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:

- o Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- o Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- o Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- o Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- o Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- o Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- o Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- o Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- o Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- o Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- o 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2008-09 X 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, April 23, 2010, 3:27:21 PM

Signature Date

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	20,418	14,762	72.3
4	20,295	14,700	72.4
5	20,024	14,427	72.0
6	9,376	6,479	69.1
7	4,849	3,628	74.8
8	4,652	3,112	66.9
High School	1,294	561	43.4
Total	80,908	57,669	71.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	20,407	16,233	79.6
4	20,293	16,288	80.3
5	20,029	14,303	71.4
6	9,378	6,752	72.0
7	4,852	3,440	70.9
8	4,654	2,948	63.3
High School	1,293	678	52.4
Total	80,906	60,642	75.0
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	7,458	5,810	77.9
4	7,544	5,997	79.5
5	7,803	6,023	77.2
6	4,080	2,886	70.7
7	2,604	1,986	76.3
8	2,528	1,735	68.6
High School	501	219	43.7
Total	32,518	24,656	75.8
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	7,456	6,331	84.9
4	7,541	6,561	87.0
5	7,808	6,078	77.8
6	4,082	3,105	76.1
7	2,598	1,960	75.4
8	2,524	1,677	66.4
High School	503	309	61.4
Total	32,512	26,021	80.0
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	25,614
Limited English proficient students	37,455
Students who are homeless	8,302
Migratory students	6,826
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4,985
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,493
Black, non-Hispanic	7,824
Hispanic	57,770
White, non-Hispanic	106,451
Total	184,523
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	14	492	16	N<6	524
K	1,996	21,806	77	54	23,933
1	2,457	22,660	132	62	25,311
2	2,364	22,773	94	75	25,306
3	2,005	22,924	92	83	25,104
4	1,552	22,483	73	111	24,219
5	1,858	21,977	78	95	24,008
6	1,248	10,421	56	105	11,830
7	424	5,097	59	28	5,608
8	354	4,867	48	40	5,309
9	35	1,620	40	46	1,741
10	40	1,558	66	51	1,715
11	31	1,383	93	53	1,560
12	19	1,241	148	43	1,451
Ungraded	72	2,570	12	333	2,987
TOTALS	14,469	163,872	1,084	1,181	180,606
Comments: No students age 0-2 were served by Title I-A.					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,461
Reading/language arts	10,647
Science	34
Social studies	20
Vocational/career	18
Other instructional services	
Comments: No other services provided.	

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	N<6
Supporting guidance/advocacy	10
Other support services	40
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	189	
Paraprofessionals[1]	268	95.9
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	1	
Clerical support staff	1	
Administrators (non-clerical)	8	
Comments:		

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	854.00	94.5
Comments:		

[3] Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	5
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	208
2. Adults participating	220
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	163
4. Participating children	315
a. Birth through 2 years	137
b. Ages 3 through 5	122
c. Ages 6 through 8	45
c. Above age 8	11
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	108
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	114
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	96
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	88
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	45
Comments:	

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

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	26
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	39
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	59
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	84
5. Total families enrolled	208
Comments:	

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

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do <u>not</u> include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Do not use TABE
CASAS	39	19	Significant learning gain defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 4 or more 80 hours ABE.
Other			No "Other"
Comments:			

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

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

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

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Do not use TABE
CASAS	52	42	
BEST			
BEST Plus	18	17	Significant learning gain defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours ESL.
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments:			

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

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<6	N<6	N<6 who did not meet earned 5 or more credits toward a diploma.
GED	N<6	N<6	
Other	N<6	N<6	
Comments:			

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

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<6	N<6	N<6 who did not meet earned 5 or more credits toward a diploma.
GED	23	19	N<6 who did not obtain GED passed 1 or more GED subtests.
Other	N<6	N<6	
Comments:			

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	34	25	15		
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	34	N<6	N<6		
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	40	29	10		
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	40	10	N<6		
Comments:					

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

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a <u>weighted</u> average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	40	22	N<6	17.7	2 who were exempted did not have enough English language skills for the test
Comments:					

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

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	19	N<6	Source: report card; teacher report. Reading on grade level information missing on 15 Kindergarteners.
1	17	N<6	Source: report card; teacher report. Reading on grade level information missing on 12 1st graders.
2	15	N<6	Source: report card; teacher report. Reading on grade level information missing on 8 2nd graders.
3	10	N<6	Source: report card; teacher report. Reading on grade level information missing on 6 3rd graders.
	Comments:		

