

**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 2009-10

OREGON



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

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

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2009-10 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

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

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

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required ED Facts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10		
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		
		Thursday, April 28, 2011, 5:30:09 PM
Signature _____		

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards for mathematics and English language arts on October 28, 2010. Districts will transition to the new standards between Fall 2011 and 2013. Full implementation of the new standards is expected by the 2013-2014 school year.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In August 2010, the state board of education adopted revised achievement standards for Oregon's general education and alternate assessment in Mathematics effective for the 2010-11 school year. Oregon anticipates adopting revised ELA achievement standards for the general education assessment in May 2011 effective for the 2011-12 school year. In addition, Oregon anticipates implementing a native language ELA general education assessment for grade 3 in January 2011 upon approval from the U.S. Department of Education.

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	10.0
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	90.0
Comments: No comments.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	Yes
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: No comments	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	299,821		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,769		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,692		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	8,229		>97
Hispanic	58,758		>97
White, non-Hispanic	201,855		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	47,138		>97
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	31,899		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	155,344		>97
Migratory students	6,822		>97
Male	153,788		>97
Female	146,033		>97
Comments: Percentages updated.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,369	74.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,123	15.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,847	10.5
Total	46,339	
Comments:		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	299,839		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,785		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	13,678		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	8,220		>97
Hispanic	58,818		>97
White, non-Hispanic	201,605		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	47,146		>97
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	31,892		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	155,357		>97
Migratory students	6,820		>97
Male	153,794		>97
Female	146,045		>97
Comments: Data source reconciled and Percentage updated.			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	34,322	74.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	6,700	14.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,331	11.5
Total	46,353	
Comments: Data updated and resubmitted. The discrepancy of 79 total students with disabilities in 1.2.4 and 1.3.2 is due to 1st year LEP students who were reported in N81, but not in N78.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	129,077		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,511	2,417	96.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	5,802		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	3,642	3,495	96.0
Hispanic	23,725		>97
White, non-Hispanic	88,513		>97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	19,159	18,312	95.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	10,954	10,612	96.9
Economically disadvantaged students	63,795		>97
Migratory students	2,676	2,584	96.6
Male	66,687		>97
Female	62,390		>97
Comments: Data and percentages have been updated.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	14,248	77.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,514	13.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,550	8.5
Total	18,312	
Comments:		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,354	33,158	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	768	527	68.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,954	1,663	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,108	678	61.2
Hispanic	9,237	6,041	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	27,507	22,817	82.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,960	3,523	50.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,884	4,034	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	23,451	16,510	70.4
Migratory students	1,118	671	60.0
Male	21,601	16,981	78.6
Female	20,753	16,177	78.0
Comments:			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,081	34,854	82.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	767	599	78.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,890	1,658	87.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,091	792	72.6
Hispanic	9,104	6,329	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	27,433	23,918	87.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,924	3,606	52.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,628	3,999	60.3
Economically disadvantaged students	23,257	17,625	75.8
Migratory students	1,086	655	60.3
Male	21,450	17,165	80.0
Female	20,631	17,689	85.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

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

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,581	33,349	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	831	557	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,017	1,703	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,159	697	60.1
Hispanic	8,921	5,892	66.0
White, non-Hispanic	27,915	23,118	82.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,435	3,693	49.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,106	3,490	57.2
Economically disadvantaged students	23,420	16,461	70.3
Migratory students	1,061	643	60.6
Male	21,773	17,105	78.6
Female	20,808	16,244	78.1
Comments:			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,395	35,579	83.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	826	636	77.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,966	1,734	88.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,143	811	71.0
Hispanic	8,855	6,344	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	27,822	24,483	88.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,418	3,964	53.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,918	3,544	59.9
Economically disadvantaged students	23,269	17,982	77.3
Migratory students	1,034	648	62.7
Male	21,667	17,706	81.7
Female	20,728	17,873	86.2
Comments:			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

