

# **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 EDFacts 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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2007-08 X 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, May 1, 2009, 1:03:11 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

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



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009  
5PM EST**

## 2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

### 2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's NCLB assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

#### 2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	19,878	14,422	72.6
4	19,736	14,327	72.6
5	18,855	13,698	72.6
6	8,382	5,551	66.2
7	4,767	3,416	71.7
8	4,382	2,821	64.4
High School	1,110	420	37.8
Total	77,110	54,655	70.9
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

#### 2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	19,882	16,107	81.0
4	19,739	15,673	79.4
5	18,843	13,213	70.1
6	8,386	5,786	69.0
7	4,770	3,246	68.1
8	4,377	2,607	59.6
High School	1,110	541	48.7
Total	77,107	57,173	74.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	7,301	5,763	78.9
4	7,678	5,985	77.9
5	7,716	5,977	77.5
6	4,874	3,268	67.0
7	2,977	2,083	70.0
8	2,999	1,929	64.3
High School	1,277	496	38.8
Total	34,822	25,501	73.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	7,299	6,278	86.0
4	7,674	6,406	83.5
5	7,732	5,920	76.6
6	4,867	3,431	70.5
7	2,984	2,111	70.7
8	2,985	1,795	60.1
High School	1,272	696	54.7
Total	34,813	26,637	76.5
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

### 2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20,151
Limited English proficient students	30,287
Students who are homeless	7,533
Migratory students	5,662
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

### 2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,481
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,126
Black, non-Hispanic	8,011
Hispanic	46,381
White, non-Hispanic	92,844
Total	158,843
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

### 2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age 0-2		9			9
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	19	1,150	36	6	1,211
K	2,345	20,575	89	34	23,043
1	3,060	20,625	127	60	23,872
2	2,913	20,546	119	62	23,640
3	2,417	20,287	109	73	22,886
4	1,968	20,178	109	54	22,309
5	1,834	19,032	100	52	21,018
6	988	8,951	80	67	10,086
7	538	5,072	53	67	5,730
8	494	4,698	39	89	5,320
9	236	1,361	55	146	1,798
10	185	1,267	78	221	1,751
11	34	1,100	96	199	1,429
12	15	1,181	70	161	1,427
Ungraded	6	39	32	83	160
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>17,052</b>	<b>146,071</b>	<b>1,192</b>	<b>1,374</b>	<b>165,689</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

#### 2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

##### 2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,180
Reading/language arts	14,069
Science	125
Social studies	50
Vocational/career	N<6
Other instructional services	54
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

##### 2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	630
Supporting guidance/advocacy	1,544
Other support services	114
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

### 2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	216.70	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	261.70	88.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	3.80	
Clerical support staff	16.40	
Administrators (non-clerical)	4.50	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:*
  1. Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  2. Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  3. Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  4. Conducting parental involvement activities;
  5. Providing support in a library or media center;
  6. Acting as a translator; or
  7. Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.*
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraquidance.doc>.*

1 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

### 2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	<b>Paraprofessionals FTE</b>	<b>Percentage Qualified</b>
Paraprofessionals3	975.00	96.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

## 2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

### 2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

#### 2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.

4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	279
2. Adults participating	300
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	239
4. Participating children	439
a. Birth through 2 years	152
b. Age 3 through 5	189
c. Age 6 through 8	79
c. Above age 8	19
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	117
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	124
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	58
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	235
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	170
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	31
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	21
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	30
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	197
5. Total families enrolled	279
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data regarding Table 2.2.1.3: Missing income/poverty data on 17 newly enrolled families. Missing number years of school completed on 6 newly enrolled adults who were reported to not have GED or High School diploma.

### 2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note:

Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Do not use TABE.
CASAS	9	7	Significant learning gain defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours ABE.
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST	10	10	
CASAS	45	41	Significant learning gain defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours ESL.
TABE			Do not use TABE.
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<6	N<6	
GED	N<6	N<6	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<6	N<6	
GED	11	9	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

**2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development**

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	46	23	12		Number Exempted not available.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	46	12	11		Number Exempted not available.
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

**2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills**

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	46	26	10		Number Exempted not available.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	46	11	N<6		Number Exempted not available.
<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.