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

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

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

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

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	44	39	16 incarcerated adults in 1 program were exempt from PEP Scale I testing.
PEP Scale II	57	53	
PEP Scale III	44	39	
PEP Scale IV	16	14	PEP Scale IV only used in 1 program.
Other			
Comments:			

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

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	1,068
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	20,111
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	505
K	428
1	423
2	430
3	301
4	260
5	261
6	257
7	245
8	266
9	314
10	291
11	325
12	299
Ungraded	36
Out-of-school	
Total	4,641
Comments: The number reported for Priority for Services for Out-of-school is zero. The criteria set for PFS students does not take into consideration out-of-school children. Out-of-school children lack state assessment information; therefore, they will not meet the criteria as defined under priority for service. The increase under age 3-5 is a result of a change in the criteria. Oregon included all preschool children who attended a preschool program.	

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	106
K	928
1	886
2	854
3	801
4	729
5	671
6	589
7	552
8	510
9	472
10	472
11	398
12	285
Ungraded	9
Out-of-school	19
Total	8,281
Comments: The LEP numbers increased for the state in 2008-09. One reason for the increase is the method used for counting LEP students. In the 2007-2008 school year, Oregon counted LEP students only if their most recent enrollment line for the school year was marked LEP. A decision was made for the 2008-2009 school year to count the students under Limited English Proficient any time LEP was marked during the 2008-2009 school year.	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<6
K	43
1	60
2	78
3	69
4	81
5	84
6	76
7	48
8	57
9	45
10	32
11	32
12	25
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	738

Comments: Age birth through 2 -Oregon does not require the collection of IDEA data for birth through 2. The IDEA numbers increased for the state; one of the reasons for the increase was in the method of counting IDEA students. In the 2007-08 school year, Oregon counted IDEA students only if their most recent enrollment line for the school year was marked IDEA. A decision was made for the 2008-09 school year to count the students under Children with Disabilities (IDEA) any time that IDEA was marked during the 2008-09 school year.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the underlined number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	543	402	116	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	986	1,005	737	314
K	375	516	404	170
1	359	393	358	201
2	356	416	367	176
3	329	414	330	185
4	328	358	332	175
5	284	336	334	164
6	276	374	280	159
7	262	343	292	165
8	237	346	241	156
9	240	318	264	151
10	227	307	268	149
11	176	316	247	135
12	124	230	235	135
Ungraded	32	27	11	N<6
Out-of-school	863	365	219	150
Total	5,997	6,466	5,035	2,596

Comments: Oregon's MEP count increased for the performance year 2008-2009. This increase in the number of identified MEP children throughout the state affected all areas of the CSPR Part II collections. Oregon had fewer students identified during the 2007-2008 school year which would have qualified them to be counted under the 37-48 month's category for 2008-2009 school year.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the underlined number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	701
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,134
K	1,016
1	932
2	939
3	899
4	855
5	780
6	756
7	755
8	703
9	665
10	670
11	602
12	542
Ungraded	48
Out-of-school	996
Total	13,993
Comments: Oregon's MEP count increased for the performance year 2008-2009. The increase in the number of identified MEP children throughout the state affected all area of the CSPR Part II collections.	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	N<6
8	N<6
9	11
10	17
11	36
12	47
Ungraded	
Total	119
Comments: Migrant data source changed for 2008-09 from the Oregon Migrant Student Information System to EdFacts N32, which is from the Early Leavers collection.	

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

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	15
Comments: Oregon's MEP count increased for the performance year 2008-2009. This increase in the number of identified MEP children throughout the state affected all areas of the CSPR Part II collections.	

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

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	979	968
4	947	939
5	948	947
6	892	886
7	909	902
8	840	834
9		
10	756	738
11		
12		
Total	6,271	6,214
Comments: For 2008-09, Oregon's grade of accountability is grade 10 so Oregon does not report assessment results/participation numbers for grades 9, 11, and 12; therefore, blank cells are correct.		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	996	990
4	953	947
5	957	954
6	885	882
7	907	902
8	844	837
9		
10	750	733
11		
12		
Total	6,292	6,245
Comments: For 2008-09, Oregon's grade of accountability is grade 10, so Oregon does not report assessment results/participation numbers for grades 9, 11, and 12; therefore blank cells are correct.		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	28
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	425
K	545
1	533
2	578
3	530
4	527
5	513
6	539
7	515
8	461
9	468
10	444
11	429
12	341
Ungraded	10
Out-of-school	221
Total	7,107
Comments: Oregon started to document on OMSIS the support services rendered to out-of-school youth. This service is usually provided through our state recruiter.	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	299
K	147
1	148
2	179
3	109
4	118
5	112
6	119
7	128
8	120
9	131
10	120
11	152
12	110
Ungraded	7
Out-of school	30
Total	2,029
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	339
K	438
1	444
2	472
3	426
4	410
5	390
6	396
7	365
8	331
9	357
10	350
11	335
12	284
Ungraded	9
Out-of-school	61
Total	5,407
Comments: Oregon MEP funds are used to serve students ages three years or older. The decrease in 1, 8, 9, 10 was a result of MEP Regional Programs receiving less monies to operate; therefore staff were reduced and fewer services were given.	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	104	99	
K	365	288	
1	363	280	
2	392	319	
3	350	301	
4	323	275	
5	331	258	
6	307	238	
7	272	206	
8	242	177	
9	196	134	331
10	157	98	331
11	170	126	323
12	108	62	277
Ungraded	N<6	N<6	8
Out-of-school	39	29	57
Total	3,723	2,893	1,327
Comments: Local programs are not required to report instructional services provided to migrant children under the age of 3 on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). The decrease was a result of MEP Regional Programs receiving less monies to operate; therefore staff were reduced and fewer services were given.			