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

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,820	33,600	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	805	545	67.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,942	1,655	85.2
Black, non-Hispanic	1,227	726	59.2
Hispanic	8,632	5,793	67.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,468	23,441	82.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,397	3,535	47.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,138	2,772	54.0
Economically disadvantaged students	23,058	16,226	70.4
Migratory students	996	582	58.4
Male	22,007	17,263	78.4
Female	20,813	16,337	78.5
Comments:			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,647	32,727	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	806	530	65.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,898	1,564	82.4
Black, non-Hispanic	1,209	713	59.0
Hispanic	8,516	5,036	59.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,423	23,414	82.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,382	3,174	43.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,962	1,908	38.5
Economically disadvantaged students	22,923	15,455	67.4
Migratory students	970	439	45.3
Male	21,922	16,371	74.7
Female	20,725	16,356	78.9
Comments:			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,672	31,634	74.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	800	520	65.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,931	1,442	74.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,221	650	53.2
Hispanic	8,591	4,448	51.8
White, non-Hispanic	28,349	23,142	81.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,362	3,655	49.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,102	1,675	32.8
Economically disadvantaged students	22,965	14,678	63.9
Migratory students	982	360	36.7
Male	21,924	16,652	76.0
Female	20,748	14,982	72.2
Comments:			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,992	31,905	74.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	821	503	61.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,922	1,558	81.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,145	634	55.4
Hispanic	8,609	5,165	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	28,856	22,756	78.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,945	2,698	38.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,155	1,651	39.7
Economically disadvantaged students	22,710	14,673	64.6
Migratory students	1,010	553	54.8
Male	21,961	16,360	74.5
Female	21,031	15,545	73.9
Comments:			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,803	32,814	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	825	547	66.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,869	1,525	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,135	716	63.1
Hispanic	8,513	5,147	60.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,800	23,530	81.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,928	2,677	38.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,982	1,289	32.4
Economically disadvantaged students	22,555	15,127	67.1
Migratory students	986	482	48.9
Male	21,840	16,107	73.8
Female	20,963	16,707	79.7
Comments:			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

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

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,265	33,753	79.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	835	573	68.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,942	1,723	88.7
Black, non-Hispanic	1,144	696	60.8
Hispanic	8,126	5,614	69.1
White, non-Hispanic	28,632	23,847	83.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,349	2,786	43.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,706	1,892	51.1
Economically disadvantaged students	21,711	15,569	71.7
Migratory students	936	589	62.9
Male	21,447	16,894	78.8
Female	20,818	16,859	81.0
Comments:			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,085	33,050	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	837	588	70.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,884	1,570	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,137	696	61.2
Hispanic	8,060	5,036	62.5
White, non-Hispanic	28,557	23,823	83.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,335	2,503	39.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,547	1,190	33.5
Economically disadvantaged students	21,590	14,945	69.2
Migratory students	904	469	51.9
Male	21,333	15,967	74.8
Female	20,752	17,083	82.3
Comments:			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

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

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,761	30,726	71.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	837	498	59.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,928	1,591	82.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,182	603	51.0
Hispanic	7,868	4,480	56.9
White, non-Hispanic	29,383	22,417	76.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,065	2,025	33.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,214	1,123	34.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,439	13,148	61.3
Migratory students	917	467	50.9
Male	22,030	15,845	71.9
Female	20,731	14,881	71.8
Comments:			

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,628	29,651	69.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	844	486	57.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,889	1,422	75.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,164	609	52.3
Hispanic	7,783	4,009	51.5
White, non-Hispanic	29,351	21,982	74.9
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,062	1,807	29.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,065	547	17.8
Economically disadvantaged students	21,333	12,366	58.0
Migratory students	897	355	39.6
Male	21,978	14,262	64.9
Female	20,650	15,389	74.5
Comments:			

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,429	29,971	70.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	834	495	59.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,911	1,420	74.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,152	537	46.6
Hispanic	7,772	3,841	49.4
White, non-Hispanic	29,193	22,579	77.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,950	2,372	39.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,166	693	21.9
Economically disadvantaged students	21,211	12,532	59.1
Migratory students	905	350	38.7
Male	21,858	16,003	73.2
Female	20,571	13,968	67.9
Comments:			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,857	23,501	56.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	787	295	37.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,900	1,350	71.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,154	353	30.6
Hispanic	6,962	2,593	37.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,673	18,159	61.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,188	858	16.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,487	410	16.5
Economically disadvantaged students	18,575	7,835	42.2
Migratory students	730	246	33.7
Male	21,690	12,362	57.0
Female	20,167	11,139	55.2
Comments:			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,926	29,913	71.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	795	478	60.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,860	1,351	72.6
Black, non-Hispanic	1,152	563	48.9
Hispanic	6,973	3,439	49.3
White, non-Hispanic	29,750	23,066	77.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,225	1,533	29.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,339	347	14.8
Economically disadvantaged students	18,562	10,850	58.5
Migratory students	714	278	38.9
Male	21,700	14,938	68.8
Female	20,226	14,975	74.0
Comments:			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science- High School

