

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2011-12**

OREGON



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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)*
 - *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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
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, March 7, 2013, 2:33:57 PM
Signature	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in Mathematics and English/Language Arts were adopted by Oregon in October 2010. Full implementation of the CCSS standards is scheduled to occur in the 2014-15 school year. Oregon adopted new science standards in 2009, and full implementation occurred in the 2011-12 school year.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p>State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	2011-12	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	2011-12	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	2011-12	2011-12

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

Oregon raised achievement standards at grades 3 - 8 in both Reading and Science. At the high school level, the "meets" achievement level used to determine proficiency remained the same for both Reading and Science. Oregon raised the "nearly meets and "exceeds" achievement standards for high school Reading and raised the "exceeds" achievement standard for high school Science.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

<p style="text-align: center;">State has revised or changed</p>	<p>No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.</p>
	<p>State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.</p>

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2014-15	2014-15	2011-12

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

The 2011-12 Science assessments are based on new, broader content standards encompassing Engineering Design.

In 2014-15, Oregon will begin administering the common ELA and Mathematics assessments based on the Common Core State Standards developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium and the alternate ELA and Mathematics assessments developed by the National Center and State Collaborative Consortium.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	92.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	8.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	Yes
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	295,432	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	5,224	98
Asian	S	11,763	>=99
Black or African American	S	7,383	98
Hispanic or Latino	S	62,019	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	1,907	>=99
White	S	192,943	>=99
Two or more races	S	14,193	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	44,774	98
Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students	S	26,771	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	158,362	>=99
Migratory students	S	6,460	>=99
Male	S	151,448	>=99
Female	S	143,984	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	30,074	67.17
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	9,149	20.43
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,551	12.40
Total	44,774	////////////////////////////////////
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	296,671	294,966	>=99
American Indian or Alaska Native	5,303	5,244	>=99
Asian	11,523	11,459	>=99
Black or African American	7,438	7,345	>=99
Hispanic or Latino	61,920	61,572	>=99
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,869	1,857	>=99
White	194,309	193,270	>=99
Two or more races	14,309	14,219	>=99
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	45,602	44,891	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	25,808	25,658	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	158,826	157,905	>=99
Migratory students	6,359	6,319	>=99
Male	152,246	151,214	>=99
Female	144,425	143,752	>=99
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Based on Oregon 201-12 participation data, 1.2.3.1 = 77 (the number of LEP students in the US < 12 months whose English language proficiency (ELP) test replaced the regular reading assessment). These students appear to not be included in the 1.2.3 count of 44891. To further clarify, 44891 + 77 = 44968, the total participation count for 1.2.4.			

1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	1,150
--	-------

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

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

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

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	31,795	70.71
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	7,106	15.80
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,990	13.32
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	77	0.17
Total	44,968	////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Based on Oregon 2011-12 proficiency data, 1.3.2 (total = 44891) does not appear to include LEP students in the US < 12 months whose English language proficiency (ELP) test replaced the regular reading assessment (total count = 77). To further clarify, 44891 + 77 = 44968, the total participation count for

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	S	124,244	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	2,190	95
Asian	S	4,917	97
Black or African American	S	3,092	95
Hispanic or Latino	S	24,956	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	746	96
White	S	82,594	98
Two or more races	S	5,749	97
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	S	17,479	95
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	8,177	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	63,210	97
Migratory students	S	2,564	98
Male	S	63,628	97
Female	S	60,616	98

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct.

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	12,923	73.93
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	2,832	16.20
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	1,724	9.86
Total	17,479	////////////////////////////////////

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

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

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,128	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	697	S	55
Asian	1,728	S	79
Black or African American	1,029	S	44
Hispanic or Latino	9,469	S	48
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	280	S	51
White	26,804	S	71
Two or more races	2,121	S	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,582	S	42
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,772	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	23,972	S	54
Migratory students	1,034	S	46
Male	21,613	S	65
Female	20,515	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,850	S	72
American Indian or Alaska Native	695	S	61
Asian	1,672	S	82
Black or African American	1,014	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	9,314	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	270	S	64
White	26,770	S	79
Two or more races	2,115	S	78
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,567	S	49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,512	S	40
Economically disadvantaged students	23,756	S	62
Migratory students	996	S	44
Male	21,462	S	70
Female	20,388	S	74
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Reading achievement standards increased from 2010-11 to 2011-12 at Grade 3, resulting in lower percent meeting in 2011-12.			