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	28	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	421	59
K	463	133
1	460	117
2	500	115
3	439	99
4	453	105
5	445	94
6	429	113
7	394	137
8	353	113
9	361	174
10	352	181
11	336	173
12	284	197
Ungraded	9	N<6
Out-of-school	207	22
Total	5,934	1,837
Comments: Local programs are not required to report supplemental services provided to children under the age of 3 on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). The decrease of 6, 7, 8 was a result of MEP Regional Programs receiving less monies to operate; therefore staff were reduced and fewer services were given. The explanation for the increase in 12, K Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service is a result of criteria changes in the program. Instead of only counting the services for the most recent enrollment line IDs, we counted all the enrollment line IDs for the reporting period that had this service checked.		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	190
K	283
1	271
2	306
3	270
4	258
5	251
6	260
7	247
8	223
9	207
10	212
11	203
12	149
Ungraded	6
Out-of-school	60
Total	3,400
Comments: The decrease in Age 3-5 (not K), 1, 4, 9, 10, 11 was a result of MEP Regional Programs receiving less monies to operate; therefore staff were reduced and fewer services were given.	

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	661
K	690
1	639
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	N<6
Total	6,199
Comments: The Oregon Department of Education placed a greater emphasis on the importance of local MEP programs ensuring that all MEP children are contacted and encouraged to attend the MEP summer school. In addition, the state encouraged the local programs to increase their summer recruitment efforts. Instructional services for the summer for MEP children under the age of 2 are not entered on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status.	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	171
K	187
1	196
2	204
3	138
4	113
5	112
6	90
7	66
8	80
9	63
10	61
11	59
12	22
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	1,565
Comments: The increase in the Priority for Services category for the summer was a result of Oregon's focus on recruiting Priority for Service students to attend the MEP summer programs. Priority for Service for UG is zero, because to be PFS the child must have turned three years old. To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status.	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
Comments: Oregon, does not collect information or provide services to students who are no longer eligible for the program.	

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	660
K	689
1	638
2	679
3	622
4	577
5	525
6	410
7	344
8	286
9	218
10	223
11	212
12	76
Ungraded	36
Out-of-school	
Total	6,195
Comments: Instructional services for the summer for MEP children under the age of 2 are not entered on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status. The increase for Children Receiving an Instructional Service is a result of the increase in summer enrollment numbers.	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	539	488	
K	681	605	
1	633	520	
2	676	573	
3	616	527	
4	569	474	
5	524	427	
6	396	340	
7	288	257	
8	253	178	
9	157	88	215
10	143	97	221
11	135	104	207
12	35	13	41
Ungraded	30	34	36
Out-of-school			
Total	5,675	4,725	720

Comments: Instructional services for MEP children under the age of 2 are not entered on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status. For the summer count, Oregon only counts children who are enrolled and served during the summer. Children identified as out-of-school during the summer, not attending summer school, and served are counted under the population information, therefore, not counted under the summer category. The Oregon Department of Education placed a greater emphasis on the importance of local MEP programs ensuring that all MEP children are contacted and encouraged to attend the MEP summer school. In addition, the state has encouraged the local programs to increase their summer recruitment efforts. Because of this effort all summer reporting category data will show an increase.