High School	#Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	#Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,167	24,703	60.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	783	381	48.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,850	1,157	62.5
Black, non-Hispanic	1,122	323	28.8
Hispanic	6,730	2,367	35.2
White, non-Hispanic	29,245	19,605	67.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	5,000	1,266	25.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,344	241	10.3
Economically disadvantaged students	18,119	8,343	46.0
Migratory students	697	175	25.1
Male	21,295	13,612	63.9
Female	19,872	11,091	55.8
Comments:			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,249	892	71.4
Districts	196	83	42.3
Comments: Data updated.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	602	491	81.6
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	415	338	81.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	187	153	81.8
Comments: Data updated.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
176	64	36.4
Comments:		

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)¹)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments:	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments:	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In an effort to advance improvement efforts in schools in improvement status, the SEA has reevaluated its statewide system of support. Currently, that system includes administrative coaches for principals in buildings in improvement. These coaching efforts are present in 35 of the districts with schools in improvement. Similarly, each district with one or more schools in improvement has been assigned an individual staff member at the SEA as an ombudsman to provide support in managing questions and inquiries directed to the SEA. Supports are also provided by intermediate service agencies distributed throughout the state.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	3
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	0
Comments:	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	3	0
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	11/30/10
---	----------

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	24,932	23,638
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	16,587	14,875
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	66.5	62.9
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	23,368	23,651
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	15,766	15,301
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	67.5	64.7
Comments: Data updated in version 1.1		

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10	38
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10	8

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

Comments: Data updated in version 1.1

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

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

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

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SES coordinates the efforts of an improvement coach at each school in improvement status. These coaches provide their expertise to a great extent but also serve as a conduit for techniques and for contemporary research leading to or contributing to improvement.

Throughout the state, intermediate districts serve both as conduits for information from the state and as primary sources for information and support. This was augmented by a state-wide data support training system directed by the SEA.

On several occasions, the SEA brought together staff from districts receiving 1003(g) funds to discuss approaches and techniques for school improvement. This forum provided an interchange among district staff and information provided by successful change agents.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0%

Comments:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has contracted with the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory at Education Northwest to provide oversight and delivery of a statewide system of support. This system coordinates the efforts of administrative coaches at the schools in improvement statewide. Similarly, we will be issuing a contract for evaluation of the statewide system of support using these funds.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No state funds are provided for this effort. Funds dedicated to school improvement are available from 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds only. Districts may be spending state general funds on their improvement efforts but these expenditures are not monitored by the SEA.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	29,060
Applied to transfer	1,333
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	1,342
Comments: Students were transferred from schools in improvement status to eligible schools without completion of the formal application process.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 824,533

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	14

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

Comments:

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	12,193
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,346
Received supplemental educational services	2,746
Comments:	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 4,131,855
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	63,705	61,185	96.0	2,520	4.0
All elementary classes	15,832	15,316	96.7	516	3.3
All secondary classes	47,873	45,869	95.8	2,004	4.2
Sum of All elementary and All secondary equals All classes.					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes
---	---

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

--

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

A full day self contained classroom equals one class.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	27.5
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	5.2
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	12.2
Other (please explain in comment box below)	55.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District explanation did not fit into any of the categories provided.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	37.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	16.3
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	39.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

District explanation did not fit into any of the categories provided.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,987	3,882	97.4
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,807	3,620	95.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	11,218	10,751	95.8
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	13,318	12,818	96.2

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	69.4	36.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	
Secondary schools	60.6	35.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other - ESL Class Period, used in secondary schools, this is a language instruction period for LEP students enrolled in secondary schools. The information on Language Instruction Programs is taken from the annual Title III LEP collection. This is a student level collection that includes each LEP student's language instruction programs.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	65,395
Comments:	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	52,560
Comments:	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	50,940
Russian	2,801
Vietnamese	2,012
Chinese	999
Somali	728

