing for any enrolled student.

A query is run to generate the number of students enrolled in the summer program with no supplemental services reported. This list is then forwarded to local projects with a request for information. If no information is submitted the enrollment line will be removed from OMSIS.

Cross-tabulation is done for misplaced grade/age or age/grade.

Cross tabulation is done for children places in an out-of-school site where they are actually enrolled in a school building.

Final run of category 1 and category 2 counts are generated; and the OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs a crosswalk of names. (See below). Any duplicates found will be carefully analyzed, corrected on OMSIS.net and subtracted from the final category 1 or 2, or both.

The checks involve the following: English cognates (e.g., James/Jaime, Francisco/Frank, Pedro/Peter.); Similar spellings or misspellings (e.g., Sanchez vs. Sanches, Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names (e.g., Yesenia vs. Jesenia, Evelia vs. Ebelia, Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names (e.g., Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez, Sanches-Rodrigues, Sanches-Rodriguez, Sanchez vs. Sanches, Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues, Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double family names against single family names (e.g., Sanchez-Rodriguez, Maria vs. Sanchez, Maria); Double first names (e.g., Juan vs. Juan Carlos, Jose vs. Jose Luis, Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names (Rodriguez, Maria, 01/01/85 vs. 10/01/85); Last names that can be written with or without spaces (e.g., A la Torre vs. Alatorre, De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated (e.g., Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, the OMESC provides the regional programs with a monthly MEP child count for their records; so they know how many MEP children they've identified to date. In addition, the local OMSIS data specialist generates a monthly list and distributes the list to the recruiters, home-school consultants, principals and USDA coordinators. Any discrepancies identified by the participating staff are reported to the local OMSIS data specialists; who then make the necessary corrections onto OMSIS.

When the COE arrives at the OMESC, the COE Quality Control Manager and the Statewide Recruiter verify the validity of the COE and randomly compare the information against the OMSIS.net. Any discrepancies found will be reported to the regional programs and the corrections will be made on OMSIS.

During the process of filing the COE at the OMESC, if discrepancies are found between the new and the old COE, the regional office will be notified of the discrepancy and asked to resolve the issue(s).

This process takes place year-round.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC state recruiter and re-interviewer is an employee of the OMESC.

Current corrective actions:

1. The OMESC staff is available at all times for the local recruiter to call with questions on eligibility during their interview.
2. The OMESC has made available both an I&R Helpdesk and an OMSIS Helpdesk via e-mail, wherein any MEP staff members throughout the state can e-mail questions on eligibility or OMSIS system corrections.
3. The state re-interviewer and the quality control manager review and verify the eligibility of the COE and its content. During this process if it is discovered that a particular finding is repeatedly occurring then a notation is made and emphasis on that topic is applied during the next identification and recruitment training.
4. The OMESC implemented the electronic COE correction form to allow immediate feedback from the local programs and/or recruiters on corrections needed on the COE.
5. When filing the COEs occasional discrepancies are found and immediate corrective actions are taken.

All of the findings are logged and corrective actions are taken by the quality control manager, the state re-interviewer, and the OMSIS data analyst to incorporate and integrate into their next trainings and mentorship.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon currently does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of reporting the child count. Furthermore, Oregon looks forward to receiving guidance from OME in regard to the new regulations that came into effect August 29, 2008.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.