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	638	28
K	668	50
1	612	18
2	647	17
3	601	28
4	555	N<6
5	512	19
6	394	24
7	327	16
8	275	21
9	193	21
10	195	22
11	179	25
12	67	9
Ungraded	36	N<6
Out-of-school		
Total	5,899	305

Comments: Support services -counseling services for MEP children under the age of 2 are not entered on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status. For the summer count, Oregon only counts children who are enrolled and served during the summer. Children identified as out-of-school during the summer, not attending summer school, and served are counted under the population information; therefore not counted under the summer category. The Oregon Department of Education placed a greater emphasis on the importance of local MEP programs ensuring that all MEP children are contacted and encouraged to attend the MEP summer school. In addition, the state has encouraged the local programs to increase their summer recruitment efforts. Because of this effort all summer reporting category data will show an increase.

FAQs on Support Services:

a. *What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*

b. *What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	377
K	277
1	235
2	295
3	246
4	191
5	184
6	144
7	121
8	84
9	63
10	63
11	58
12	8
Ungraded	29
Out-of-school	
Total	2,375
Comments: Referred Service for MEP children under the age of 2 are not entered on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS). To participate in the MEP summer program, the child must have turned three years at the start of summer school with an active eligibility status. For the summer count, Oregon only document children who are enrolled and served during the summer. Children identified as out-of-school during the summer, not attending summer school, and served are counted under the population information; therefore not counted under the summer category. The Oregon Department of Education placed a greater emphasis on the importance of local MEP programs ensuring that all MEP children are contacted and encouraged to attend the MEP summer school. In addition, the state has encouraged the local programs to increase their summer recruitment efforts. Because of this effort all summer reporting category data will show an increase.	

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	30
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	949
K	978
1	929
2	967
3	901
4	859
5	795
6	749
7	707
8	629
9	610
10	595
11	554
12	401
Ungraded	43
Out-of-school	149
Total	10,845
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	689
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	15,018
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Oregon has no consolidated MEP funds, so that the value is zero since no schools had consolidated MEP funds. Oregon's 18 regional migrant education programs do not combine Title I-C funds with schoolwide programs. The total for this is zero.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	71	2,997
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	
Summer/intersession only	0	
Year round	108	13,513
Comments: Most schools are identified as year round or regular school year. Oregon does not have schools that only run for the summer or only run extended day. All 18 regional programs run summer school and any extended day programs are attached to a school that runs during the regular school year. This results in the zeros under summer/intersession only and regular school year -school day/extended day.		

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

FAQs on type of MEP project:

a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*

b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*

c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*

d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*

e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

    b. *Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	52	12.24	288	225.02
Counselors	0	0.00	1	0.34
All paraprofessionals	132	56.19	235	185.44
Recruiters	63	44.84	32	27.10
Records transfer staff	22	11.39	17	7.75
Comments: The guidance counselor was hired at .34 FTE during the summer to assist/guide MEP children with plans for graduation. The counselor assisted the students with projected credits needed and what classes student should focus on to meet Oregon's graduation requirements. The Oregon Department of Education placed a greater emphasis on the importance of local MEP programs ensuring that all MEP children are contacted and encouraged to attend the MEP summer school. Because of this effort all summer reporting category data will show an increase. Record Transfer Staff in the local programs are at times funded through other sources at the district, because their year round position. Title I-C funds are used at a minimum to fund Record Transfer staff during the summer. During the regular school year, there were no Counselors hired with Title I-C funds.				

Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

FAQs on MEP staff:

a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
    1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
    2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*

c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*

d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*

e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*

f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	**FTE**	**Headcount**	**FTE**
Qualified paraprofessionals	129	54.70	184	160.30
Comments: Oregon's MEP count increased for the performance year 2008-2009. This increase in the number of identified MEP children throughout the state affected all areas of the CSPR Part II collections.				

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

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
    1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
    2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do <u>not</u> include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
    - **Adult Corrections: An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.**
    - **At-Risk Programs: Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.**
    - **Juvenile Corrections: An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.**
    - **Juvenile Detention Facilities: Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.**
    - **Multiple Purpose Facility: An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.**
    - **Neglected Programs: An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.**
    - **Other: Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve** <u>non-adjudicated children</u> **and youth.**

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	35	138
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	10	134
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	2	60
Total	47	136

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	2
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	35
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	10
Adult Corrections	0
Other	2
Total	47
Comments:	

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

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2,166		2,080		39
Long Term Students Served	1,144		1,018		14

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	113		75		29
Asian or Pacific Islander	26		14		N<6
Black, non-Hispanic	166		261		N<6
Hispanic	206		278		N<6
White, non-Hispanic	1,626		1,440		9
Total	2,137		2,068		39

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,420		1,905		18
Female	746		175		21
Total	2,166		2,080		39

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	31		N<6		8
6	42		N<6		N<6
7	60		N<6		N<6
8	76		N<6		N<6
9	86		N<6		N<6
10	105		N<6		N<6
11	110		N<6		N<6
12	141		N<6		N<6
13	204		14		N<6
14	286		46		N<6
15	337		136		9

