

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 2008-09

OREGON



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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-HLPEDEN (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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Oregon Department of Education

Address:

255 Capitol St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97310

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Tryna Luton

Telephone: 503-947-5922

Fax: 503-378-5156

e-mail: tryna.luton@state.or.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Tryna Luton

Friday, March 12, 2010, 4:52:25 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Oregon's State Board of Education adopted revised K-8 mathematics standards in December 2007, science standards in February 2009, and high school mathematics standards in June 2009.

The new mathematics state assessment aligned to the revised standards will be implemented in 2010-2011. The new science assessment aligned to the revised standards is scheduled for administration in 2011-2012.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

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

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

(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon plans on submitting to USED for peer review in Spring 2010, a native language Spanish Reading assessment.

Oregon plans on adopting new achievement standards for Mathematics in Fall, 2010 and submit to USED revised assessments for peer review prior to the 2010-11 AYP designations.

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Oregon plans on adopting new achievement standards for Science in Fall, 2011 and submit to USED revised assessments for peer review prior to the 2011-12 AYP designations.
--

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	300,198		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,030		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,585		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	8,793		>97%
Hispanic	51,953		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	204,997		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	45,666		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,830		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	145,337		>97%
Migratory students	6,292		>97%
Male	153,951		>97%
Female	146,247		>97%
Comments:			

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

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	32,210	71.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	8,138	18.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,631	10.3
Total	44,979	
Comments: As of 12/17/09 1.2.2 not uploaded by EDFacts.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	300,242		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	6,032		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	14,588		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	8,798		>97%
Hispanic	51,975		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	205,003		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	45,657		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,839		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	145,353		>97%
Migratory students	6,271		>97%
Male	153,985		>97%
Female	146,257		>97%
Comments: LEP student counts reflect participation for LEP students who took the Reading assessment plus 527 students who were first-year LEP students and were counted as participating by taking the English Language proficiency test in lieu of the Reading test as allowed by Title I. (Also see explanation on 1.3.2.)			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	32,355	72.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,550	16.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,057	11.2
Total	44,962	
Comments: EDFacts data not uploaded as of 12/17/09.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	129,290		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,653	2,529	95.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	6,235		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	3,775	3,578	94.8
Hispanic	21,392	20,681	96.7
White, non-Hispanic	89,959		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	18,463	17,518	94.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	11,226	10,780	96.0
Economically disadvantaged students	58,985		>97%
Migratory students	2,548	2,463	96.7
Male	66,351		>97%
Female	62,939		>97%
Comments: Black non-Hispanic data correct -participation rate is below 95% for the subgroup. Children with disabilities data correct participation rate is below 95% for the subgroup. LEP student counts reflect participation for LEP students who took the Science assessment including 538 students who were first-year LEP students. (Also see explanation on 1.3.2.)			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	13,075	74.6
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,916	16.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,527	8.7
Total	17,518	
Comments: Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level and based on Modified Achievement Standards data not available.		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	42,368	32,392	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	826	549	66.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,081	1,745	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,228	751	61.2
Hispanic	7,870	4,715	59.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,030	22,850	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,909	3,331	48.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,263	3,378	53.9
Economically disadvantaged students	22,244	14,924	67.1
Migratory students	947	514	54.3
Male	21,696	16,697	77.0
Female	20,672	15,695	75.9
Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.			

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

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	42,343	35,043	82.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	825	629	76.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,074	1,847	89.0
Black, non-Hispanic	1,228	902	73.4
Hispanic	7,853	5,308	67.6
White, non-Hispanic	28,031	24,393	87.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,890	3,564	51.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,252	3,719	59.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,233	16,712	75.2
Migratory students	925	548	59.2
Male	21,677	17,389	80.2
Female	20,666	17,654	85.4
Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.			

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

through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in Grade 3.			

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,561	32,857	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	856	582	68.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,002	1,689	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,290	793	61.5
Hispanic	7,613	4,630	60.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,612	23,451	82.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,284	3,560	48.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,605	2,891	51.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,945	14,906	67.9
Migratory students	916	467	51.0
Male	21,869	16,950	77.5
Female	20,692	15,907	76.9
Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.			

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

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,552	35,779	84.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	858	673	78.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,000	1,756	87.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,289	953	73.9
Hispanic	7,624	5,257	69.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,592	25,242	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,270	3,928	54.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,600	3,279	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	21,943	16,815	76.6
Migratory students	908	528	58.2
Male	21,867	17,961	82.1
Female	20,685	17,818	86.1

Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: Science is not tested in Grade 4.