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.00
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is no Science Assessment for Grade 3.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,841	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	688	S	55
Asian	1,619	S	83
Black or African American	997	S	48
Hispanic or Latino	9,416	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	289	S	53
White	26,824	S	72
Two or more races	2,008	S	69
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,152	S	40
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6,117	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	23,745	S	56
Migratory students	964	S	48
Male	21,468	S	68
Female	20,373	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	41,634	S	76
American Indian or Alaska Native	685	S	66
Asian	1,555	S	83
Black or African American	991	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	9,308	S	59
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	277	S	67
White	26,813	S	82
Two or more races	2,005	S	80
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,133	S	49
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,908	S	43
Economically disadvantaged students	23,590	S	66
Migratory students	940	S	46
Male	21,383	S	74
Female	20,251	S	78
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Reading achievement standards increased from 2010-11 to 2011-12 at Grade 4, resulting in lower percent meeting in 2011-12.			

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.00
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. There is no Science assessment at Grade 4.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,659	S	60
American Indian or Alaska Native	740	S	42
Asian	1,708	S	77
Black or African American	1,037	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	9,453	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	261	S	46
White	27,358	S	65
Two or more races	2,102	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,115	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,662	S	25
Economically disadvantaged students	24,001	S	48
Migratory students	985	S	39
Male	21,803	S	60
Female	20,856	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,502	S	71
American Indian or Alaska Native	739	S	58
Asian	1,666	S	78
Black or African American	1,027	S	52
Hispanic or Latino	9,379	S	53
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	257	S	54
White	27,339	S	77
Two or more races	2,095	S	76
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,106	S	41
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,506	S	26
Economically disadvantaged students	23,890	S	60
Migratory students	970	S	40
Male	21,721	S	68
Female	20,781	S	73
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Reading achievement standards increased from 2010-11 to 2011-12 at Grade 5, resulting in lower percent meeting in 2011-12.			

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,397	S	70
American Indian or Alaska Native	735	S	59
Asian	1,684	S	75
Black or African American	1,025	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	9,389	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	261	S	48
White	27,214	S	78
Two or more races	2,089	S	75
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,035	S	45
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,615	S	24
Economically disadvantaged students	23,811	S	58
Migratory students	981	S	37
Male	21,656	S	71
Female	20,741	S	68
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,814	S	59
American Indian or Alaska Native	780	S	43
Asian	1,752	S	78
Black or African American	1,054	S	37
Hispanic or Latino	9,037	S	44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	273	S	50
White	27,763	S	64
Two or more races	2,155	S	63
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,854	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,085	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	23,576	S	47
Migratory students	958	S	37
Male	21,933	S	59
Female	20,881	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,669	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	778	S	51
Asian	1,706	S	76
Black or African American	1,048	S	46
Hispanic or Latino	8,962	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	268	S	53
White	27,756	S	73
Two or more races	2,151	S	72
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,848	S	33
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,938	S	13
Economically disadvantaged students	23,478	S	54
Migratory students	941	S	38
Male	21,856	S	63
Female	20,813	S	69
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Reading achievement standards increased from 2010-11 to 2011-12 at grade 6, resulting in lower percent meeting in 2011-12.			

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	S	S	N<
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.00
White	S	S	N<
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	S	S	N<
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data is correct.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,026	S	63
American Indian or Alaska Native	838	S	48
Asian	1,661	S	80
Black or African American	1,134	S	43
Hispanic or Latino	8,794	S	49
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	303	S	49
White	28,206	S	68
Two or more races	2,090	S	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,398	S	26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,430	S	22
Economically disadvantaged students	22,979	S	51
Migratory students	903	S	40
Male	22,127	S	62
Female	20,899	S	64
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Race/ethnicity are self-reported by school districts. Oregon had a significant increase in the number of ELLs obtaining academic English proficiency from 2007-08 to 2009-10. Depending on the student's LEP exit date these students would not have been included in the LEP sub-group for 2011-12			

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,869	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	834	S	65
Asian	1,605	S	83
Black or African American	1,117	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	8,740	S	58
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	297	S	59
White	28,190	S	81
Two or more races	2,086	S	81
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,406	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,280	S	17
Economically disadvantaged students	22,859	S	66
Migratory students	882	S	44
Male	22,037	S	72
Female	20,832	S	79
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. Race/ethnicity are self-reported by school districts. Oregon had a significant increase in the number of ELLs obtaining academic English proficiency from 2007-08 to 2009-10. Depending on the student's LEP exit date these students would not have been included in the LEP sub-group for 2011-12			