16	343		314		N<6
17	303		561		N<6
18	33		504		N<6
19	8		285		N<6
20	N<6		147		N<6
21	N<6		68		N<6
Total	2,166		2,080		39

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This

response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: "other" category not available above: Race/Ethnicity-Neglected: 29 and Juvenile Corrections: 12

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	20	10		
Awarded high school diploma(s)	N<6	9		
Awarded GED(s)	N<6	7		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	948	1,767		
Enrolled in a GED program	59	88		
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	509	124		6
Earned a GED	24	91		
Obtained high school diploma	27	136		
Were accepted into post-secondary education	14	93		
Enrolled in post-secondary education	11	81		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	340	640		
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	9	203		
Obtained employment	44	71		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the underlined number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading.Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	650	440		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	624	417		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	44	120		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	95	95		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	162	28		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	170	38		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	153	136		
Comments: The data in the "other programs" column is a neglected facility that has been taken over by the Educational Service District this last summer (2009). There is no data available for this program prior to summer 2009. This program will have data to report for the 2009 CSPR reporting year.				

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	682	513		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	581	431		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	32	87		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	86	93		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	153	44		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	151	40		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	159	167		
Comments: The data in the "other programs" column is a neglected facility that has been taken over by the Educational Service District this last summer (2009). There is no data available for this program prior to summer 2009. This program will have data to report for the 2009 CSPR reporting year.				

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	16	122
Neglected programs	6	71
Juvenile detention	4	29
Juvenile corrections	12	125
Other	4	80
Total	42	85

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	1
Comments: # Programs/Facilities changed to actual facilities (previously a headcount was input).	

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	10
Neglected programs	5
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	9
Other	2
Total	30
Comments: Data in this table updated because we asked SDs to resubmit.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.
2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,858	269	1,203	519	1,476
Total Long Term Students Served	1,378	87		225	1,291

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	67	23	52	14	24
Asian or Pacific Islander	21	6	11	9	16
Black, non-Hispanic	38	32	40	20	36
Hispanic	476	39	129	120	378
White, non-Hispanic	1,140	160	878	341	873
Total	1,742	260	1,110	504	1,327

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,159	199	909	461	763
Female	699	70	294	58	675
Total	1,858	269	1,203	519	1,438

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8			N<6		
9			N<6		
10	N<6		N<6		
11	N<6	N<6	6	N<6	N<6
12	29	10	33		N<6
13	67	20	80	10	16
14	151	30	131	28	70
15	350	59	198	93	200
16	487	40	277	68	382
17	498	32	299	79	515
18	230	61	43	211	172
19	32		7	34	
20	8		N<6	35	
21		N<6		18	
Total	1,857	261	1,079	579	1,360

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

Comments: It has come to our attention that there are discrepancies in our data due to inaccurate submissions by some of our school districts. We wanted to let you know we are aware of the discrepancies and are taking steps to clean up the process and improve our data for next year.

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	10	6	13	4
Awarded high school diploma(s)	4	2	6	4
Awarded GED(s)	3	1	5	0
Comments: Student count changed to Program count.				

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

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	1,682	222	308	1,046
Enrolled in a GED program	349	N<6	11	7
Comments: Corrected count that has been resubmitted.				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	121	66	158	390
Earned a GED	47	N<6	16	9
Obtained high school diploma	221	N<6	22	14
Were accepted into post-secondary education	13	N<6	9	N<6
Enrolled in post-secondary education	8	N<6	9	N<6
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	37	39	78	
Comments:				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	N<6	8	6	
Obtained employment	60	10	49	
Comments:				

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

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of <u>long-term</u> students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities <u>together</u> in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	168	98	349	7
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	224	27	131	N<6

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	9	6	38	N<6
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	N<6	N<6	21	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	14	7	20	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	11	6	19	N<6
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	12	9	34	N<6
Comments: It has come to our attention that there are discrepancies in our data due to inaccurate submissions by some of our school districts. We wanted to let you know we are aware of the discrepancies and are taking steps to clean up the process and improve our data for next year.				

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	73	42	293	N<6
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	49	20	108	N<6

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	9	N<6	27	N<6
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	10	N<6	18	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	14	N<6	9	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	7	6	16	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	9	12	49	
Comments: It has come to our attention that there are discrepancies in our data due to inaccurate submissions by some of our school districts. We wanted to let you know we are aware of the discrepancies and are taking steps to clean up the process and improve our data for next year.				