### 2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	46	7		12.0	Number Exempted not available.
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

### 2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	36	N<6	Outcome data only available on 11 (of the 36) Kindergartners. Source: report card.
1	28	9	Outcome data only available on 16 (of the 28) 1st graders. Source: report card.
2	20	12	Outcome data only available on 12 (of the 20) 2nd graders. Source: report card.
3	10	N<6	Outcome data only available on 8 (of the 10) 3rd graders. Source: report card.
<b>Comments: Data reported if child received 60 or more hours of Even Start</b>			

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

**2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities**

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	<b># In Cohort</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
PEP Scale I	76	40	Eleven (11) incarcerated adults exempt from PEP Scale I testing. PEP Scales I & II not used in Oregon Even Start until 2008.
PEP Scale II	83	50	Incarcerated adults (11) included in testing. PEP Scales I & II not used in Oregon Even Start until 2008.
PEP Scale III			PEP Scale III not used in Oregon Even Start programs this reporting period. Piloted on 19 adults, 7 who met goal.
PEP Scale IV			PEP Scale IV not used in Oregon Even Start programs this reporting period. Piloted on 10 adults, 9 who met goal.
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

### 2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

#### 2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	835
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	18,332
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

### 2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<6
K	300
1	322
2	342
3	221
4	232
5	220
6	213
7	241
8	239
9	268
10	261
11	240
12	203
Ungraded	38
Out-of-school	0
Total	3,341

**Comments: New criterions were applied to the generation of PFS counts. Withdrawal dates must be between 09/01/07 and 05/20/08. Summer QADs were excluded from the criteria because move must take place during the regular school year. Only counted those students who had state assessment score on file. Regarding 3-5 and Out-of-school Verification: PFS criteria do not specify counting children under ages 3-5 or Out-of-school children. If you feel this criteria need to be added, we can add it to the next reporting period 2008-2009.**

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

#### **FAQ on priority for services:**

*Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.*

### 2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	67
K	478
1	448
2	499
3	456
4	420
5	367
6	347
7	366
8	386
9	386
10	301
11	311
12	230
Ungraded	10
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	5,073
<b>Comments: Oregon's migrant population continued to decrease for the school year 2007-2008. Therefore, aggregate information for migrant children will show a substantial decrease.</b>	

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

### 2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<6
K	23
1	25
2	30
3	44
4	33
5	28
6	40
7	36
8	42
9	28
10	18
11	15
12	20
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	384
<p><b>Comments: Oregon's migrant population continued to decrease for the school year 2007-2008. Therefore, aggregate information for migrant children will show a substantial decrease. Regarding Out-of-school: ODE does not collect SPED on out-of-school children.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	428	307	96	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	795	915	555	309
K	304	414	283	214
1	307	375	283	211
2	316	410	281	280
3	244	360	261	266
4	274	350	251	230
5	220	308	223	235
6	250	323	226	231
7	236	303	239	233
8	224	301	213	187
9	215	342	220	229
10	198	279	207	213
11	165	267	181	212
12	139	215	160	167
Ungraded	100	35	7	N<6
Out-of-school	750	351	206	193
Total	5,165	5,855	3,892	3,417

**Comments: Previous 13-24 Mons. Oregon's migrant population continued to decrease for the school year 2007-2008. However, recruitment numbers for the last three or four months at the end of the reporting period showed a slight increase as recruiters' confidence levels increased as a result of clear, written guidance and support. Previous 37-48 Mons. Oregon had less MEP children enrolled in this reporting period (2007-2008) compared to last year (2006-2007) which explains the decrease for this column.**

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

### 2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	521
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,488
K	683
1	651
2	680
3	571
4	560
5	494
6	513
7	501
8	476
9	504
10	472
11	406
12	352
Ungraded	107
Out-of-school	773
Total	9,752

**Comments: Oregon's migrant population continued to decrease for the school year 2007-2008. Therefore, aggregate information for migrant children shows a substantial decrease. The 2006-07 report for 2.3.1.6 was calculated against the beginning of the reporting period, September 1. For this year's submission (2007-2008), the calculation for this section was changed to calculate against the last reporting period, August 31, as per the instructions above. That is why we see a decrease in the 2007-2008 report.**

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

### 2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migrant students.

#### 2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	N<6
10	N<6
11	6
12	7
Ungraded	N<6
Total	17
<p><b>Comments: Although Oregon's Hispanic and Migrant student drop-out rate is still high compared to the state and national standard, the decrease in the total number of migrant students who dropped out of school has more to do with the eligibility factors.</b></p>	

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

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

*How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."*

#### 2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your State	N<6
Comments:	

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

### 2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

#### 2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	955	947
4	939	934
5	886	881
6	856	850
7	796	792
8	735	731
9	0	0
10	713	699
11	0	0
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	5,880	5,834