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,730	32,671	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	880	579	65.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,987	1,686	84.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,195	736	61.6
Hispanic	7,657	4,757	62.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,920	23,278	80.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,257	3,240	44.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,932	2,520	51.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,754	14,559	66.9
Migratory students	922	508	55.1
Male	21,833	16,735	76.6
Female	20,897	15,936	76.3

Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,725	32,580	76.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	877	594	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,989	1,627	81.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,197	764	63.8
Hispanic	7,656	4,357	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	28,911	23,583	81.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,259	2,948	40.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,926	1,908	38.7
Economically disadvantaged students	21,746	14,262	65.6
Migratory students	914	421	46.1
Male	21,839	16,127	73.8
Female	20,886	16,453	78.8

Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,453	31,671	74.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	874	591	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,969	1,533	77.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1,182	686	58.0
Hispanic	7,611	3,918	51.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,763	23,344	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	7,143	3,538	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,888	1,760	36.0
Economically disadvantaged students	21,581	13,707	63.5
Migratory students	921	388	42.1
Male	21,692	16,665	76.8
Female	20,761	15,006	72.3

Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,094	30,662	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	830	523	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,006	1,650	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,214	625	51.5
Hispanic	7,345	4,054	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	28,694	22,322	77.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,563	2,330	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,189	1,549	37.0
Economically disadvantaged students	20,768	12,790	61.6
Migratory students	846	434	51.3
Male	21,372	15,491	72.5
Female	20,722	15,171	73.2

Comments: The explanation is that EDFacts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,084	32,185	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	825	571	69.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,007	1,637	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,216	724	59.5
Hispanic	7,328	4,252	58.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,699	23,401	81.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,551	2,462	37.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,183	1,394	33.3
Economically disadvantaged students	20,756	13,550	65.3
Migratory students	850	420	49.4
Male	21,363	15,648	73.2
Female	20,721	16,537	79.8

Comments: The explanation is that ED Facts does not include multi-ethnic or those individuals who decline to report their ethnicity. In 20102011 Oregon will report all ethnic/racial categories and this issue will go away.

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

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			

Comments: Science is not tested in Grade 6.

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,472	33,030	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	866	591	68.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,009	1,772	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,225	775	63.3
Hispanic	7,191	4,598	63.9
White, non-Hispanic	29,298	23,822	81.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,153	2,533	41.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,592	1,696	47.2
Economically disadvantaged students	20,443	13,851	67.8
Migratory students	867	501	57.8
Male	21,841	16,676	76.4
Female	20,631	16,354	79.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,437	32,791	77.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	866	608	70.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,008	1,670	83.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,218	803	65.9
Hispanic	7,180	4,128	57.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,262	24,069	82.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	6,143	2,405	39.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,581	1,093	30.5
Economically disadvantaged students	20,425	13,574	66.5
Migratory students	867	420	48.4
Male	21,828	15,991	73.3
Female	20,609	16,800	81.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: Science is not tested in Grade 7.			

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,566	30,059	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	875	513	58.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,958	1,609	82.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,271	630	49.6
Hispanic	6,854	3,665	53.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,794	22,362	75.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,785	1,762	30.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,989	971	32.5
Economically disadvantaged students	19,526	11,401	58.4
Migratory students	797	367	46.0
Male	21,825	15,438	70.7
Female	20,741	14,621	70.5
Comments:			

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

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,557	29,558	69.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	874	523	59.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,954	1,454	74.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,269	686	54.1
Hispanic	6,852	3,290	48.0
White, non-Hispanic	29,793	22,306	74.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,762	1,575	27.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,989	535	17.9
Economically disadvantaged students	19,514	10,946	56.1
Migratory students	795	268	33.7
Male	21,819	14,319	65.6
Female	20,738	15,239	73.5
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,220	30,385	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	864	546	63.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,952	1,496	76.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,257	638	50.8
Hispanic	6,799	3,283	48.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,566	23,133	78.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	5,666	2,164	38.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,966	695	23.4
Economically disadvantaged students	19,309	11,358	58.8
Migratory students	786	282	35.9
Male	21,634	16,034	74.1
Female	20,586	14,351	69.7
Comments:			

