

**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 type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input checked="" 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, June 2, 2011, 1:09:37 PM
Signature		

**2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE 1, PART A)**

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	21,771	16,330	75.0
4	21,771	16,338	75.0
5	21,634	16,069	74.3
6	10,083	7,211	71.5
7	4,838	3,811	78.8
8	4,738	3,295	69.5
High School	3,269	1,302	39.8
Total	88,104	64,356	73.0

**Comments:**

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

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	21,602	17,151	79.4
4	21,651	17,554	81.1
5	21,520	15,342	71.3
6	10,029	7,300	72.8
7	4,823	3,550	73.6
8	4,714	2,975	63.1
High School	1,717	955	55.6
Total	86,056	64,827	75.3

**Comments:**

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

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	7,135	5,712	80.1
4	7,193	5,776	80.3
5	7,396	5,992	81.0
6	5,924	4,097	69.2
7	4,640	3,596	77.5
8	4,717	3,243	68.8
High School	2,951	1,373	46.5
Total	39,956	29,789	74.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage at or above Proficient</b>
3	7,101	6,086	85.7
4	7,178	6,235	86.9
5	7,380	5,951	80.6
6	5,901	4,385	74.3
7	4,607	3,530	76.6
8	4,697	3,127	66.6
High School	1,459	1,030	70.6
Total	38,323	30,344	79.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

## 2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	28,255
Limited English proficient students	37,172
Students who are homeless	9,430
Migratory students	8,357
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	9,217
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,898
Black, non-Hispanic	8,020
Hispanic	56,565
White, non-Hispanic	107,607
Total	189,307
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age 0-2				6	6
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)		600	14	7	621
K	2,458	24,169	69	92	26,788
1	2,429	24,423	100	124	27,076
2	2,436	23,708	116	150	26,410
3	2,154	24,394	88	165	26,801
4	1,802	24,161	77	153	26,193
5	1,498	24,007	66	168	25,739
6	1,137	12,125	87	168	13,517
7	861	6,857	61	126	7,905
8	795	6,728	73	147	7,743
9	349	4,351	102	153	4,955
10	403	4,005	122	188	4,718
11	59	3,864	156	213	4,292
12	38	3,735	165	261	4,199
Ungraded	166	2,833	25	29	3,053
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>16,585</b>	<b>189,960</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>210,016</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	4,168
Reading/language arts	11,652
Science	213
Social studies	58
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	10
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	32
Supporting guidance/advocacy	151
Other support services	58
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	180	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	208	
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	0	
Clerical support staff	0	
Administrators (non-clerical)	2	
<b>Comments:</b> ODE will submit accurate data in April 2011 when Part II reopens.		

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

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

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

	<b>Paraprofessionals FTE</b>	<b>Percentage Qualified</b>
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>		
<b>Comments:</b> ODE will submit data for this item when Part II reopens in April 2011.		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

**2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)****2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2009 to June 30, 2010.

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

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	4
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2009. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	178
2. Adults participating	190
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	140
4. Participating children	260
a. Birth through 2 years	72
b. Ages 3 through 5	123
c. Ages 6 through 8	37
c. Above age 8	28
<b>Comments:</b> Oregon Program Note: 4.d. is calculated as above age 9 since 4.c. and program criteria include children "through" age 8	

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

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

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	84
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	90
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	76
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	75
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9 <sup>th</sup> grade at the time of enrollment	53
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2010). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	17
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	37
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	43
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	81
5. Total families enrolled	178
<b>Comments:</b>	

## 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

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

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	22	18	Gain of 4 or more scaled score points with a minimum of 80 hours or more in ABE
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	N<6	N<6	
BEST			
BEST Plus	53	25	Gain of 4 or more scaled score points with a minimum of 80 hours or more in ESL
BEST Literacy			
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

<b>School-Age Adults</b>	<b># With Goal</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
Diploma	N<6	N<6	1 who did not meet goal earned 5 or more credits toward diploma
GED	N<6	N<6	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			
<b>Non-School-Age Adults</b>	<b># With Goal</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
Diploma			
GED	25	13	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	38	16	10	N<6	1 Exempted unable to understand directions
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	38	13	8	N<6	
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	38	21	10	N<6	1 Exempted unable to understand directions
PPVT-IV					
TVIP	38	13	11	N<6	1 Exempted unable to understand directions
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2010 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	38	15	N<6	16.4	1 Exempted unable to understand directions
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	26	9	Report card; teacher report.
1	13	N<6	Report card; teacher report.
2	11	N<6	Report card; teacher report.
3	N<6	N<6	Report card; teacher report.
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	57	51	
PEP Scale II	60	54	
PEP Scale III	49	43	
PEP Scale IV	44	40	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