**Comments: The increase in number of students enrolled and tested could be attributed to the following: 1) In 2007-2008, information was compiled through the Assessment Office at the Oregon Department of Education; whereas last year, 20062007, data came from the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). 2) There was an increase in the number of students who did not move during the testing window due to economic reasons.**

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

#### 2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	953	947
4	946	939
5	893	885
6	855	849
7	800	797
8	728	725
9	0	0
10	725	709
11	0	0
12	0	0
Ungraded	0	0
Total	5,900	5,851

**Comments: The increase in number of students enrolled and tested could be attributed to the following: 1) In 2007-2008, information was compiled through the Assessment Office at the Oregon Department of Education; whereas last year, 20062007, data came from the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). 2) There was an increase in the number of students who did not move during the testing window due to economic reasons.**

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

### 2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1-3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

#### 2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

##### 2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	11
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	420
K	648
1	677
2	672
3	626
4	612
5	547
6	600
7	569
8	575
9	622
10	565
11	486
12	361
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	27
Total	8,022
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	173
1	172
2	178
3	111
4	137
5	126
6	128
7	142
8	146
9	170
10	152
11	142
12	106
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	1,886
<p><b>Comments: Oregon does not serve MEP children whose eligibility ended before September 1, 2007. MEP funds and services are targeted to those who are eligible for MEP as of September 1, 2007. Regarding age 3-5: PFS criteria do not specify counting children under ages 3-5.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
<b>Comments: Oregon does not serve MEP children whose eligibility ended before September 1, 2007. MEP funds and services are targeted to those who are eligible for MEP as of September 1, 2007</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

#### FAQ on Services:

*What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.*

### 2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	378
K	511
1	563
2	549
3	511
4	485
5	413
6	466
7	437
8	455
9	514
10	441
11	390
12	250
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	10
Total	6,378
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	N<6	N<6	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	55	53	
K	296	205	
1	351	250	
2	318	221	
3	276	207	
4	265	228	
5	246	188	
6	252	201	
7	224	189	
8	247	226	
9	202	154	422
10	168	152	354
11	155	128	338
12	106	79	223
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	8	7	8
Total	3,170	2,489	1,345
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

#### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<6	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	382	69
K	471	95
1	484	103
2	483	93
3	459	97
4	442	83
5	419	74
6	433	176
7	405	173
8	413	175
9	456	201
10	423	171
11	396	175
12	300	146
Ungraded	N<6	0
Out-of-school	24	9
Total	5,996	1,840

**Comments: An increase in the number of MEP children receiving counseling service was, in part, due to the materials, training and services provided by the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center on the "Paths to Scholarship" academic program. This academic program allowed the 18 regional migrant programs to collaborate with high school counselors in an effort to work with migrant high school students to continue their education after high school. Another factor that might contribute to this increase is an enhanced emphasis on providing more resources/services for MEP secondary students to prepare them for live challenging after high school.**

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

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

#### 2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239
K	343
1	351
2	331
3	313
4	327
5	301
6	288
7	274
8	274
9	305
10	285
11	265
12	172
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	20
Total	4,093
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is ED Facts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

#### 2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
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: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	0
K	124
1	134
2	136
3	100
4	95
5	86
6	63
7	74
8	48
9	51
10	44
11	39
12	10
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,004
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
<b>Comments: Oregon does not serve MEP children whose eligibility ended before September 1, 2007. MEP funds and services are targeted to those who are eligible for MEP as of September 1, 2007</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

#### FAQ on Services:

*What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are NOT considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.*

### 2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	411
K	495
1	526
2	535
3	473
4	468
5	376
6	299
7	280
8	188
9	173
10	176
11	154
12	87
Ungraded	62
Out-of-school	0
Total	4,703
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	206	179	
K	481	425	
1	512	456	
2	521	466	
3	460	401	
4	451	377	
5	369	337	
6	293	259	
7	230	235	
8	152	160	
9	93	82	170
10	106	55	175
11	74	35	150
12	16	10	76
Ungraded	17	18	42
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	3,981	3,495	613

**Comments: Oregon had a slight increase in secondary migrant students attending summer school for the 2008 summer program. Almost all of the regional summer programs were able to grant high school credit to their secondary students. In addition, the state sponsored a yearly summer Migrant Student Leadership Institute; students who attended the institute took PASS courses and received high school credit at the Institute.**

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

#### FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	402	11
K	496	6
1	513	N<6
2	511	6
3	452	N<6
4	449	N<6
5	361	N<6
6	288	N<6
7	254	14
8	171	18
9	145	17
10	147	19
11	127	22
12	81	N<6
Ungraded	65	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	4,462	132
<b>Comments: Even though the Oregon Migrant Education Summer School program increased slightly for the summer of 2008, the emphasis for the regional summer programs was to provide direct instructional services rather than counseling services. Other than that we do see any other reasons for the decrease from 2006-2007 to 2007-2008.</b>		