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: .9% 2007-08: 1.1% 2008-09: 1.7%	2006-07: 1.0%	1.2%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: .1% 2007-08: 1.7% 2008-09: 1.2%	2006-07: 1.2%	.5%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 13.5% 2007-08: 15.8% 2008-09: 17.3%	2006-07: 15.8%	15.9%	2002-2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 5% 2007-08: 8.4% 2008-09: 8.0%	2006-07: 8.5%	7.4%	2002-2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 8th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 10% 2007-08: 12.8% 2008-09: 18.8%	2006-07: 14.1%	13.1%	2002-2003

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 11th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 23.5% 2007-08: 20.8% 2008-09: 25.6%	2006-07: 23.8%	25.1%	2002-2003

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 14%	2006-07: 15.9%		
% of 8th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007 08: 13.5% 2008-09: 18.2% 11:	2007 08: 14.6%	15.9%	2003-2004
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month. (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 22% 2007-08: 23.5% 2008-09: 26.4%	2006-07: 25%	24.3%	2003-2004
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 22.5% 2007-08: 28.9% 2008-09: 23.2%	2006-07: 30.9%	24.7%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
_ _ % of 11th grade students who _Oregon Healthy • • • 200910: 35% report using alcohol in the previous month _Teen Survey (YRBS) • Annual Annual	2009	2009-10: 35% 201011:		2006-07: 35% 2007-08: 35% 2008-09: 35%	2006-07: 48.7% 2007-08: 46.1% 2008-09: 38.4%	43.4%	2002-2003

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 12.5% 2007-08: 15.6% 2008-09: 18.2%	2006-07: 15.6%	14.6%	2004-2005
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 10.5% 2007-08: 12.9% 2008-09: 13.5%	2006-07: 13.7%	12.5%	2004-2005
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 46.5% 2007-08: 40.9% 2008-09: 40.8%	2006-07: 42.8%	48.1%	2004-2005
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006 07: 25% 2007 08: 20% 2008 09: 20% 11:	2006 07: 30.7% 08: 30.6% 09: 27.4%	41.2%	2004-2005
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 4.5% 2007-08: 6.1% 2008-09: 6.4%	2006-07: 5.8%	6.7%	2004-2005
Comments:							

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

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

% of 11th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 3%	2006-07: 4.6%		
				2007-08: 4.5%			
				2008-09: 3.6%			
						4.7%	2004-2005
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				200607: 11%	2006-07: 8.9%		
				2007-08: 9.0%			
				2008-09: 10.6%			
% of 8th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	10: 8%			
				11:		12.7%	2002-2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 15%	2006-07: 18.6%		
				2007-08: 18.9%			
				2008-09: 21.9%			
% of 11th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009			23.4%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report	Oregon Healthy	Annual	2009	200607: 8%	2006-07: 10.7%	10.5%	2002-2003

using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	Teen Survey (YRBS)			2007-08: 10.4%			
				2008-09: 9.8%			
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 15% 2007-08: 19.5% 2008-09: 15%	2006-07: 20.4%	18.7%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 93% 2007-08: 85.8% 2008-09: 80%	2006-07: 76.5%	95.1%	2002-2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 93% 2007-08: 84.3% 2008-09: 86.8%	2006-07: 82.4%	95.3%	2002-2003

one or more packs of cigarettes a day '05)							

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 95% 2007-08: 80.4% 2008-09: 74.5%	2006-07: 74.5%	85.5%	2002-2003

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				200607: 90% 2007-08: 69% 2008	2006-07: 67.7%		
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	09: 90% 11:	09: 65.8%	78.4%	2002-2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 99% 2007-08: 98.5% 2008-09: 98.5%	2006-07: 98.5%	98.3%	2003-2004

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	20009	200607: 98% 2007-08: 98% 2008-09: 97.8%	2006-07: 97.9%	97.4%	2003-2004

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 94% 2007-08: 62% 2008-09: 56%	2006-07: 55.1%	88.4%	2002-2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 95% 2007-08: 64% 2008-09: 62.3%	2006-07: 60.3%	86.8%	2002-2003

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 99% 2007-08: 99.2% 2008-09: 99%	2006-07: 98.6%	95.9%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2006-07: 95% 2007-08: 97.9% 2008-09: 98.4%	2006-07: 98.4%	91.3%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2006-07: 98%	2006-07: 97.7%		
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007 08: 99% 2008 09: 99% 11:	2007 08: 97.3% 09: 97.5%	94.1%	2002-2003
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	200607: 95%	2006-07: 95.5%		
				2007-08: 95.8%			
				2008-09: 95%			
						88.8%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	nnual	2009	2006-07: 99%	2006-07: 98.3%		
				2007-08: 98.4%			
				2008-09: 98.3%			
						99%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
_				2006-07: 95%	2006-07: 97.1%		
_			2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 96.8%		
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of _Oregon Healthy • • • 2009-10: 98.5%		2009-10: 98.5%	2008-09: 98.5%	2008-09: 98.5%	2008-09: 96.9%		
other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05) _Teen Survey (YRBS) • Annual • 2009	2009						
		201011:				94.8%	2002-2003