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Ukrainian-718, Chuukese-472, Korean-461, Arabic-452 and Romanian-412
--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	60,830
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,938
Total	63,768
Comments: 4,565 students did not participate in the 2009 ELPA, of these 1,627 were not enrolled in Oregon during the ELPA testing window. The remaining 2938 students were not tested but were enrolled during the ELPA testing window.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9,993
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	15.3
Comments:	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	60,830
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,938
Total	63,768
Comments: 4,565 students did not participate in the 2009-10 ELPA, of these 1,627 were not enrolled in Oregon during the ELPA testing window. The remaining 2938 students were not tested but were enrolled during the ELPA testing window. ODE monitors for ELPA participation and cite the district for lack of participation, but the fact is not all the students who could take the test do.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	11,907

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	26,481	91.2	26,732	50.00
Attained proficiency	9,993	15.7		

Comments: Targets: Making progress: AMAO 1 = 50%; Attained proficiency: AMAO 2A/9156 = 14% and AMAO 2B/4300 = 22%
 There are two calculations for attainment starting this year.
 AMAO 1: Percent of LEP students making progress towards English Language Proficiency.
 PROGRESS - 26481 DEMONINATOR = 53468 PCNT 49.53%
 Due to SEA calculation policies Oregon's denominator includes 4565 students who were not enrolled during the testing window or who were enrolled but did not take the test. Thus the percentages vary from those automatically calculated in the CSPR.
 TARGET 50% = 26734
 AMAO 2A: Percent of ALL LEP students obtaining proficiency
 Oregon's denominator for English Language Proficiency attainment varies from the calculation policies for EdFacts reports and those in the CSPR. As Oregon is a 'local control' state, districts determine proficiency based upon multiple criteria (one of which is the state English Language proficiency assessment). Oregon's denominator includes students who may have not been tested (4565).
 PROFICIENT - 9993 DENOMINATOR- 65398 PCNT- 15.28%
 TARGET 14% = 9155.72
 AMAO 2B: Percent of LEP students identified as LEP for 5 years or more who obtained proficiency.
 PROFICIENT -5209 DENOMINATOR-19544 PCNT- 26.65%
 TARGET 22% = 4299.68

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The Oregon Department of Education is developing our data collections to provided data on immigrant students. Until the data collections are refined, the Oregon Department of Education is unable to accurately report the number of immigrant students.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
N/A
Comments:

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
6,833	4,873	11,706
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,401	5,291	71.5	2,110
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
7,165	5,305	74.0	1,860
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3,262	1,627	49.9	1,635
Comments:			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	63
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	34
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	28
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	11
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	1
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	1

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Consortia members are counted based on their consortia. Each consortium is counted as a single subgrantee. This count was used for all responses on this section.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	<u> </u> N
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
		1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Department of Education is developing our data collections to provided data on immigrant students. Until the data collections are refined, the Oregon Department of Education is unable to accurately report the number of immigrant students.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	994
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	51	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	13	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	4	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	11	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	0	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	42	2,674
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	18	487
PD provided to principals	13	137
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	4	17
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	4	12
PD provided to community based organization personnel	1	0
Total	82	3,327

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Consortium members were included in their consortium. Each Consortium is counted as a single LEA.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
7/1/09	11/2/09	123
Comments:		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The delay in distribution was due to a recalculation of the ELPA assessment resulting in more students scoring as proficient on the assessment. In the future, Oregon will be reviewing the English language proficiency assessment levels as the assessment is scored which will result in LEAs having accurate scores so determinations on proficiency can be made in a timely manner. This will improve the process for distributing Title III funds.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
Comments: Oregon reported that we did not have any Persistently Dangerous Schools in the ED Facts N130 report. Therefore, the count field should display zero.	

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	85.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	73.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.5
Black, non-Hispanic	71.4
Hispanic	75.9
White, non-Hispanic	87.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	74.2
Limited English proficient	62.8
Economically disadvantaged	83.2
Migratory students	82.8
Male	83.6
Female	86.7
Comments:	

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	3.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	6.1
Hispanic	5.1
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3.7
Limited English proficient	6.2
Economically disadvantaged	3.1
Migratory students	3.3
Male	3.7
Female	3.1
Comments:	