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

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

#### 2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	123
K	208
1	229
2	227
3	197
4	191
5	173
6	129
7	110
8	68
9	46
10	31
11	29
12	N<6
Ungraded	13
Out-of-school	0
Total	1,779
<p><b>Comments: One explanation for the increase in referral services for 2007-2008 is because Oregon had a slight increase in the number of migrant students during the summer programs. Plus, there were more migrant families in need of additional economic resources.</b></p>	

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

### 2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Program Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	11
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	792
K	1,051
1	1,058
2	1,079
3	999
4	960
5	835
6	833
7	797
8	722
9	767
10	694
11	592
12	445
Ungraded	69
Out-of-school	28
Total	11,732
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

#### 2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	681
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	12,023
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0
<b>Comments: For the 2007-2008 reporting period, none of Oregon's 18 regional migrant education programs combined Title I-C funds with schoolwide programs. The total for this is zero therefore the number of students in a schoolwide program that combined MEP funds is zero. Title I-C funds are kept separate and reserved for service to migrant students. For the reporting year 2006-2007, Oregon had five schoolwide schools that combined Title I-C funds, those regional programs were discouraged in continuing this practice for the school year 2007-2008.</b>	

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

### 2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	77	3,505
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	113	12,984
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*
- e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

### 2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

#### 2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

##### 2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

<b>State Director FTE</b>	1.00
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### FAQs on the MEP State director

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
- b. *Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

##### 2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	46	15.90	245	196.80
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	118	59.90	134	113.80
Recruiters	76	51.10	34	31.00
Records transfer staff	24	15.00	20	13.40

**Comments: Oregon Migrant Education Program received a cut in funding for 2007-2008. In addition, regional programs' recruitment efforts suffered due to the tight regulations and recruiters reluctance in signing up new families. The decrease of migrant children identified in the 18 regional programs contributed to a decrease of Title I-C funds going to those programs. The cuts filtered down to the 18 regional programs; therefore, causing some programs to lay off recruiters and instructional assistants. Oregon Migrant Education Program suffered a sizable decrease in funds to operate the 2008 summer programs due to the decrease of summer school children identified in the 2007 summer school. Regional programs had to reduce their summer school program days and were forced to hire less staff to run 2008 summer programs. This alone explains the decrease of staff and FTE for Oregon's summer/intersession program. On last year's (2006-2007) CSPR Report, two regional migrant education programs' records transfer staff data were overlooked and therefore, their information was excluded from the 2006-2007 CSPR Report. The 2007-2008 CSPR report however, reflects all records transfer staff in all 18 of Oregon's regional migrant programs. In addition, four regional migrant programs assigned back-up records transfer staff to assist the primary records transfer staff. This additional staff explains the increase of 3.5 FTE. On the 2006-07 CSPR Report Oregon's records show that 9 out of the 18 regional migrant programs did not report records transfer staff for the summer/intersession term because their records transfer staff were paid year-round through their regular school year allocation and they had reported the FTE under that classification.**

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

## FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

### 2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	100	50.10	173	155.70
<b>Comments: Oregon Migrant Education Program received a cut in funding for 2007-2008. In addition, regional programs' recruitment efforts suffered due to the tight regulations causing recruiters' to be reluctant in signing up new families. The decrease of migrant children identified in the 18 regional programs contributed to a decrease of Title I-C funds going to those programs. The cuts filtered down to the 18 regional programs; therefore, causing some programs to lay off many qualified paraprofessionals. Oregon Migrant Education Program suffered a sizable decrease in funds to operate the 2008 summer programs due to the decrease in summer school children identified in the 2007 summer school. Regional programs had to reduce their summer school program days and were forced to hire less staff to run the 2008 summer programs. This alone explains the decrease of qualified paraprofessional hired for the summer program.</b>				

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

#### FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

**2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

**2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1**

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	18	217
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	10	145
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	17	169
Total	45	177

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	<b>#</b>
<b>Programs in a multiple purpose facility</b>	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:**

*How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.*

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>State Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
Neglected Programs	18
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	10
Adult Corrections	0
Other	17
Total	45
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,436		2,200		710
Long Term Students Served	778		1,049		367

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	78		95		18
Asian or Pacific Islander	21		23		9
Black, non-Hispanic	120		251		62
Hispanic	138		406		82
White, non-Hispanic	1,058		1,420		536
Total	1,415		2,195		707

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	853		1,982		470
Female	583		218		240
Total	1,436		2,200		710

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	43		0		N<6
6	39		0		8
7	42		0		20
8	56		0		19
9	76		0		30
10	86		0		36
11	74		0		30
12	77		N<6		46
13	164		35		71
14	169		93		92
15	221		202		112
16	218		368		119
17	141		491		93
18	17		446		30
19	N<6		286		N<6
20	N<6		161		0
21	N<6		113		0
Total	1,436		2,200		710

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This response is limited to 8,000

characters.