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

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,826	22,404	53.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	802	286	35.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,061	1,373	66.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,198	332	27.7
Hispanic	6,218	2,052	33.0
White, non-Hispanic	30,140	17,611	58.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,919	704	14.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,554	419	16.4
Economically disadvantaged students	16,558	6,274	37.9
Migratory students	702	203	28.9
Male	21,453	11,607	54.1
Female	20,373	10,797	53.0
Comments:			

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

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,042	27,784	66.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	817	439	53.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,070	1,403	67.8
Black, non-Hispanic	1,212	509	42.0
Hispanic	6,252	2,530	40.5
White, non-Hispanic	30,311	21,981	72.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,979	1,143	23.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,556	304	11.9
Economically disadvantaged students	16,662	8,427	50.6
Migratory students	705	221	31.4
Male	21,564	13,532	62.8
Female	20,478	14,252	69.6
Comments:			

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

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,850	23,671	58.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	786	366	46.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,013	1,235	61.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,112	318	28.6
Hispanic	5,963	1,852	31.1
White, non-Hispanic	29,633	19,121	64.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	4,670	1,090	23.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,388	239	10.0
Economically disadvantaged students	15,962	6,782	42.5
Migratory students	663	151	22.8
Male	20,944	13,008	62.1
Female	19,906	10,663	53.6
Comments:			

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

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,259	882	70.1
Districts	196	93	47.4
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	574	462	80.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	396	308	77.8
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	178	154	86.5
Comments: Numbers reported are correct.			

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

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
175	72	41.1
Comments:		

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

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

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement û Year 1, School Improvement û Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	12
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	2
Comments:	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The schools replaced the principal and are implementing improved collaborative structures, and modified schedules and course offerings. Using 21st Century School funding, the two have provided extended day for the students most in need of intervention. Each had implemented a behavior modification and tracking system, as well.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2009-10 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

To support districts in need of improvement in their planning for improvement the Oregon Department of Education provides planning services through our regional support network of Educational Service Districts. Additionally, Oregon Department of Education staff provide direct support to these districts in planning for improvement and development of continuous improvement plans.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	6	4
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	08/21/09
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2008-09.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	12,603	
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	8,302	
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	65.9	
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	12,610	
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	8,055	
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	63.9	
Comments:		

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

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	16
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	6
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	18
Comments:	

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
6 = Combo 1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	34	5	12		
Comments:						

Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State utilized its statewide system of support (Oregon School Improvement Facilitators) to share strategies. The State held three team meetings with schools in improvement to provide technical assistance in addressing school improvement issues.

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

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

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

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2008-09.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Technical assistance was provided to schools through Department staff dedicated to school improvement. Evaluation is being completed through another funding source.
--

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

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2008-09 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

None taken.

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

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	13,413
Applied to transfer	627
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	617

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 590,089

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	11

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	12,094
Applied for supplemental educational services	1,673
Received supplemental educational services	1,451
Comments:	

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

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 1,867,757
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	64,128	60,455	94.3	3,673	5.7
All elementary classes	16,214	15,404	95.0	810	5.0
All secondary classes	47,914	45,051	94.0	2,863	6.0

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Elementary self contained classes are counted as one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]*
- c. *How is a class defined? A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category? States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes? States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.*
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes? Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	75.5
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	2.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.1
Other (please explain in comment box below)	10.3
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts submit data and select options listed above, for some elementary classes none of the criteria above were applicable so they selected Other.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	73.6
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.9
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	11.5
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Districts submit data and select options listed above, for some elementary classes none of the criteria above were applicable so they selected Other.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,927	3,824	97.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,985	3,713	93.2
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	10,631	10,054	94.6
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	14,592	13,854	94.9

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	66.8	33.1
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	57.1	32.7
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose? States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ESL Class Period, used in secondary schools, is a language instruction period for LEP students enrolled in secondary schools.