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	#LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	80	80
LEAs with subgrants	117	117
Total	197	197
Comments:		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6	919
K	36	1,357
1	33	1,381
2	31	1,477
3	26	1,391
4	33	1,412
5	30	1,359
6	38	1,295
7	29	1,229
8	37	1,278
9	28	1,240
10	44	1,371
11	49	1,487
12	84	2,254
Ungraded	N<6	N<6
Total		
Comments:		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	36	1,742
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	397	14,522
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	52	2,535
Hotels/Motels	19	651
Total	504	19,450
Comments:		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,174
K	1,490
1	1,602
2	1,750
3	1,602
4	1,690
5	1,578
6	1,580
7	1,482
8	1,544
9	1,412
10	1,616
11	1,774
12	2,710
Ungraded	154
Total	23,158
Comments:	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	4,016
Migratory children/youth	850
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3,864
Limited English proficient students	2,962
Comments:	

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	54
Expedited evaluations	48
Staff professional development and awareness	54
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	56
Transportation	54
Early childhood programs	37
Assistance with participation in school programs	56
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	51
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	56
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	56
Coordination between schools and agencies	56
Counseling	54
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	54
Clothing to meet a school requirement	56
School supplies	56
Referral to other programs and services	56
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	55
Other (optional – in comment box below)	43
Other (optional – in comment box below)	
Other (optional – in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Narrative information on Other Services was not collected.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	52
School Selection	42
Transportation	70
School records	32
Immunizations	49
Other medical records	0
Other Barriers – in comment box below	42

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The definition of "barrier" is problematic, as is a count of districts reporting a barrier. It gets counted even if one child out of 1,000 met a barrier. And it does not capture whether the barrier was resolved by the Liaison or not.

We did not collect narrative information on "Other Barriers," but have heard Liaisons discuss multiple barriers created by parents and guardians.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	764	532
4	806	573
5	772	447
6	741	398
7	695	431
8	739	350
High School	690	301
Comments:		

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	770	511
4	807	495
5	772	465
6	740	406
7	699	433
8	732	353
High School	679	202
Comments:		

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3,046
K	1,428
1	1,407
2	1,299
3	1,333
4	1,254
5	1,172
6	1,176
7	1,072
8	1,069
9	1,045
10	922
11	888
12	837
Ungraded	144
Out-of-school	1,452
Total	19,544

Comments:

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

This year's Category 1 numbers increased slightly from last year. . The increased is attributed to several reasons; one reason clearly shows that families who were formerly migrant are now returning to perform migratory agricultural work. Another reason is that regional programs were prepared to receive families upon their arrival based upon last year migration pattern.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	680
K	648
1	670
2	623
3	617
4	555
5	509
6	396
7	274
8	205
9	172
10	151
11	140
12	50
Ungraded	56
Out-of-school	
Total	5,746

Comments: Out-of-School students are counted under category 1, because ODE does not enroll them into summer school nor does ODE provide instructional or support services.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's category 2 counts decreased for the performance year 2009-2010 performance years. There are many reasons to support the decrease: 1) weather, 2) state government changes. The unforeseen weather changes affected many of the state's seasonal harvest, because of the heavy rain crops were practically destroyed or were late. Many families who regularly migrate from California to Oregon received mixed messages from growers as to when the harvest would be ready. Some families would bypass Oregon altogether and went straight to Washington for harvest. The other is state governmental changes. State's Department of Motor Vehicle requires proof of permanent resident before a driver license can be issues, because of this families are hesitate to travel to look for work outside of their resident state.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS) to generate the 2009-10 child count category 1 and category 2 child counts.

Yes, Oregon used OMSIS to generate the 2008-09 child count.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Child count data is first collected on paper using the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). All eligible children that fit the definitions of MEP are listed on the COE. The COE is used to document new qualifying moves and as an initial enrollment form for entry of data onto the OMSIS system. Upon the completion of the COE, it is forwarded to the local MEP office for input onto the OMSIS system.

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

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

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

a. What data were collected?

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

b. What activities were conducted to collect the data?