**Comments: Race/ethnicity: Neglected/Other = 21, making total 1436. Juvenile Corrections/Other = 5, making total 2200. Other Programs/Other = 3, making total 710. These "Other" category is for non-response students.**

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.*

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

### 2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

<b># Programs That</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities</b>	<b>Adult Corrections Facilities</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	8	10	0	10
Awarded high school diploma(s)	3	9	0	3
Awarded GED(s)	2	6	0	1
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

##### 2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	704	1,453	0	229
Enrolled in a GED program	27	90	0	5
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

##### 2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	635	67	0	363
Earned a GED	10	73	0	N<6
Obtained high school diploma	11	123	0	7
Were accepted into post-secondary education	7	164	0	N<6
Enrolled in post-secondary education	7	163	0	N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

#### 2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	N<6	601	0	80
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	6	159	0	3
Obtained employment	10	186	0	10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

#### 2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pretested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	221	503		170
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	229	405		131

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	8	157		N<6
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	30	59		19
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	85	14		30
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	77	70		56
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	29	105		22
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### **FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

### 2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	442	617		175
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	413	469		131

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	19	170		3
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	53	55		18
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	114	20		31
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	83	80		54
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	144	144		25
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

## 2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

### 2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	11	174
Neglected programs	10	68
Juvenile detention	7	45
Juvenile corrections	9	107
Other	0	0
Total	37	99

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

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	10
Comments:	

#### FAQ on average length of stay:

*How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.*

### 2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	9
Neglected programs	9
Juvenile detention	7
Juvenile corrections	9
Other	0
Total	34
<b>Comments: State section (2.4.1) does not have an At Risk category but the LEA section (2.4.2) does; if you add the At Risk and Neglected together in the LEA section, it = the total neglected in the State section.</b>	

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

### 2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2,923	724	1,288	516	
Total Long Term Students Served	2,448	190	36	206	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	96	25	67	25	
Asian or Pacific Islander	197	17	14	17	
Black, non-Hispanic	75	28	54	22	
Hispanic	686	70	166	135	
White, non-Hispanic	1,826	565	987	315	
Total	2,880	705	1,288	514	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,507	419	856	467	
Female	1,416	305	432	49	
Total	2,923	724	1,288	516	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	N<6	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	N<6	8	0	0
12	9	13	27	N<6	
13	44	26	75	16	
14	109	89	150	33	
15	336	171	229	57	
16	533	170	344	104	
17	694	171	351	117	
18	1,161	63	87	152	
19	30	7	6	20	
20	6	6	N<6	14	
21	N<6	N<6	N<6	N<6	0
Total	2,923	724	1,288	516	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments: Race/Ethnicity -categories of students did not report: At Risk-43; Neglected-19; Juvenile Corrections-2.**

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

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.*

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.*

### 2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

<b>LEA Programs That</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention/ Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	8	9	14	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	5	3	8	0
Awarded GED(s)	3	3	5	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

##### 2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	2,275	436	816	0
Enrolled in a GED program	442	44	187	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

##### 2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	2,455	282	949	0
Earned a GED	244	15	39	0
Obtained high school diploma	262	10	38	0
Were accepted into post-secondary education	14	N<6	16	0
Enrolled in post-secondary education	14	N<6	15	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

##### 2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	77	21	109	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

##### 2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	8	N<6	21	0
Obtained employment	47	16	62	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

#### 2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	49	136	139	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	18	74	145	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	8	26	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	14	29	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	12	8	30	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	6	13	24	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	31	36	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### **FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.*

#### 2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	44	123	139	0
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	18	78	143	0

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	N<6	24	0
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	17	30	0
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	12	6	24	0
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	6	15	21	0
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	36	44	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