The information on Language Instruction Programs is taken from the annual Title III LEP Collection. This is a student level collection that includes each LEP student's language instruction programs.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	66,341
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	56,406
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	51,908
Russian	2,959
Vietnamese	1,948
Chinese	1,012
Ukrainian	813

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Somali-663, Korean-557, Romanian-439, Chuukese-412, Hmong-398, Arabic-382, Japanese-278, Marshallese-258, Tagalog-227

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	61,648
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,694
Total	66,342
Comments: The numbers are accurate. The number 61,648 is the actual number of identified LEP students in Oregon who participated in the ELP assessment in 2008-09. This number is different from the 66342, because the 66342 is the total number of identified LEP students in 2008-09. 4,694 students did not participate in the ELP assessment in 2008-09. Of these 4,694 students, 2544 were not enrolled or identified as a LEP student in Oregon during the ELP assessment window according to the ADM collection verification.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	6,347
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	9.6
Comments:	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	58,836
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,175
Total	63,011
Comments: The numbers are accurate. This number is larger than 56,406 reported for the number of students served in Title III programs (see 1.6.2.2). The number reported in 1.6.2.2 (Total Number of Title III LEP Students) reflects the number of ALL LEP students served by a Title III program minus the number of LEP students (6604) achieving proficiency (by SEA definition, not as defined by EdFacts Report N50) in the 2008-2009 school year regardless if they took the state ELP assessment . All Oregon LEP students are required to take the state ELP regardless of when they achieve proficiency during the year. The new numbers for this section should read: 58836—participated 4175—didn't participate	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	10,302

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	22,774	42.1	16,631	35.00
ELP attainment	6,338	11.7	13,715	50.00
Comments:				

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5,159	5,676	10,835
Comments:		

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,448	5,100	68.5	2,348
Comments:			

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

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,218	5,255	72.8	1,963
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,306	1,660	50.2	1,646
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# -Total number of subgrantees for the year	60
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	58
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	4
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	13
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	2
# -Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2007-08 and 2008-09)	10
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	10
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	2
Comments: Consortia members are counted based on their consortia. Each consortium is counted as a single subgrantee. This count was used for all responses on this section.	

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
18,704	18,129	1

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	875
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	60	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	15	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	24	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	12	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	8	
Other (Explain in comment box)	5	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	48	
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	50	
PD provided to principals	18	
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	13	
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	11	
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	
Total	141	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other-District Personnel were trained as district interpreters in order to assist LEP parents with communication with schools. Consortia members were included in the consortia. Each Consortium is counted as a single LEA.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/08	10/06/09	96
Comments:		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon takes the student level collection and compares it to the annual ADM and ELPA participation to ensure all LEP students are included in our Title III allocation process. This process occurs in Late July/early August, depended upon the closing dates of all collections. This realignment is used as a basis for Title III funding allocations.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: For school year 08-09 Oregon had no schools (Zero) identified as persistently dangerous. Last year Oregon had identified one school as being persistently dangerous. The reason for this drop is that in 08-09 no schools in Oregon met the criteria of our definition of persistently dangerous.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	84.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	75.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.3
Black, non-Hispanic	68.5
Hispanic	70.5
White, non-Hispanic	87.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	75.5
Limited English proficient	60.4
Economically disadvantaged	81.5
Migratory students	83.4
Male	82.2
Female	85.7

Comments: The graduation rate this year for limited English proficient students included improved identification of limited English proficient students. The graduation rates for Migratory, Male and Female students were not reported in the prior year, but are available to report this year.

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

FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:*
 - The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
 - Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
 - Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.6
Black, non-Hispanic	7.0
Hispanic	6.4
White, non-Hispanic	3.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.6
Limited English proficient	6.6
Economically disadvantaged	3.5
Migratory students	0.0
Male	4.0
Female	3.4
Comments: Oregon does not currently calculate dropout rates for migrant students.	

FAQ on dropout rates:

What is a dropout? A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State-or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State-or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	155	155
LEAs with subgrants	41	41
Total	196	196
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		
K	626	710
1	645	767
2	662	726
3	636	808
4	599	726
5	641	722
6	538	665
7	506	691
8	495	673
9	524	754
10	538	764
11	655	846
12	951	1,183
Ungraded		
Total	8,016	10,035
Comments: Age 3-5 data not collected. Ungraded data not collected.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths -LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	714	1,007
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	6,314	6,998
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	622	1,642
Hotels/Motels	366	388
Total	8,016	10,035
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	183
K	664
1	758
2	720
3	796
4	702
5	716
6	645
7	662
8	679
9	738
10	741
11	781
12	1,109
Ungraded	167
Total	10,061
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	1,696
Migratory children/youth	957
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,682
Limited English proficient students	2,096
Comments:	