**2.3.1 Population Data**

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

**2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Eligible Migrant Children</b>
Age birth through 2	970
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	20,514
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.2 Priority for Services**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<6
K	780
1	709
2	636
3	396
4	337
5	361
6	398
7	351
8	429
9	553
10	440
11	563
12	531
Ungraded	102
Out-of-school	
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,590</b>

**Comments:** Oregon changed the grade range and narrowed the days absent criteria for the 2009-2010 PFS count. The 2008-2009 CSPR counted grades P3-P5 and KG-12; this year we are counting only KG-12 grades. A change was made to the days absent, if students were absent more than ten days then they met the first part of the criteria for PFS. This criteria was omitted from the counts for 2008-2009 CSPR.

**FAQ on priority for services:**

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

**2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	217
K	1,032
1	1,049
2	945
3	958
4	809
5	707
6	589
7	537
8	465
9	456
10	383
11	348
12	280
Ungraded	22
Out-of-school	100
Total	8,897
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA)</b>
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	67
1	70
2	84
3	102
4	103
5	104
6	93
7	93
8	87
9	88
10	64
11	58
12	50
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,063

**Comments:** 1. We had an increase in migrant population for 2009-2010 (501 to be exact), so SPED students would also be expected to increase.  
 2. The local programs are more proactive in reporting special education and ELL students. Comparing the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 data, for 2009-2010 we only increased by 325 for SPED students compared to 2008-2009.  
 3. The use of MSIX to let areas know of incoming students moving into their area and their needs including Special Education has helped students not fall through the cracks.

**2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	441	400	126	N<6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	888	965	785	408
K	330	499	393	206
1	315	407	423	262
2	293	425	358	222
3	318	412	352	251
4	264	424	346	220
5	246	383	314	229
6	253	394	304	225
7	203	355	309	205
8	218	346	305	200
9	210	355	301	179
10	161	310	274	177
11	171	288	254	175
12	134	230	293	180
Ungraded	68	39	26	11
Out-of-school	712	268	265	206
Total	5,225	6,500	5,428	
<b>Comments:</b> Many of Oregon's migrant families were in the last year of eligibility. Families are hesitant to move to Mexico because of immigration issues and are having difficulties finding work around Oregon. In addition, MEP staffing was low due to funding issues, therefore, staff was not able to reach families to determine new qualifying moves.				

**2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2009. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Move During Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	634
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,201
K	1,039
1	1,029
2	916
3	971
4	879
5	850
6	824
7	767
8	758
9	736
10	638
11	634
12	613
Ungraded	112
Out-of-school	895
Total	14,496
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.2 Academic Status

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

#### 2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	N<6
8	N<6
9	7
10	18
11	21
12	44
Ungraded	
Total	

**Comments:** 1. We had an increase in migrant population for 2009-2010 (501 to be exact), so SPED students would also be expected to increase.  
 2. The local programs are more proactive in reporting special education and ELL students. Comparing the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 data, for 2009-2010 we only increased by 325 for SPED students compared to 2008-2009.  
 3. The use of MSIX to let areas know of incoming students moving into their area and their needs including Special Education has helped students not fall through the cracks.

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

*How is "dropped out of school" defined?* The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2008-09 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

#### 2.3.2.2 GED

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

<b>Obtained a GED in your state</b>	37
<b>Comments:</b> 37 students were reported as receiving GED on OMSIS for 2009-2010.	