Annual

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2009	200607: 3% 2007-08: 5.8% 2008-09: 7.5%	2006-07: 8.4%	4.8%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2009	200607: 3.5% 2007-08: 3.8% 2008-09: 4.9%	2006-07: 5.8%	5.2%	2002-2003
Comments:							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	2008	2006-07: 16500 2007-08: 17270 2008-09: 16667	2006-07: 17597	17804	2003-2004
Comments: *The unique number of youth processed by the juvenile justice system in the reporting year. Youth and referrals statewide report criminal and non-criminal offenses committed by juveniles for each reporting year. Each statistic is available grouped by the youth's sex, age at the time of disposition and race. The full report is available with county specific data on the following website. http://www.oya.state.or.us/jjisdata.htm							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	20080	200607: 6100 2007-08: 6677 2008-09: 5939	2006-07: 6837	6462	2003-2004

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
# of persistently dangerous schools	ODE Disciplinary Collection	Annual	2009	2006-07: 0 2007-08: 1 2008-09: 0	2006-07: 1	1	2002-2003

Comments: Note: The student behavior data is derived from the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey. Oregon Healthy Teens is a combined survey of the "Youth Risk Behavior Survey" and the "Communities that Care: survey. Oregon surveys 8th and 11th graders in a randomly selected sample every year. Oregon Department of Education requires that school districts report expulsion data annually. The number of "Persistently Dangerous/Unsafe School Choice" schools are determined from a subset of the collected expulsion data.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase,transportation, possession, or consumption of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol. Suspicion of being under the influence of alcohol may be included if it results in disciplinary action.
Illicit drug related	Unlawful use, cultivation, manufacture, distribution, sale, solicitation, purchase, possession, transportation, or importation of any controlled drug (e.g., Demerol, morphine) or narcotic substance.
Violent incident without physical injury	Oregon's definition comes directly from the definitions of specific codes from the EDEN (N30) Incident Codes (Appendix P) list. These code numbers are: 1100, 1700, 2500, 2600, 2700, 3200, and 8000. Code 1100: Arson (Setting a Fire); To unlawfully and intentionally damage or attempt to damage any school or personal property by fire or incendiary device. Firecrackers, fireworks and trashcan fires would be included in this category if they were contributing factors to a damaging fire. Code 1700: Fighting (Mutual Altercation); Mutual participation in an incident involving physical violence, where there is no major injury. Code 2500: Physical Altercation, Minor (Pushing, Shoving); Confrontation, tussle, or physical aggression that does not result in injury. Code 2600: Robbery (Taking of Things by Force); The taking of or attempting to take anything of value that is owned by another person or organization under confrontational circumstances by force or threat of force or violence and/or by putting the victim in fear. A key difference between robbery and theft is that the threat of physical harm or actual physical harm is involved in a robbery. Code 2700: School Threat (Threat of Destruction or Harm); Any threat (verbal, written or electronic) by a person to bomb or use other substances or devices for the purpose of exploding, burning, causing damage to a school building or school property, or to harm students or staff. Code 3200: Threat/Intimidation (Causing Fear of Harm); Physical, verbal, written, or electronic action which immediately creates fear of harm, without displaying a weapon and without subjecting the victim to actual physical attack. Code 8000: Other violent Criminal Offense (e.g. Coercion, Hate/Bias crime).
Violent incident with physical injury	Oregon's definition comes directly from the definitions of specific codes from the EDEN (N30) Incident Codes (Appendix P) list. These code numbers are; 1300, 2000, 2800, and 3000. Code 1300: Battery (Physical Attack/Harm); Touching or striking of another person against his or her will or intentionally causing bodily harm to an individual. Code 2000: Homicide (Murder or Manslaughter); Killing a human being. Code 2800: Sexual Battery (Sexual Assault); Oral, anal, or vaginal penetration forcibly or against the person's will or where the victim is incapable of giving consent. Includes rape, fondling, indecent liberties, child molestation, and sodomy. Code 3000: Suicide; Act or instance of taking one's own life voluntarily and intentionally.
Weapons possession	339.250 Duty of student to comply with rules; discipline, suspension, expulsion, removal and counseling; written information on alternative programs required. (e) For purposes of this subsection, "weapon" includes a: (A) "Firearm" as defined in 18 U.S.C. 921; (B) "Dangerous weapon" as defined in ORS 161.015; or (C) "Deadly weapon" as defined in ORS 161.015. 161.015 General definitions. As used in chapter 743, Oregon Laws 1971, and ORS 166.635, unless the context requires otherwise: (1) "Dangerous weapon" means any weapon, device, instrument, material or substance which under the circumstances in which it is used, attempted to be used or threatened to be used, is readily capable of causing death or serious physical injury. (2) "Deadly weapon" means any instrument, article or substance specifically designed for and presently capable of causing death or serious physical injury
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2,686	198
6 through 8	6,235	198
9 through 12	4,804	198
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	11	198
6 through 8	118	198
9 through 12	197	198
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	500	198
6 through 8	536	198
9 through 12	245	198
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	18	198
9 through 12	30	198
Comments:		