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

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	17
Expedited evaluations	15
Staff professional development and awareness	39
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	23
Transportation	20
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	25
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	19
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	18
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	21
Coordination between schools and agencies	34
Counseling	15
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	18
Clothing to meet a school requirement	24
School supplies	39
Referral to other programs and services	21
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	21
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	17
School Selection	16
Transportation	25
School records	19
Immunizations	18
Other medical records	18
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	615	403
4	618	421
5	603	306
6	558	288
7	563	311
8	603	257
High School	538	202
Comments:		

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

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	620	345
4	617	342
5	604	331
6	564	274
7	577	313
8	612	284
High School	525	133
Comments:		

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

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,046
K	1,466
1	1,312
2	1,316
3	1,260
4	1,194
5	1,119
6	1,090
7	1,062
8	982
9	973
10	952
11	875
12	724
Ungraded	75
Out-of-school	1,597
Total	19,043
Comments:	

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

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon Category 1 numbers increased due to the change in the regulations and the State's challenge to identify and recruitment all eligible migrant students. The Oregon Migrant Education Program staff has established consistent communication and trainings for all recruiters to assist them with eligibility determination and recruitment support during times of high influx. Due to the recession, (Oregon has one of the highest unemployment rates in the country) there is more movement around the state with people looking for work in agriculture. Also the change in the federal requirements dealing with "Principle Means of Livelihood" has had some effect on the number of families that qualify.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	662
K	690
1	638
2	679
3	622
4	577
5	525
6	411
7	344
8	286
9	218
10	223
11	212
12	76
Ungraded	36
Out-of-school	
Total	6,199
Comments: Nothing to report.	

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

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's category 2 counts increased due to greater emphasis being placed on recruitment and empowering regional program coordinators to encourage student participation in the summer school program. The migrant camps were at maximum capacity throughout the state and our traditional migrant families continue to migrate to The Dalles and Hillsboro to pick seasonal crops and then return home to California.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS.net) to generate the 2008-09 child count category 1 and category 2 child counts.

Yes, Oregon used OMSIS to generate the 2007-08 child count.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data is first collected on paper using the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is used to document new qualifying moves and as an initial enrollment form for entry of data onto the OMSIS system. All eligible children that fit the definition of MEP are listed on the COE. Upon completion of the COE, it is forwarded to the local MEP office for input onto the OMSIS system. Once the student is entered onto OMSIS, he/she is eligible for MEP services for up to three years from the Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD).

Other enrollment forms used to update a child's school enrollment on OMSIS.net are; 1) the Mass Enrollment Form and 2) the Change of Residency/School Form (CRSF). The two forms are used to document changes to the child's enrollment status that are not related to a new qualifying move (e.g. re-enrollment for a new school year, transfer of school, or a move to a new address.)

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

The enrollment type field on OMSIS has two acceptable values; "S" and "R". Enrollment type "S" is for summer school and enrollment type "R" could be interpreted in two ways; Regular school year enrollment or Out-of-School (OOS) enrollment. The value in the OOS field determines if the child is an out-of-schooler or enrolled child.

a. What data were collected?

The OMSIS system collects the following data: student demographics; student enrollment history; enrollments and withdrawals; LEP and SPED flag, medical alert; supplemental instructional and support services; language assessment; reclassification flag and date; days enrolled and present; education interruption flag; Oregon Statewide Assessment data; health immunizations, etc.

b. What activities were conducted to collect the data?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Withdrawal and identifying service delivered Local districts employ necessary staff to provide supplemental instructional and support All of the above information and forms are given to the local data specialists for processing on the OMSIS.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

To maintain the consistency and integrity of the data on OMSIS, only the OMSIS data specialists have full access to the system. Staff development for new OMSIS data specialists is especially important, therefore Oregon requires that they attend a full day Identification and

Recruitment (ID&R) training and a full day OMSIS application training. In addition they must attend the annual veteran I&R training, OMSIS meetings, and the annual Statewide OMSIS training.

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

When a new COE is completed and handed to the local OMSIS specialists, they review the COE for completeness, accuracy, and then search the OMSIS for possible match. If there is a match then there is already an OMSIS ID. The OMSIS ID is then recorded on the COE. If the student doesn't exist, the OMSIS specialist takes the necessary steps to thoroughly search the system before creating a new record.

OMSIS allows two types of searches; users may search for a record by the parent/guardian names or by the student's names. In the student search there is a search engine called "search full text" that users can use to search for a student with two last names. Example, when searching for Jose Gonzalez-Martinez, under the search full text, the user would enter Jose Martinez and the system will return a listing of all students named Jose Martinez with the Martinez in front or behind the hyphen. This search engine helps expedite the search process, especially when searching for students with double last names.