**2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)**

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 1%	2005-06: .6%	1.2%	2002-03
				2006-07: 1%			
				2007-08: 1.1%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: .2%	2005-06: .5%	.5%	2002-03
				2006-07: 1.2%			
				2007-08: 1.7%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 14%	2005-06: 15.9%	15.9%	2002-03
				2006-07: 15.8%			
				2007-08: 15.8%			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 5%	2005-06: 7.3%	7.4%	2002-03
				2006-07: 8.5%			
				2007-08: 8.4%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 8th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 10%	2005-06: 13.6%	13.1%	2002-03
				2006-07: 14.1%			
				2007-08: 12.8%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 11th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 24%	2005-06: 23.7%	25.1%	2002-03
				2006-07: 23.8%			
				2007-08: 20.8%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 14.5%	2005- 06: 15.7%	15.9%	2003-04
				2006 07: 14%	2006 07: 15.9%		
				2007- 08: 14.6%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month. (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 23%	2005- 06: 21.8%	24.3%	2003-04
				2006- 07: 25%			
				2007- 08: 23.5%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 23%	2005- 06: 31.9%	24.7%	2002-03
				2006- 07: 30.9%			
				2007- 08: 28.9%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•••• 200607: 35%</li> <li>•••• 200708: 35%</li> </ul> % of 11th grade students who • Oregon Healthy Oregon Healthy report using alcohol in the previous month • Teen Survey (YRBS) Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2009-10:	2005-06: 35%	2005-06: 43.9%	43.4%	2002-03
				2006-07: 35%	2006-07: 48.7%		
				2007-08: 35%	2007-08: 46.1%		
				2008-09: 35%			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 13%	2005-06: 10.7%	14.6%	2004-05
				2006-07: 15.6%			
				2007-08: 15.6%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 11%	2005-06: 11.9%	12.5%	2004-05
				2006-07: 13.7%			
				2007-08: 12.9%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 47%	2005- 06: 38.8%	48.1%	2004-05
				2006- 07: 42.8%			
				2007- 08: 40.9%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005 06: 30%	2005 06: 31.1%	41.2%	2004-05
				2006 07: 25%	07: 30.7%		
				2007 08: 20%	08: 30.6%		
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 5%	2005- 06: 6.2%	6.7%	2004-05
				2006- 07: 5.8%			
				2007- 08: 6.1%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------------

% of 11th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 3%	2005-06: 5.3%	4.7%	2004-05
				2006-07: 4.6%			
				2007-08: 4.5%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 8%	2005-06: 8.2%	10.5%	2002-03
				2006-07: 10.7%			
				2007-08: 8%	08: 10.4%		
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 15%	2005-06: 15.4%	18.7%	2002-03
				2006-07: 20.4%			
				2007-08: 19.5%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a	Oregon Healthy Teen	Annual	2008	2005-06: 93%	2005-06: 84.2%	95.1%	2002-03

moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke one or more cigarette packs a day '05)	Survey (YRBS)			2006-07: 76.5%			
				2007-08: 85.8%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke one or more cigarette packs a day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 93%	2005-06: 90.8%	95.3%	2002-03
				2006-07: 82.4%			
				2007-08: 84.3%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 95%	2005-06: 84.1%	85.5%	2002-03
				2006-07: 74.5%			
				2007-08: 80.4%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 90%	2005-06: 79.3%	78.4%	2002-03
				2006-07: 67.7%			
				2007-08: 69.0%			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 99%	2005- 06: 99.1%	98.3%	2003-04
				2006- 07: 98.5%			
				2007- 08: 98.5%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 98%	2005- 06: 98.5%	97.4%	2003-04
				2006			
				07: 98%	07: 97.9%		
				2007- 08: 98%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. ( high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 92%	2005- 06: 61.8%	88.4%	2002-03
				2006- 07: 55.1%			
				2007- 08: 62%			

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 95%	2005-06: 67.2%	86.8%	2002-03
				2006-07: 60.3%			
				2007-08: 64%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of tobacco use (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 98%	2005-06: 99%	95.9%	2002-03
				2006-07: 98.6%			
				2007-08: 99.2%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of tobacco use (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 95%	2005-06: 98.6%	91.3%	2002-03
				2006-07: 98.4%			
				2007-08: 97.9%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 97%	2005- 06: 98%	94.1%	2002-03
				2006- 07: 97.7%			
				2007- 08: 97.3%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005- 06: 95%	2005- 06: 97%	88.8%	2002-03
				2006- 07: 95.5%			
				2007- 08: 95.8%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005 06: 98%	2005 06: 97.6%	96.3%	2002-03
				2006 07: 99%	07: 98.3%		
				2007 08: 99%	08: 98.4%		
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------------

% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 95%	2005-06: 98.1%	94.8%	2002-03
				2006-07: 97.1%			
				2007-08: 96.8%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2008	2005-06: 3.5%	2005-06: 6.4%	4.8%	2002-03
				2006-07: 8.4%			
				2007-08: 5.8%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•••• 200607: 3.5%</li> </ul> % of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property • Oregon Healthy Teen Survey Oregon Healthy Teen Survey	(YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2008	2005-06: 4%	2005-06: 4.8%	5.2%	2002-03
				2006-07: 3.5%	2006-07: 5.8%		
				2007-08: 3%	2007-08: 3.8%		
(during past 12 months added '05)	(YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2008	2009-10:		5.2%	2002-03
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year (see comments)	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	2008	2005-06: 17,000	2005-06: 17,295	17,804	2003-04
				2006-07: 17,597			
				2007-08: 17,270			

**Comments: \*The unique number of youth processed by the juvenile justice system in the reporting year. Youth and referrals statewide report criminal and non-criminal offenses committed by juveniles for each reporting year. Each statistic is available grouped by the youth's sex, age at the time of disposition and race. The full report is available with county specific data on the following website. <http://www.oya.state.or.us/jjisdata.htm>**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year (see comments)	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	2008	2005-06: 6,200	2005-06: 6,578	6,462	2003-04
				2006-07: 6,837			
				2007-08: 6,677			

**Comments: \*The unique number of youth processed by the juvenile justice system in the reporting year. Youth and referrals statewide report criminal and non-criminal offenses committed by juveniles for each reporting year. Each statistic is available grouped by the youth's sex, age at the time of disposition and race. The full report is available with county specific data on the following website. <http://www.oya.state.or.us/jjisdata.htm>**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
# of persistently dangerous schools	ODE Disciplinary Collection	Annual	2008	2005-06: 0	2005-06: 1	1	2002-03
				2006-07: 1			
				2007-08: 1			

**Comments: Note: The student behavior data is derived from the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey. Oregon Healthy Teens is a combined survey of the "Youth Risk Behavior Survey" and the "Communities that Care" survey. Oregon surveys 8th and 11th graders in a randomly selected sample every year. Oregon Department of Education requires that school districts report expulsion data annually. The**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month.	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 11.5%	2005-06: 9.9%	12.7%	2002-03
				2006-07: 8.9%			
				2007-08: 9.0%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month.	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2008	2005-06: 15%	2005-06: 18.7%	23.4%	2002-03
				2006-07: 18.6%			
				2007-08: 18.9%			

**Comments: For all preceding Performance Measures, requested % and #. Our responses were meant to represent % and # where appropriate. We have now added the % sign where % was requested.**

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

## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or consumption of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. Suspicion of being under the influence of alcohol may be included if it results in disciplinary action.
Illicit drug related	Unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, solicitation, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug (e.g., Demerol, morphine) or narcotic substance.
Violent incident without physical injury	Oregon's definition comes directly from the definitions of specific codes from the EDEN (N30) Incident Codes (Appendix P) list. These code numbers are: 1100, 1700, 2500, 2600, 2700, 3200, and 8000. Code 1100: Arson (Setting a Fire); To unlawfully and intentionally damage or attempt to damage any school or personal property by fire or incendiary device. Firecrackers, fireworks and trashcan fires would be included in this category if they were contributing factors to a damaging fire. Code 1700: Fighting (Mutual Altercation); Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence, where there is no major injury. Code 2500: Physical Altercation, Minor (Pushing, Shoving); Confrontation, tussle, or physical aggression that does not result in injury. Code 2600: Robbery (Taking of Things by Force); The taking of or attempting to take anything of value that is owned by another person or organization under confrontational circumstances by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. A key difference between robbery and theft is that the threat of physical harm or actual physical harm is involved in a robbery. Code 2700: School Threat (Threat of Destruction or Harm); Any threat (verbal, written or electronic) by a person to bomb or use other substances or devices for the purpose of exploding, burning, causing damage to a school building or school property, or to harm students or staff. Code 3200: Threat/Intimidation (Causing Fear of Harm); Physical, verbal, written, or electronic action which immediately creates fear of harm, without displaying a weapon and without subjecting the victim to actual physical attack. Code 8000: Other violent Criminal Offense (e.g. Coercion, Hate/Bias crime).