### 2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

#### 2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	1,124	1,122
4	1,063	1,060
5	998	996
6	1,016	1,009
7	942	932
8	930	922
HS	747	732
Ungraded		
Total	6,820	6,773

**Comments:**

#### 2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	1,120	1,118
4	1,068	1,061
5	1,000	996
6	1,016	1,010
7	941	936
8	926	917
HS	751	730
Ungraded		
Total	6,822	6,768

**Comments:**

### 2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

#### 2.3.3.1 MEP Participation Regular School Year

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

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	456
K	617
1	616
2	597
3	653
4	543
5	527
6	536
7	514
8	481
9	517
10	469
11	457
12	443
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	71
Total	7,538
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	N<6
K	396
1	360
2	322
3	212
4	166
5	168
6	223
7	167
8	213
9	288
10	254
11	334
12	291
Ungraded	12
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	
<b>Comments:</b> Oregon changed the grade range and narrowed the days absent criteria for the 2009-2010 PFS count. The 2008-2009 CSPR counted grades P3-P5 and KG-12; this year we are counting only KG-12 grades. A change was made to the days absent, if students were absent more than ten days then they met the first part of the criteria for PFS. This criteria was omitted from the counts for the 2008-2009 CSPR.	

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

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

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

### 2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	359
K	468
1	454
2	452
3	480
4	390
5	358
6	316
7	321
8	259
9	350
10	338
11	323
12	295
Ungraded	9
Out-of-school	7
Total	5,185
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service**

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	N<6	N<6	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	53	45	
K	365	290	
1	365	294	
2	351	284	
3	380	296	
4	308	267	
5	268	235	
6	228	169	
7	222	160	
8	188	120	
9	102	73	315
10	121	68	313
11	111	66	309
12	126	60	285
Ungraded	6		9
Out-of-school	N<6	N<6	7
Total			1,238

**Comments:** Regular Term

0809 Reading - 3723

0910 Reading - 3200 (-523)

0809 Math - 2893

0910 Math - 2433 (-460)

The drop in middle school is due to the drop in funding, LOAs in some cases only had funding for one age group. The most selected was PK and Elementary, followed by High School students and then Middle school students. Keep in mind that we only report services that are funding through Title I-C funds.

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

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

### 2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	30	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	450	24
K	539	74
1	537	92
2	540	76
3	575	88
4	491	67
5	472	81
6	468	79
7	436	113
8	399	92
9	430	148
10	387	120
11	387	127
12	378	163
Ungraded	13	N<6
Out-of-school	132	7
Total	6,664	

**Comments:** Many factors could have contributed to the decrease in Counseling Services; funding, regional program's priority of service, training on reporting this service, etc. Regional migrant programs are encouraged to collaborate with other programs to assist with counseling. another possibility is that the counseling services might have remained the same, but the service was not funded through Title I-C.

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	14
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	309
K	314
1	328
2	295
3	321
4	258
5	266
6	284
7	251
8	244
9	299
10	254
11	281
12	237
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	77
Total	
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.3.2 MEP Participation - Summer/Intersession Term

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<6
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	N<6
Total	

**Comments:** Oregon's category 2 counts decreased for the 2009-2010 performance years. There are many reasons to support the decrease including: weather and state government changes. The unforeseen weather changes affected many of the state's seasonal harvests. The drop in middle school and high school is between 15 to 81 students from last year. This drop is attributed to the above circumstances. Due to the drop in funding, LOAs in some cases only had funding for one age group. The most selected was PK and Elementary, followed by High School students and then Middle school students.

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services</b>
Age 3 through 5	N<6
K	451
1	415
2	385
3	213
4	187
5	188
6	163
7	102
8	92
9	101
10	78
11	104
12	36
Ungraded	42
Out-of-school	N<6
Total	
<b>Comments:</b> Oregon changed the grade range and narrowed the days absent criteria for the 2009-2010 PFS count. The 2008-2009 CSPR counted grades P3-P5 and KG-12; this year we are counting only KG-12 grades. A change was made to the days absent, if students were absent more than ten days then they met the first part of the criteria for PFS. This criteria was omitted from the counts for the 2008-2009 CSPR.	

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

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

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

### 2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

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

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	669
K	637
1	657
2	614
3	608
4	543
5	502
6	393
7	272
8	204
9	171
10	150
11	137
12	50
Ungraded	56
Out-of-school	
Total	5,663

#### Comments: Summer Term

0809 Reading - 5675

0910 Reading - 4585 (-1090)

0809 Math - 4725

0910 Math - 3911 (-814)

The drop in middle school is due to the drop in funding, LOAs in some cases only had funding for one age group. The most selected was PK and Elementary, followed by High School students and then Middle school students. Keep in mind that we only report services that are funding through Title I-C funds.