The State OMSIS system follows these steps for validation:

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

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

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

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

Specific crosswalk or tabulation are:

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

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

A student is identified in the OMSIS data tables by their OMSIS ID. The OMSIS ID is a key value, unique to the student. The OMSIS ID is the primary key which uniquely identifies those records in the different tables which provide the relational profile of the student. The OMSIS ID is

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

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

Step 7 Step 7: OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a list of qualifying migrant children who turned 3 years old between September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2009. This list is produced three times a year. Some local programs generate this report once a month to quickly locate families that fall under this category. Families are contacted by telephone or through a home visit by the recruiter to verify residency/eligibility.

Step 8 Step 8: Local MEPs were given October 1, 2009 as the deadline date for processing all 2008-2009 regular school year and 2009 summer enrollments and withdrawals. All reporting is done on the Title I-C withdrawal form.

Step 9: State category 1 and category 2 counts were generated on October 30, 2009. Numbers from both counts are produced along with a hard copy print-out of all student names. Manual checking and cross-tabulation are done by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found will be carefully analyzed, subtracted from the final count, and corrected on the OMSIS system.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Oregon all eligible children (0-21) are listed on the COE and all qualifying children (children who move with, to join, or on own, etc.) are entered on OMSIS. When COEs are processed on OMSIS, each child is assigned a unique OMSIS ID number. Before OMSIS appends the record, the system validates the student's age and qualifying arrival date. The system filters out: children who were born after the qualifying arrival date, children who are age 22 or over as of the enroll date or Out-of-School (OOS) date, and children who have a qualifying arrival date before 09/01/05 for the year 09/01/08 -08/31/09. When the category 1 and 2 counts are generated, all students between the ages of 0-2 as of the enroll date or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned three years old between 09/01/08 and 08/31/09, OMSIS checks the latest enrollment line ID and validates the enroll or OOS date against the date of birth to verify it is three years after the date of birth. Before generating the final count, OMESC staff generates and distributes the 2 Turning 3 Report three times during the school year for the local programs to follow-up and update the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters and local data specialists contact the families to verify the residency of the child. Once residency at age three is established the recruiters or data specialist re-enrolls the child back on the system with the contact date as the new enrollment or OOS date. The contact date must be a date that is after the child's third birthday. The data specialist also changes the grade level to P3. The OMSIS system automatically creates a database which stores all records that justify both counts (Category 1 and 2). The databases are checked manually by OMESC staff, including checking single last names against double last names, similar spelling of both first/last names, etc. If a conflicting record is identified, OMESC staff research the differences and take corrective action. Records are corrected on OMSIS and counts are adjusted on the child count report. Resident Children(09/01 -08/31): Recruiters verify students' residency in their regional programs before completing a COE, mass enrollment list, or CRSF form for input onto OMSIS. Students are not automatically re-enrolled on OMSIS. Verifying a child's residency can be done through face-to-face or telephone contact, checking the LEA student information system, or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children is done with the aid of the mass enrollment list which lists all OOS children identified during the previous school year (2007-08) that are eligible for the new school year (2008-09). Before re-enrolling OOS children for the new school year, the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the mass enrollment list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move, a new COE is completed. No documentation is needed if the family cannot be found.

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

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

Category 1: Information is verified in two tables for the category 1 count-the Student Information table and the Enrollment table. The Student Information table has the primary key (OMSIS ID), student names and demographics. The primary key is coded with a unique

index command. With a unique index command the same value cannot be contained within that field (OMSIS ID). This ensures there is only one OMSIS ID for each student. The Enrollment table contains information on each student's enrollments and withdrawals and stores all enrollment history line IDs for separate enrollment periods and types. These two tables have the OMSIS ID in common which allows the relation of the two tables. The criteria for determining the category 1 count are as follows: between 09/01/08-08/31/09 student must be enrolled or OOS; student must be between the age of 3-21; student who turns 3 between must have a new enrollment line ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3 years greater than student's date of birth and there must be a check in the 2 turning 3 box; student must have a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrollment date, or OOS date) between start date and end date. The start date is 09/01/08; the end date would be the run date, 10/30/09; student must have a QAD on or after 09/01/05; student must have a residency date on or before 08/31/09; student enrolled after 09/01/09, must have a residency date earlier than 08/31/09; and for a student whose regular school year started in August 2008, the 2008-09 enrollment line must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/09. All eight conditions must be met for a child to be counted as category 1. The results of the above code are stored in the 0809_FederalRegularCount.dbf table. The table is then manually scanned by OMESC staff for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and deducted from the category 1 count.