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

Identification Oregon provides extensive training to recruiters on the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG), on MEP eligibility criteria and determination, and on the completion of Oregon's COE. Newly hired recruiters are engaged in a full-day, six-hour COE/eligibility training in which they are taught the eligibility criteria, techniques for interviewing, proper completion of the COE, and an overview of Chapter 2 of the NRG, etc. Veteran recruiters must undergo a refresher course on I&R and eligibility rulings. Recruiters are trained to collect necessary information required on the COE in order to establish eligibility for the MEP. This initial and necessary information is then entered onto OMSIS by the local data specialists.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Withdrawal and identifying service delivered Local districts employ necessary staff to provide supplemental instructional and support services to students in need of extra academic services or social services. Staff is trained to use the Title I-C Withdrawal Form to record

all Title I-C funded services provided to migrant students. Other information requested on the form includes the language proficiency data, withdrawal date, days enrolled/present, ELL/LEP and SPED flagged, etc. The Title I-C Withdrawal Form is completed when the student withdraws from school or at the end of the school year, whichever comes first.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The State OMSIS system follows these steps for validation:

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

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

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

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

Specific crosswalk or tabulation are:

English cognates: (e.g., James/Jaime, Francisco/Frank, Pedro/Peter); Similar spellings or misspellings: (e.g., Sanchez vs. Sanches, Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names: (e.g., Yesenia vs. Jesenia, Evelia vs. Ebelia, Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names: (e.g., Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez, Sanches-Rodrigues, Sanches- Rodriguez, Sanchez vs. Sanches, Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues, Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double first names: (e.g., Juan vs. Juan Carlos, Jose vs. Jose Luis, Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names: (Rodriguez, Maria, 01/01/94 vs. 10/01/94.); Last names that can be written with or without spaces: (e.g., A la Torre vs. Alatorre, De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated: (e.g., Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus)

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

A unique OMSIS ID (student key) is assigned to a students in the parent table called the Student Information. The OMSIS ID is assigned when the student is first enrolled on OMSIS. This OMSIS ID can never be assigned to another student, and follows the student everywhere he/she attends school in Oregon.

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

school enrollment.

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

Step 7: OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a list of qualifying migrant children who turned 3 years old between September 1, 2009 and August 31, 2010. This list is produced twice a year. Some local programs generate this report once a month to quickly locate families that fall under this category. Families are contacted by telephone or through a home visit by the recruiter to verify residency/eligibility.

Step 8: Local MEPs were given October 1, 2010 as the deadline date for processing all 2009-2010 regular school year and 2010 summer enrollments and withdrawals.

Step 9: State category 1 and category 2 counts were generated on October 31, 2010. Numbers from both counts are produced along with a hard copy print-out of all student names. Manual checking and cross-tabulation are done by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are carefully analyzed, subtracted from the final count, and corrected on the OMSIS system.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Oregon all eligible children (0-21) are listed on the COE and all qualifying children who moved with, to join, or on own are entered on OMSIS. When COEs are processed on OMSIS, each child is assigned a unique OMSIS ID number. Before OMSIS appends the record, the system validates the student's age and qualifying arrival date. The system filters out: children who were born after the qualifying arrival date, children who are age 22 or over as of the enroll date or Out-of-School (OOS) date, and children who have a qualifying arrival date before 09/01/06 for the year 09/01/09 - 08/31/10.

When category 1 and 2 counts are generated, all students between the ages of 0-2 as of the enroll date or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned three years old between 09/01/09 and 08/31/10, OMSIS checks the latest enrollment line ID and validates the enroll or OOS date against the date of birth to verify it is three years after the date of birth. Before generating the final count, OMESC staff generates and distributes the 2 Turning 3 Report twice during the school year for the local programs to follow-up and update the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters and local data specialists contact the families to verify the residency of the child. Once residency at age three is established the recruiters or data specialist re-enrolls the child back on the system with the contact date as the new enrollment or OOS date. The contact date must be a date that is after the child's third birthday. The data specialist also changes the grade level to P3.

The OMSIS system automatically creates a database which stores all records that justify both counts (Category 1 and 2). The databases are checked manually by OMESC staff, including checking single last names against double last names, similar spelling of both first/last names, etc. When conflicts are identified, OMESC staff research the differences and take corrective action. Records are corrected on OMSIS and counts are adjusted on the child count report.

Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligible period (09/01 - 08/31);

Recruiters verify students' residency in their regional programs before completing a COE, mass enrollment list, or CRSEF form for input onto OMSIS. Students are not automatically re-enrolled on OMSIS.

Verifying a child's residency can be done through face-to-face contact, telephone contact, checking the LEA student information system, or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children is done with the aid of the mass enrollment list which lists all OOS children identified during the previous school year (2008-09) that are eligible for the new school year (2009-10). Before re-enrolling OOS children for the new school year, the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the mass enrollment list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move, a new COE is completed. No documentation is needed if the family cannot be found.