**2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Reading Instruction</b>	<b>Mathematics Instruction</b>	<b>High School Credit Accrual</b>
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	351	366	
K	591	505	
1	624	531	
2	581	495	
3	568	496	
4	523	445	
5	447	356	
6	300	274	
7	183	155	
8	162	112	
9	76	59	170
10	72	56	149
11	51	48	137
12	9	6	37
Ungraded	47	7	56
Out-of-school			
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,585</b>	<b>3,911</b>	<b>549</b>

**Comments:** Oregon Category 2 was down for the reporting year 2009-2010 which contributed to the decrease in instructional services rendered. In addition, because of funding issues, staff were immediately released from their duties after summer school session ended.

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

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

### 2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	573	
K	595	49
1	607	42
2	575	N<6
3	557	N<6
4	497	20
5	458	35
6	349	30
7	241	N<6
8	189	N<6
9	139	26
10	128	31
11	122	39
12	45	N<6
Ungraded	56	7
Out-of-school		
Total	5,131	

**Comments:** Oregon Category 2 was down for the reporting year 2009-2010 which contributed to the decrease in counseling services rendered. In addition, because of funding issues, staff was immediately released from their duties after summer school session ended.

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	121
K	119
1	137
2	119
3	116
4	83
5	120
6	76
7	69
8	35
9	41
10	33
11	29
12	7
Ungraded	N<6
Out-of-school	
Total	

**Comments:** Oregon Category 2 was down for the reporting year 2009-2010 which contributed to the decrease in referred services rendered. In addition, because of funding issues, staff were immediately released from their duties after summer school session ended.

**2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Program Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	968
K	986
1	1,014
2	927
3	989
4	846
5	794
6	755
7	653
8	590
9	595
10	548
11	518
12	482
Ungraded	78
Out-of-school	73
Total	10,834
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.3.4 School Data

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

#### 2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	696
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	14,907
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments:</b> This should be zero. Title-C funds are not consolidated with Schoolwide Programs.	

### 2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	80	2,714
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	
Summer/intersession only	0	
Year round	111	13,385
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

### 2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

#### 2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

##### 2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

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

#### FAQs on the MEP State director

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

**2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff**

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	36	9.10	295	181.50
Counselors	2	0.70	1	0.50
All paraprofessionals	73	33.00	195	124.10
Recruiters	60	41.10	22	19.60
Records transfer staff	21	10.50	11	6.40
<b>Comments:</b> Comments are: Oregon Title 1-C regional programs suffered a 30% reduction in their allocation; therefore the number of staff hired for 2009-2010 reporting year was down from the 2008-2009 reporting year.				

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

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

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

### 2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	69	30.40	174	115.10
<p><b>Comments:</b> Oregon Title 1-C regional programs suffered a 30% reduction in their allocation; therefore the number of staff hired for the reporting year was down from 2008-2009. We reported the following in 0910: RSY 69 Headcount/30.37 FTE. Summer 174 Headcount/115.09 FTE</p> <p>We reported the following for 0809: RSY 129 Headcount/54.665 FTE. Summer 184 Headcount/160.28 FTE.</p> <p>We are not clear as to why zeros were submitted for the CSPR 2008-2009 reporting year.</p>				

#### FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	27	135
Juvenile detention	0	
Juvenile corrections	8	149
Adult corrections	0	
Other	5	201
Total	40	142

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

	#
<b>Programs in a multiple purpose facility</b>	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	27
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	8
Adult Corrections	0
Other	5
Total	40
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,901		1,109		103
Long Term Students Served	901		731		56

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	120		41		28
Asian or Pacific Islander	26		8		N<6
Black, non-Hispanic	151		158		N<6
Hispanic	207		234		6
White, non-Hispanic	1,351		668		65
Total	1,855		1,109		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,165		985		67
Female	736		124		36
Total	1,901		1,109		103

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	44		N<6		N<6
6	23		N<6		N<6
7	36		N<6		N<6
8	60		N<6		N<6
9	73		N<6		N<6
10	82		N<6		N<6
11	70		N<6		6
12	111		7		8
13	162		14		15
14	270		51		17
15	311		115		15
16	335		177		18
17	247		287		7
18	67		253		N<6
19	6		128		N<6
20	N<6		51		N<6
21	N<6		26		N<6
Total					

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** Portland Public Schools DART program had 46 students that reported "more than one ethnicity" . Instead of putting them in the "other" category they added the number as a comment.