Violent incident with physical injury	Oregon's definition comes directly from the definitions of specific codes from the EDEN (N30) Incident Codes (Appendix P) list. These code numbers are; 1300, 2000, 2800, and 3000. Code 1300: Battery (Physical Attack/Harm); Touching or striking of another person against his or her will or intentionally causing bodily harm to an individual. Code 2000: Homicide (Murder or Manslaughter); Killing a human being. Code 2800: Sexual Battery (Sexual Assault); Oral, anal, or vaginal penetration forcibly or against the person's will or where the victim is incapable of giving consent. Includes rape, fondling, indecent liberties, child molestation, and sodomy. Code 3000: Suicide; Act or instance of taking one's own life voluntarily and intentionally.
Weapons possession	339.250 Duty of student to comply with rules; discipline, suspension, expulsion, removal and counseling;

written information on alternative programs required. (e) For purposes of this subsection, "weapon" includes  
a:

- (A) "Firearm" as defined in 18 U.S.C. 921;
- (B) "Dangerous weapon" as defined in ORS 161.015; or
- (C) "Deadly weapon" as defined in ORS 161.015.

161.015 General definitions. As used in chapter 743, Oregon Laws 1971, and ORS 166.635, unless the context requires otherwise:

(1) "Dangerous weapon" means any weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which under the circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing death or serious physical injury.

(2) "Deadly weapon" means any instrument, article or substance specifically designed for and presently capable of causing death or serious physical injury.

**Comments:**

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

### 2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

#### 2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2,681	198
6 through 8	6,499	198
9 through 12	4,983	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to reflect total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	11	198
6 through 8	153	198
9 through 12	205	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to reflect total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

### 2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

#### 2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	373	198
6 through 8	522	198
9 through 12	253	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to reflect total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	24	198
9 through 12	34	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

##### 2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	248	198
6 through 8	356	198
9 through 12	326	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

##### 2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	29	198
6 through 8	154	198
9 through 12	152	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

### 2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	14	198
6 through 8	158	198
9 through 12	684	198
<b>Comments: Change # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	22	198
9 through 12	107	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

### 2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

#### 2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	15	198
6 through 8	392	198
9 through 12	1,577	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	128	198
9 through 12	412	198
<b>Comments: Changed # LEAs Reporting to total number of LEAs.</b>		

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

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
Yes	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

## **2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)**

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

### **2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary**

Section 5122 of ESEA, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

**Please attach your statewide summary.** You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

### 2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	182	96.8
Total received Title V, Part A funds	188	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	2,162,054	93.4
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	2,314,000	
<b>Comments: The Total Title V-A funds includes funds that REAP Flex districts flexed into VA and funds transferred in from other Titles.</b>		

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

#### 2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	136	74
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	15	9
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	37	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	188	83
<b>Comments: Cannot indicate AYP for unknown use of funds.</b>		

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

## 2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

### 2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	78
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	0
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	4
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	5
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	3
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's goal for Rural Low Income Schools (RLIS) is to ensure that the students have opportunities to meet state standards and graduate secondary school. The RLIS objectives are to achieve targets for AYP and graduation. Oregon measures both the goals and objectives through District Improvement Status and Graduation rate status.

#### Process for meeting Goals/Objectives:

Oregon has a process of Continuous Improvement Planning (CIP) for all districts including the RLIS districts. In the CIP, districts analyze data on 10 Oregon Education Performance standards (two of the standards are AYP and Graduation). After the data analysis, districts then prioritize their resources to effectively meet the standards through using research-based practices. ODE has provided districts regional professional development and technical assistance on how to create, enhance and update the LEA CIP plans. In addition, districts were involved in a peer review process which helped build capacity in districts and to provide feedback to other districts on their CIP plan. The districts are continuously updating their CIP's and turned in revised versions in the Fall of 2007. ODE also has a process for monitoring districts either through a desk audit process or an onsite monitoring. ODE monitored six of the eight RLIS districts in either 07-08 or 08-09.

In Fall 2007 and Fall of 2008, ODE provided professional development and technical assistance training on NCLB issues, accountability and compliance. RLIS districts participated in this training. These trainings helped support districts in assessing where they were on meeting the standards and effectively utilizing their Federal resources. After analyzing their data the RLIS districts have determined that the following activities will continue to help them meet AYP and graduation targets: by focusing on academic achievement of subgroups especially ELL; education technology -specifically distance learning opportunities for students (helps students continue on until graduation by better meeting their needs) and additional support for Title IA services.

#### Outcomes:

Of the eight RLIS districts in Oregon (2007-08), All RLIS districts met the graduation targets and none of the districts were in District Improvement Status.

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

## 2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

### 2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	31
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	26	2
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	5	2
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	10	4
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	7	18
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		15

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

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	1,838,998.00	3,139.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	20,974.00	32,005.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	80,524.00	278,970.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	10,216.00	1,212,372.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		424,226.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*