Children who - in the case of category 2 - received an MEP-funded service during the summer (SS) or intersession term; and

Oregon's category 2 count includes every child enrolled in a Title I-C funded SS program and who received supplemental instructional/support services. Like the RSY program, recruiters complete one of the 3 enrollment forms to enroll and enter the information on OMSIS. Students must be eligible and 3 years old as of the first day of SS. SS enrollments entered on OMSIS are flagged with an enrollment type "S" to distinguish from RSY enrollments. Oregon does not have intersession programs.

SS programs are required to complete a "Summer Title I-C Withdrawal Form" for each student enrolled. The form captures withdrawal dates, days enrolled/present, and supplemental instructional/support services the student received. This form is completed at the end of the SS and forwarded to the data specialist to be entered on OMSIS. The information is stored in the Enrollment and Supplemental Services tables on OMSIS. The enrollment table is compared against the supplemental services table to verify that all students enrolled have at least two or more services reported on OMSIS. Records with no services are excluded from the Category 2 count.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

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

Category 1

Information is verified in two tables for the category 1 count: the Student Information table and the Enrollment table. The Student Information table has the primary key (OMSIS ID), student names, and demographics. This ensures only one OMSIS ID for each student. The Enrollment table contains information on each student's enrollments and withdrawals, and stores all enrollment history line IDs for separate enrollment periods and types. These two tables have the OMSIS ID in common which allows the relation of the two tables.

The criteria for determining the category 1 count are as follows: student must be enrolled or OOS between 09/01/09-08/31/10; student must be between the age of 3-21 during the period of 09/01/09-08/31/10; student who turns 3 between 09/01/09-08/31/10 must have a new enrollment line ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3 years greater than student's date of birth and there must be a check in the 2 turning 3 box; student must have a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrollment date, or OOS date) between start date and end date. The start date is 09/01/09; the end date would be the run date, 10/31/10; student must have a QAD on or after 09/01/06; student must have a residency date on or before 08/31/10; student enrolled after 09/01/10, must have a residency date earlier than 08/31/10; and for a student whose regular school year started in August 2009, the 2009-10 enrollment line must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/10.

All eight conditions must be met for a child to be counted as category 1. The results of the above code are stored in the 0910_FederalRegularCount.dbf table. The table is than manually scanned by OMESC staff for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and deducted from the category 1 count.

Category 2

For category 2 we use the two tables used for category 1 plus the Supplemental Services table. The Supplemental Services table contains instructional and support services provided during regular and summer programs.

Using the two tables used for category 1, the criteria below are coded: student is enrolled between 06/01/10 and 08/31/10; student is 3 years as of the enrolled date; student is less than 22 as of the enrolled date; student has a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 06/01/10 and 08/31/10; student enrollment type equal to S-summer with at least two or more supplemental service codes reported; student previous enrollment lines do not have a value of G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased.

All seven conditions must be met for a student to be included in the category 2 count. The results of the codes are written to the table 0910 FederalSummerCount.dbf, where it is manually scanned by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are deducted from the category 2 count. Oregon does not operate Intersession programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

I. Trainings

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

B. Recruiters completing the COE during the summer months, attend one Summer Training before summer recruitment begins; and

C. Individual recruiters and/or regional programs participate in additional trainings as ODE deems necessary.

New Recruiter Certification Procedures

Oregon MEP policy requires that new recruiters be certified before they conduct interviews and complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). In order for the new recruiter to be certified she/he is required to complete the following requirements:

A. Attend the New Recruiter's Training conducted by OMESC staff (equivalent to a full-day, six-hour training).

a. This training includes a pre-test, quizzes, and a post-test. Attendees must have an 80% accuracy level or better.

B. Fieldwork

a. Interviewing protocol (conduct a minimum of three interviews while accompanied by an approved, experienced recruiter, OMESC staff, or the local lead recruiter) and

b. COE protocol (successfully complete two COEs).

II. COE Quality Control

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

1. The COEs with errors or issues are compiled and logged each month by OMESC staff. The OMESC provides the 18 regional programs with a monthly report on COE accuracy.

2. The COEs in question are returned to the regional programs for them to make corrections. Regional programs have 30 days to make the COE corrections.

3. Regional programs must document all corrections on the COE Correction Form. The COE Correction Form is used to document changes/corrections needed on the COE.