This explains the Neglected Programs 46 count discrepancy between:

Total Unduplicated Students Served: 1901

Race/Ethnicity Subtotal: 1855

---

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

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

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

<b># Programs That</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities</b>	<b>Adult Corrections Facilities</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	15	8	0	1
Awarded high school diploma(s)	4	8	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	4	5	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1**

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	787	1,040		27
Enrolled in a GED program	15	95		N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	427	140		51
Earned a GED	15	74		N<6
Obtained high school diploma	25	130		N<6
Were accepted into post-secondary education	6	73		N<6
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<6	70		N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1**

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	229	426		10
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	22	90		N<6
Obtained employment	6	19		N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1**

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

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

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	545	270		12
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	601	265		18

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	45	70		N<6
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	148	61		15
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	179	28		N<6
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	129	57		N<6
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	100	49		N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

**2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	578	304		13
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	597	266		30

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	53	69		N<6
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	143	64		15
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	136	27		N<6
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	144	55		8
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	121	51		N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

### 2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	19	130
Neglected programs	10	183
Juvenile detention	4	25
Juvenile corrections	9	118
Other	1	23
Total	43	96

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

	#
<b>Programs in a multiple purpose facility</b>	6
<b>Comments:</b> Updated for Average Length of Stay for Total. Corrected number of programs/facilities.	

#### FAQ on average length of stay:

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	16
Neglected programs	8
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	8
Other	1
Total	37
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2,861	445	958	345	87
Total Long Term Students Served	613	173		232	N<6

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	162	18	53	11	
Asian or Pacific Islander	25	6	N<6	N<6	N<6
Black, non-Hispanic	165	38	32	22	6
Hispanic	970	64	171	64	34
White, non-Hispanic	1,539	319	697	243	46
Total	2,861	445			

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,494	275	729	302	70
Female	1,367	170	229	43	17
Total	2,861	445	958	345	87

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10			N<6		
11	N<6	N<6	N<6		
12	N<6	N<6	28		N<6
13	64	9	81		N<6
14	103	43	148	9	17
15	192	84	182	49	14
16	451	126	246	75	23
17	773	122	222	89	22
18	748	47	42	99	N<6
19	311	8	N<6	12	
20	151			8	
21	62	N<6		N<6	
Total					

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

**Comments:** Blanks = 0 (these are prepopulated, so cannot be manually input)

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010.

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

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

<b>LEA Programs That</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention/ Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	32	10	44	1
Awarded high school diploma(s)	5	3	8	1
Awarded GED(s)	5	3	7	1
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 2**

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	2,126	283	483	56
Enrolled in a GED program	372	6	41	N<6
<b>Comments:</b> Students in the Hillsboro facility are not going to attend long enough to earn high school credits.				

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	2,297	204	816	75
Earned a GED	372	6	41	N<6
Obtained high school diploma	275	7	19	N<6
Were accepted into post-secondary education	7	N<6	N<6	N<6
Enrolled in post-secondary education	N<6	N<6	N<6	N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2**

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	57	42	109	30
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education	11	N<6	15	N<6
Obtained employment	38	17	46	N<6
<b>Comments:</b>				

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2**

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

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

In the tables below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading testing. In the first table, report the number of students who tested below grade level upon entry based on their pre-test. A post-test is not required to answer this item. Then, indicate the number of students who completed both a pre-test and a post-test. In the second table, report only students who participated in both pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2009, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	66	129	103	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	33	111	102	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	N<6	9	18	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	6	32	30	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	13	16	15	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<6	40	17	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	7	14	22	

**Comments:** ODE knows data is correct refer to the PSC ticket number is 168932.

Correct values should be:

2.4.2.6.1 - Reading

ATRISK UPHALFGRADE 13

ATRISK UPONEGRADE 3

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2009, through June 30, 2010.