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

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

The following sections collect data on <u>weapons possession</u>.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	270	198
6 through 8	318	198
9 through 12	309	198
Comments: All grade levels in section 2.7.2.4 dropped except for suspensions for weapons in K-5, which increased. The possible reasons for the significant drop in this category is that Oregon School Districts are focusing on and improving school climate by implementation of evidence based programs such as PBS. These programs have proven to be effective in reducing the number of students bringing weapons on school property.		

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

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	26	198
6 through 8	133	198
9 through 12	125	198
Comments: All grade levels in section 2.7.2.4 dropped except for suspensions for weapons in K-5, which increased. The possible reasons for the significant drop in this category is that Oregon School Districts are focusing on and improving school climate by implementation of evidence based programs such as PBS. These programs have proven to be effective in reducing the number of students bringing weapons on school property.		

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

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

The following questions collect data on <u>alcohol-related</u> incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	15	198
6 through 8	230	198
9 through 12	576	198
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	34	198
9 through 12	86	198
Comments:		

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

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

The following questions collect data on <u>illicit drug-related</u> incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	14	198
6 through 8	493	198
9 through 12	1,820	198
Comments:		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	198
6 through 8	130	198
9 through 12	432	198
Comments:		

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

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

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

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

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

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	19	95.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	20	
Comments: In 2008-09 USDE did not allocate any Title VA dollars. In Oregon, only 20 districts chose to use the transferability option. This is the reason the numbers look dramatically different from prior years.		

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

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

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

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

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

	$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	1,400,073	95.8
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,461,273	
Comments:		

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

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

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

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	12	2
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	5	2
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	3	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	20	4
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	76
Comments:	

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	9
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	16
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	6
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	4
Comments:	

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

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Process for meeting Goals/Objectives Oregon has a process of Continuous Improvement Planning (CIP) for all districts including the RLIS districts. In the CIP, districts analyze data on 10 Oregon Education Performance standards (two of the standards are AYP and Graduation). After the data analysis, districts then prioritize their resources to effectively meet the standards through using research-based practices. ODE has provided districts regional professional development and technical assistance on how to create, enhance and update the LEA CIP plans. In addition, districts were involved in a peer review process which helped build capacity in districts and to provide feedback to other districts on their CIP plan. The districts are continuously updating their CIP's. Districts submit the CIP (now called eCIP because it is an online submission) on a two year cycle. ODE receive revised eCIPs from five of the nineteen funded districts from 08-09. ODE also has a process for monitoring districts either through a desk audit process or an onsite monitoring. ODE monitored 18 of the nineteen RLIS districts in either 07-08, 08-09 or 09-10.

In Fall of 2008 and Fall of 2009, ODE provided professional development and technical assistance training on NCLB issues, accountability and compliance. RLIS districts participated in this training. These trainings helped support districts in assessing

where they were on meeting the standards and effectively utilizing their Federal resources. After analyzing their data the RLIS districts have determined that the following activities will continue to help them meet AYP and graduation targets: by focusing on academic achievement of subgroups especially ELL; education technology -specifically distance learning opportunities for students (helps students continue on until graduation by better meeting their needs) and additional support for Title IA services.

Outcomes Of the nineteen RLIS districts in Oregon (2008-09), eighteen RLIS districts met the graduation targets and one of the districts is in District Improvement Status.

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

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2008-09?	No
Comments:	

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	34
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	31	1
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	1
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	6	4
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	20
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		12

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2,194,354.00	3,967.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	21,212.00	10,000.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	41,025.00	484,641.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	1,461,273.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		296,710.00
Total	2,256,591.00	2,256,591.00
Comments:		

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

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