Category 2: We use the two tables used for category 1 plus the Supplemental Services table. The Supplemental Services table contains instructional and support services provided during regular and summer programs. Using the two tables used for category 1, the criteria below are coded: student is enrolled between 06/01/09 and 08/31/09; student is 3 years as of the enrolled date; student is less than 22 as of the enrolled date; student has a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 06/01/09 and 08/31/09; student enrollment type equal to S-summer with at least two or more supplemental service codes reported; student previous enrollment lines do not have a value of G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased. All seven conditions must be met for a student to be included in the category 2 count. The results of the codes are written to the table 0809 FederalSummerCount.dbf, where it is manually scanned by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are deducted from the category 2 count. Oregon does not operate Intersession programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) contracts with the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) to carry out the required trainings.

I. Trainings

A. Oregon MEP policy requires that all active recruiters who are responsible for completing the COE during the regular school year attend the Fall Refresher Training on an annual basis; and

B. Recruiters completing the COE during the summer months, attend one Summer Training before summer recruitment begins; and
C. Individual recruiters and/or regional programs participate in additional trainings as ODE deems necessary.

New Recruiter Certification Procedures

Oregon MEP policy requires that new recruiters be certified before they conduct interviews and complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE).

In order for the new recruiter to be certified she/he is required to complete the following requirements:

A. Attend the New Recruiter's Training conducted by OMESC staff (equivalent to a full-day, six-hour training).
1) This training includes a pre-test, quizzes, and a post-test. Attendees must have an 80% accuracy level or better.

B. Fieldwork

1) Interviewing protocol (conduct a minimum of three interviews while accompanied by an approved, experienced recruiter, OMESC staff, or the local lead recruiter) and
2) COE protocol (successfully complete two COEs).

II. COE Quality Control

The OMESC reviews 100% of COEs submitted by the Oregon's 18 regional migrant education programs. If a COE passes the "Review of Certificate of Eligibility -Errors/Issues" examination, it is placed in the official state files at the OMESC to be held for 10 years. If a COE does not pass the examination, the OMESC then proceeds with the following process:

- 1 The COEs with errors or issues are compiled and logged each month by OMESC staff. The OMESC provides the 18 regional programs with a monthly report on COE accuracy.
- 2 The COEs in question are returned to the regional programs for them to make corrections. Regional programs have 30 days to make the COE corrections.
- 3 Regional programs must document all corrections on the COE Correction Form. The COE Correction Form is used to document changes/corrections needed on the COE.
- 4 The local program's recruiter or OMSIS specialist makes the necessary changes to the COE on both the copy to be returned to OMESC and to the regional program's copy.
- 5 All corrections are properly initialed by the recruiter, OMSIS specialist, or parent/guardian.
- 6 The recruiter returns the COE to the OMSIS specialist if changes affect the OMSIS system, i.e., QAD dates, move from, move to, etc.
- 7 The Correction Form is then digitally/manually signed to verify corrections done by either the recruiter or OMSIS specialist.
- 8 The recruiter or OMSIS specialist then returns the Form to the OMESC. The COE Correction Form is stapled to the COE.

If a COE is determined to be ineligible for the Oregon Migrant Education Program, the OMESC follows the steps below:

- 1 A memo is sent to the regional program explaining the findings.
- 2 The regional program has 30 days to contest the findings and submit additional supporting documentation in written form to the OMESC.
- 3 If the regional program does not contest the findings, then the OMESC voids the COE and follows-up with a memo to the regional program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's re-interview procedures are as follows:

- 1 Every two weeks the OMESC runs a list of all students entered on OMSIS.
- 2 The OMESC then appends the student list onto an Excel spreadsheet. A computerized selection of random names is generated through a formula.

The formula used to determine a random sample for re-interviews is as follows:

Random number generation,

- ii. The number of variables is 1,
- iii. The number of random numbers is the category 1 count from previous year,
- iv. Uses a binomial distribution,
- v. With a probability of success (p Value) of .003%,

• This gives the OMESC 60 random number samples for yearly re-interviews.