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

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	47	131	119	
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	29	112	92	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	N<6	23	17	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	9	11	18	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	8	20	14	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<6	42	9	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	5	16	34	

**Comments:** ODE knows data is correct - refer to the PSC ticket number is 168932.

Correct values should be:

2.4.2.6.2 - Math

ATRISK UPONEGRADE 3  
 NEGLECT NOCHANGE 11  
 NEGLECT UPHALFGRADE 20  
 NEGLECT UPONEGRADE 42  
 NEGLECT UPGTONE 16

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

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

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
How many times in the past year (12 months) have you taken a handgun to school? % of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days.	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS_ Table 73, Page 67	Annual	2010	2007-08: .5%	2007-08: 1.1	1.2%	2002-2003
				2008-09: .5%	2008-09: 1.7		
				2009-10: .5%	2009-10: 1.4		
				2010-11: .5%			
				2011-12: TBA			
<b>Comments:</b> OSWS asks related to last 12 months in lieu of last 30 days.							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days  How many times in the past year (12 months) have you taken a handgun to school?	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 73 page 67	Annual	2010	2007-08: .05%	2007-08: 1.7	.5%	2002-2003
				2008-09: .5%	2008-09: 1.2		
				2009-10: .5%	2009-10: 1.6		
				2010-11: .5%			
				2011-12: TBA			
<b>Comments:</b> OSWS asks related to last 12 months in lieu of last 30 days.							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Figure 7 page 22	Annual	2010	2007-08: 13%	2007-08: 15.8%	15.9%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 13%	2008-09: 17.3%		
				2009-10: 13%	2009-10: 21.4%		
				2010-11: 13%			
				2011-12: TBA			
<b>Comments:</b>							
Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 5%	2007-08: 8.4		

% of 11th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Figure 7 page 22	Annual	2010	2008-09: 5%	2008-09: 8.0	7.4%	2002-2003
				2009-10: 5%	2009-10: 10.1%		
				2010-11: 5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 8th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007-08: 10%	2007-08: 12.8%	13.1%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 10%	2008-09: 18.8%		
				2009-10: 10%	2009-10: 18.8%		
				2010-11: 10%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
%of 11th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007-08: 22%	2007-08: 20.8%	25.1%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 22%	2008-09: 25.6%		
				2009-10: 22%	2009-10: 25.6%		
				2010-11: 22%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 134 page 83	Annual	2010	2007-08: 13.5%	2007-08: 14.6%	15.9%	2003-2004
				2008-09: 13.5%	2008-09: 18.2%		
				2009-10: 13.5%	2009-10: 16.7%		
				2010-11: 13.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 20%	2007-08: 23.5%		
				2008-	2008-		

% of 11th grade students who used Illicit drugs in the past month. (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 134 page 83	Annual	2010	09: 20%	09: 26.4%	24.3%	2003-2004
				2009-10: 20%	2009-10: 26.1%		
				2010-11: 20%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 111 page 76	Annual	2010	2007-08: 22%	2007-08: 28.9%	24.7%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 22%	2008-09: 23.2%		
				2009-10: 22%	2009-10: 22.5%		
				2010-11: TBA			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 111 page 76	Annual	2010	2007-08: 35%	2007-08: 46.1%	43.4%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 35%	2008-09: 38.4%		
				2009-10: 35%	2009-10: 36.3%		
				2010-11: 35%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 16 page 27	Annual	2010	2007-08: 12%	2007-08: 15.6%	14.6%	2004-2005
				2008-09: 8%	2008-09: 18.2%		
				2009-10: 8%	2009-10: 13.9%		
				2010-11: 8%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 10%	2007-08: 12.9%		
				2008-09: 9.5%	2008-09: 13.5%		

% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 16 page 27	Annual	2010	2009-10: 9.5%	2009-10: 12.6%	12.5%	2004-2005
				2010-11: 9.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 9 page 17	Annual	2010	2007-08: 46%	2007-08: 40.9%	48.1%	2004-2005
				2008-09: 38%	2008-09: 40.8%		
				2009-10: 38%	2009-10: 52.5%		
				2010-11: 38%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 9 page 17	Annual	2010	2007-08: 20%	2007-08: 30.6%	41.2%	2004-2005
				2008-09: 20%	2008-09: 27.4%		
				2009-10: 20%	2009-10: 40.4%		
				2010-11: 20%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 68 page 65	Annual	2010	2007-08: 4%	2007-08: 6.1	6.7%	2004-2005
				2008-09: 3.5%	2008-09: 6.4		
				2009-10: 3.5%	2009-10: 18.5%		
				2010-11: 3.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 3%	2007-08: 4.5		
				2008-09: 2.5%	2008-09: 3.6		