4. The local program's recruiter or OMSIS specialist makes the necessary changes to the COE on both the copy to be returned to OMESC and to the regional program's copy.

5. All corrections are properly initialed by the recruiter, OMSIS specialist, or parent/guardian.

6. The recruiter returns the COE to the OMSIS specialist if changes affect the OMSIS system, i.e., QAD dates, move from, move to, etc.

7. The Correction Form is then digitally/manually signed to verify corrections done by either the recruiter or OMSIS specialist.

8. The recruiter or OMSIS specialist then returns the Form to the OMESC. The COE Correction Form is kept on file for reference and training needs.

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

1. A memo is sent to the regional program explaining the findings.

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

III. Recruiter Review and Evaluation

Once a year the OMESC disseminates an electronic identification and recruitment assessment to all active Oregon recruiters. The assessment incorporates the following categories for evaluation:

- Questions on best practices for COE documentation
- Questions regarding eligibility criteria
- Eligibility case studies
- Interviewing best practices

The results of the assessments are compiled and assessed then applied toward future identification and recruitment trainings. The latest assessment showed recruiters scored an average of 80% or better.

In addition, twice a year the OMESC collects recruitment log from the 18 regional programs. The log documents the total time worked in correlation to the total time spent in active identification and recruitment of migrant students and services to their families. Recruiters time spent on recruitment are evaluated through the recruitment log in effort to meet the state recruitment goal of 60% FTE spent on active recruitment. This year's results showed recruiters spent an average of 70% in active identification and recruitment.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's re-interview procedures are as follows:

1. Every two weeks the OMESC runs a list of all students entered on OMSIS.

2. The OMESC then appends the student list onto an Excel spreadsheet. A computerized selection of random names is generated through a formula.

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

i. Random number generation,

ii. The number of variables is 1,

iii. The number of random numbers is the number of student recruited from the previous year,

iv. Uses a binomial distribution,

v. With a probability of success (p Value) of .003%,

•This gives the OMESC 80 random number samples for yearly re-interviews.

3. The Excel spreadsheet identifies the samples for the year.

4. The OMESC statewide recruiter/re-interviewer contacts families to schedule re-interview dates and times. If a family is not available for a re-interview, the OMESC documents the efforts made on the Re-interview Contact Denied Form and proceeds to the next student on the sample list.

5. After the appointment is scheduled, a courtesy memo is sent to the regional program coordinator notifying them of the re-interview. The OMESC then contacts the regional program's recruiter and invites him/her to accompany the OMESC statewide recruiter/re-interviewer. The local recruiter's role is to introduce the OMESC staff to the family; and they are instructed to observe and not participate during the interview process.

6. The OMESC statewide recruiter/re-interviewer documents any findings on the Oregon MEP Re-interview Form.

7. The OMESC examines the re-interview results and sends a memo to the regional program coordinator advising them of the outcome.

A. Determined to be eligible

•The OMESC notifies the regional program of the result.

B. Determined to be ineligible

*The OMESC notifies the regional program of any findings

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

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

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

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

Total Re-interviews conducted for 2009-2010 Performance Year

Number of re-interviews conducted: 69

Number of eligible COEs: 67

Number of ineligible COEs: 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC staff provides the regional MEPs with a running total of migrant children identified in their local region on a monthly basis. Corrective actions are taken immediately in the local regions when discrepancies are found. After the October 1, 2010 deadline, OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs additional validations and cross-tabs of information and checks for human errors, i.e. names misspelled, etc. This year, category 1 and category 2 were generated October 31, 2010.

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

Local projects are given a deadline of October 01, 2010 to enroll and withdraw migrant students on OMSIS. Following the deadline, the OMESC staff runs reports to confirm withdrawals on all students enrolled in K-12 institutions. Regional programs are notified if withdrawals are missing for any enrolled student.

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

When the COE arrives at the OMESC, the COE quality control manager and the statewide recruiter/re-interviewer verify the validity of the COE and randomly compare the information against the OMSIS. Any discrepancies found will be reported to the regional programs and the corrections are made on OMSIS.

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

This process takes place year-round.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Other support for corrective actions are:

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon currently does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of reporting the child count. Oregon was monitored by the Office of Migrate Education in May and is awaiting feedback about the findings in order to apply best practices and guidance to the 18 regional programs.