- 1 The Excel spreadsheet identifies the samples for the year.
 4. The OMESC statewide recruiter/re-interviewer contacts families to schedule re-interview dates and times. If a family is not available for a re-interview, the OMESC documents the efforts made on the Re-interview Contact Denied Form and proceeds to the next student on the sample list.
 5. After the appointment is scheduled, a courtesy memo is sent to the regional program coordinator notifying them of the re-interview. The OMESC then contacts the regional program's recruiter and invites him/her to accompany the OMESC recruiter/re-interviewer. The local recruiter's role is to introduce the OMESC staff to the family; and they are instructed to observe and not participate during the interview process.
- 2 The OMESC recruiter/re-interviewer documents any findings on the Oregon MEP Re-interview Form.
- 3 The OMESC examines the re-interview results and sends a memo to the regional program coordinator advising them of the outcome.

A. Determined to be eligible

The OMESC notifies the regional program of the result.

Determined to be ineligible

The OMESC notifies the regional program of any findings

The findings must be contested within 30 days and submitted on the "Contesting Re-interview Findings Form".

1 If the regional program cannot provide sufficient written evidence to successfully contest the re-interview findings within 30 days of notification, the OMESC will VOID that child's COE.

2 The OMESC sends a memo to the Title I-C regional program coordinator confirming that the child's COE information has been voided and deleted from the OMSIS.

3 The OMESC retains copies of the re-interview paperwork to serve as verification to USED/OME that Oregon has implemented a re-interview process according to regulation CFR 200.89.

Total Re-interviews conducted for 2008-2009 Performance Year Number of re-interviews conducted: 45 Number of eligible COEs: 40
Number of ineligible COEs: 5

The formula described above was set up in January of 2009; therefore, Oregon began their computerized sampling process well into the performance year. Between January and August 2009 Oregon was able to reinterview 45 of 60 records provided by this computerized process.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC staff provides the regional MEPs with a running total of migrant children identified in their local region on a monthly basis. Corrective actions are taken immediately in the local regions when discrepancies are found. After the October 1, 2009 deadline, OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs additional validations and cross-tabs of information and checks for human errors, i.e. names misspelled, etc. This year, category 1 and category 2 were generated October 31, 2009.

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

Local projects are given a deadline of October 01, 2009 to enroll and withdraw migrant students on OMSIS. Following the deadline, the OMESC staff runs reports to confirm withdrawals on all students enrolled in K-12 institutions. Regional programs are notified if withdrawals are missing for any enrolled student.

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

Cross tabulation is done and corrected for children placed in an out-of-school site when they are actually enrolled in a school building.

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

The checks involve the following: English cognates (e.g., James/Jaime, Francisco/Frank, Pedro/Peter.); Similar spellings or misspellings (e.g., Sanchez vs. Sanches, Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names (e.g., Yesenia vs. Jesenia, Evelia vs. Ebelia, Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names (e.g., Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez, Sanches-Rodrigues, Sanches-Rodriguez, Sanchez vs. Sanches, Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues, Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double family names against single family names (e.g., Sanchez-Rodriguez, Maria vs. Sanchez, Maria); Double first names (e.g., Juan vs. Juan Carlos, Jose vs. Jose Luis, Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names (Rodriguez, Maria, 01/01/95 vs. 10/01/95); Last names that can be written with or without spaces (e.g., A la Torre vs. Alatorre, De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated (e.g., Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

This process takes place year-round.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC staff is responsible for carrying out I&R and OMSIS training for MEP staff in Oregon. The OMESC staff meets on a monthly basis to review re-interviewing results and COE errors and issues. Lessons learned are identified and trainings are tailored to meet the identified needs.

Other support for corrective actions are:

- 1 The OMESC staff is available at all times for the local recruiter to call with questions on eligibility.
- 2 The OMESC has the I&R Helpdesk and the OMSIS Helpdesk e-mail accounts, where local MEP staff can e-mail questions on eligibility or OMSIS system corrections.
- 3 The state recruiter/re-interviewer and the quality control manager review and verify the eligibility of the COE and its content.
- 4 The OMESC implemented the electronic COE correction form to allow immediate feedback from the local programs and/or recruiters on corrections needed on the COE.
- 5 When filing the COEs, occasional discrepancies are found and immediate corrective action is taken.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon currently does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of reporting the child count. Furthermore, Oregon looks forward to receiving guidance from OME in regard to the new regulations that came into effect August 29, 2009.