% of 11th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 68 page 65	Annual	2010	2009-10: 2.5%	2009-10: 15.2%	4.7%	2004-2005
				2010-11: 2.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
% of 8th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 123 page 80	Annual	2010	2007-08: 10.5%	2007-08: 9.0	12.7%	2002-2003	
				2008-09: 8%				2008-09: 10.6%
				2009-10: 8%				2009-10: 12.2%
				2010-11: 8%				
				2011-12: TBA				

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
% of 11th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 123 page 80	Annual	2010	2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 18.9%	23.4%	2002-2003	
				2008-09: 14.5%				2008-09: 21.9%
				2009-10: 14.5%				2009-10: 23.7%
				2010-11: 14.5%				
				2011-12: TBA				

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
% of 8th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 106 page 75	Annual	2010	2007-08: 8%	2007-08: 10.4%	10.5%	2002-2003	
				2008-09: 7.5%				2008-09: 9.8
				2009-10: 7.5%				2009-10: 9.8
				2010-11: 7.5%				
				2011-12: TBA				

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 15%	2007-08: 19.5%		
				2008-09: 14.5%	2008-09: 15.0%		
				2009-	2009-		

% of 11th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 106 page 75	Annual	2010	10: 14.5%	10: 20.0%	18.7%	2002-2003
				2010-11: 14.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 27 page 46	Annual	2010	2007-08: 93%	2007-08: 85.8%	95.1%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 95%	2008-09: 80		
				2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 85.8%		
				2010-11: 95%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to, smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 27 page 46	Annual	2010	2007-08: 93%	2007-08: 84.3%	95.3%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 95%	2008-09: 86.8%		
				2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 85.1%		
				2010-11: 95%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 155 page 88	Annual	2010	2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 80.4%	85.5%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 95%	2008-09: 74.5%		
				2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 74.2%		
				2010-11: 95%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 90%	2007-08: 69.0%		
				2008-09: 90%	2008-09: 65.8%		
				2009-	2009-		

% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 155 page 88	Annual	2010	10: 90%	10: 60.1%	78.4%	2002-2003
				2010-11: 90%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** Sum of moderate risk and high risk.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007-08: 99%	2007-08: 98.5%	98.3%	2003-2004
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 98.5%		
				2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 98.5%		
				2010-11: 99%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Annual	2009	2007-08: 98%	2007-08: 98.0%	97.4%	2003-2004
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 97.8%		
				2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 97.8%		
				2010-11: 99%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. ( high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 152 page 87	Annual	2010	2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 62.0%	88.4%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 95%	2008-09: 56		
				2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 64.3%		
				2010-11: 95%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 64.0%		
				2008-09: 95%	2008-09: 62.3%		

% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. ( high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 152 page 87	Annual	2010	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 64.9%	86.8%	2002-2003
				2010-11: 95%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 25 page 45	Annual	2010	2007-08: 99%	2007-08: 99.2%	95.9%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 99		
				2009-10: 99.2%	2009-10: 96.6%		
				2010-11: 99.2%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 25 page 45	Annual	2010	2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 97.9%	91.3%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 98.4%		
				2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 92.4%		
				2010-11: 99%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 25 page 45	Annual	2010	2007-08: 99%	2007-08: 97.3%	94.1%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 97.5%		
				2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 90.3%		
				2010-11: 99%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 95%	2007-08: 95.8%		
				2008-09: 97%	2008-09: 95		
				2009-	2009-		

% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 25 page 45	Annual	2010	10: 97%	10: 79.4%	88.8%	2002-2003
				2010-11: 97%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (OSWS) Table 25 page 45	Annual	2010	2007-08: 99%	2007-08: 98.4%	96.3%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 99%	2008-09: 98.3%		
				2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 94.1%		
				2010-11: TBA			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2009	2007-08: 2.5%	2007-08: 5.8	4.8%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 2.5%	2008-09: 7.5		
				2009-10: 2.5%	2009-10: 7.5		
				2010-11: 2.5%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b.	Annual	2009	2007-08: 3%	2007-08: 3.8	5.2%	2002-2003
				2008-09: 3%	2008-09: 4.9		
				2009-10: 3%	2009-10: 4.9		
				2010-11: 3%			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:** These data collected biennially

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2007-08: 16,000	2007-08: 17,270		
				2008-09: 16,000	2008-09: 16,667		
				2009-10: 16,000	2009-10: TB		

* # of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	2008	2010-11: TBA	17,804	2003-2004
				2011-12: TBA		

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

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Annual	2008	2007-08: 6,000	2007-08: 6,67	6,462	2003-2004
				2008-09: 6,000	2008-09: 5,9		
				2009-10: 5,900	2009-10: TB		
				2010-11: TBA			
				2011-12: TBA			

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

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
# of persistently dangerous schools	ODE Disciplinary Collection	Annual	2009	2007-08: 0	2007-08: 1	1	2002-2003
				2008-09: 0	2008-09: 0		
				2009-10: 0	2009-10: 0		
				2010-11: 0			
				2011-12: TBA			

**Comments:**

## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	3,355	197
6 through 8	5,597	197
9 through 12	4,173	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	N<6	197
6 through 8	75	197
9 through 12	137	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	644	197
6 through 8	574	197
9 through 12	240	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	N<6	197
6 through 8	14	197
9 through 12	25	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Weapons Possession</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	298	197
6 through 8	292	197
9 through 12	260	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsion for Weapons Possession</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	22	197
6 through 8	91	197
9 through 12	131	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	13	197
6 through 8	191	197
9 through 12	445	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<6	197
6 through 8	19	197
9 through 12	55	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	16	197
6 through 8	480	197
9 through 12	1,851	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

<b>Grades</b>	<b># Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents</b>	<b># LEAs Reporting</b>
K through 5	N<6	197
6 through 8	172	197
9 through 12	541	197
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	77
<b>Comments:</b> Seven districts which were eligible for SRSA alternative use of funding authority declined ESEA formula funds.	

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	7
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	15
Parental involvement activities	0
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	4
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	8
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the June 2002 Consolidated State application, Oregon set the goal for Rural Low Income Schools (RLIS) to ensure that the students have opportunities to meet state standards and graduate secondary school. The RLIS objectives are to achieve targets for AYP and graduation. Oregon measures both the goals and objectives through District Improvement Status and Graduation rate status.

#### Process for meeting Goals/Objectives:

In Oregon, the designation of not meeting AYP signals that based on a number of indicators, the district is not on track for all students meeting the state standards for student academic achievement by the target year of 2014. The district as a whole may have a strong academic performance but the designation may be based on a single factor or a single subgroup. Oregon Department of Education (ODE) selected to follow the USED approved Title IA District Improvement standard instead of the AYP designation.

During 2009-10 Oregon used the approved method for calculating graduation rate. USED issued new regulations so that graduation rates would be consistent across states. The new cohort graduation rate calculation will go into effect for the 2010-11 school year.

Oregon provides technical assistance and training to districts annually to help support the effective use of ESEA funds and to support the implementation of research based strategies. Districts biennially turn in a Continuous Improvement Plan and annually turn in an ESEA Budget Narrative. ODE reviews these documents to ensure that the district is in compliance with ESEA and that the strategies are aligned to support student academic achievement and effective teaching. The RLIS districts use the funds to support strategies that enhance what is available due to the rural nature of their districts. The following strategies were utilized by RLIS districts to help meet the goals and objective of RLIS: education technology to enhance student learning and to provide opportunities not otherwise available; intervention strategies in literacy/math (activities under Title IA); instructional coaches to improve academic achievement; professional development such as Professional Learning Communities; and activities that support English Language Learners.

#### Outcomes:

Oregon has seventeen RLIS school districts in 2009-10. All seventeen met the graduation rate. Three of the districts are in District Improvement. ODE monitors how the RLIS funds are utilized to ensure that the funds are targeted towards the issues that put the district into District Improvement status.

**2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)****2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2009-10?	No
<b>Comments:</b> ODE did not use the State Transferability authority.	

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

	<b>#</b>
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	11
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	10	1
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	2	2
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		10

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2010 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	374,823.00	2,863.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	6,608.00	163,546.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		215,022.00
Total	381,431.00	381,431.00

**Comments:**

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