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.00
Asian	0	0	0.00
Black or African American	0	0	0.00
Hispanic or Latino	0	0	0.00
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0	0.00
White	0	0	0.00
Two or more races	0	0	0.00
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	0	0	0.00
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.00
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.00
Migratory students	0	0	0.00
Male	0	0	0.00
Female	0	0	0.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct. There is not Science Assessment at Grade 7.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,123	S	65
American Indian or Alaska Native	787	S	51
Asian	1,656	S	81
Black or African American	1,080	S	45
Hispanic or Latino	8,735	S	52
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	260	S	60
White	28,590	S	70
Two or more races	2,015	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,157	S	27
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,124	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	22,506	S	54
Migratory students	949	S	43
Male	22,134	S	64
Female	20,989	S	67

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct as reported. Oregon had a significant increase in the number of ELLs obtaining academic English proficiency from 2007-08 to 2009-10. Depending on the student's LEP exit date these students would not have been included in the LEP sub-group for 2011-12

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	43,050	S	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	789	S	55
Asian	1,630	S	77
Black or African American	1,074	S	51
Hispanic or Latino	8,679	S	51
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	255	S	58
White	28,608	S	74
Two or more races	2,015	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,162	S	30
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,004	S	12
Economically disadvantaged students	22,436	S	57
Migratory students	930	S	37
Male	22,105	S	64
Female	20,945	S	73

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct as reported. Oregon had a significant increase in the number of ELLs obtaining academic English proficiency from 2007-08 to 2009-10. Depending on the student's LEP exit date these students would not have been included in the LEP sub-group for 2011-12

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	42,938	S	67
American Indian or Alaska Native	783	S	56
Asian	1,660	S	75
Black or African American	1,074	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	8,699	S	47
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	260	S	50
White	28,463	S	74
Two or more races	1,999	S	71
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	6,080	S	39
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,115	S	15
Economically disadvantaged students	22,373	S	55
Migratory students	945	S	35
Male	22,039	S	69
Female	20,899	S	65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Data are correct as reported. Oregon had a significant increase in the number of ELLs obtaining academic English proficiency from 2007-08 to 2009-10. Depending on the student's LEP exit date these students would not have been included in the LEP sub-group for 2011-12			

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	39,841	S	66
American Indian or Alaska Native	694	S	51
Asian	1,639	S	82
Black or African American	1,052	S	41
Hispanic or Latino	7,115	S	50
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	241	S	48
White	27,398	S	70
Two or more races	1,702	S	68
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,516	S	23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,581	S	20
Economically disadvantaged students	17,583	S	53
Migratory students	667	S	46
Male	20,370	S	65
Female	19,471	S	66
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	40,392	S	84
American Indian or Alaska Native	724	S	77
Asian	1,625	S	85
Black or African American	1,074	S	66
Hispanic or Latino	7,190	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	233	S	72
White	27,794	S	89
Two or more races	1,752	S	86
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,669	S	52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,510	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	17,896	S	76
Migratory students	660	S	61
Male	20,650	S	83
Female	19,742	S	86
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	38,909	S	64
American Indian or Alaska Native	672	S	53
Asian	1,573	S	71
Black or African American	993	S	35
Hispanic or Latino	6,868	S	40
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	225	S	37
White	26,917	S	71
Two or more races	1,661	S	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	4,364	S	29
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,447	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	17,026	S	50
Migratory students	638	S	31
Male	19,933	S	67
Female	18,976	S	60
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,259		
Districts	221		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Districts count includes ESDs.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	585		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	459		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	126		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oregon was granted a waiver-79-12. AYP Status will not be reported for 2011-2012.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
173		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oregon was granted a waiver-79-12. AYP Status will not be reported for 2011-2012.		

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	11
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	11
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon had eleven schools in different districts enter restructuring sanctions in improvement. All eleven schools revised school improvement plans to reflect restructuring activities. Some of those activities included restructuring the staff, staff evaluation, and professional learning communities. Some of those buildings implemented an extended day learning option for students and targeted assistance to families as part of a strategy to engage the parents in the learning process. Each building's school improvement plan addresses the restructuring activities specific to each location.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ODE and its many partners support district staff as they work to successfully plan and implement improved instructional efforts. Staff at all districts identified as in Title I improvement status must update and submit for approval a continuous improvement plan (CIP) within 3 months of receiving a letter informing staff of the district's status. Revisions to the CIP must directly address the needs of students as identified through an analysis of student achievement data. The law encourages district staff to use Title I and other federal funding sources in addition to general fund moneys to develop and implement this revised CIP. District staff must begin implementation of the revised plan as soon as possible, with full implementation no later than the beginning of school in the next school year. The plan must:

- Incorporate scientifically based research strategies that strengthen the core academic program in all of the district's schools.
- Identify actions that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement in Title I schools and assisting students who have not yet met state standards.
- Address the professional development needs of instructional staff.
- Include specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each group of students identified in the disaggregated data as not meeting AYP.
- Address the specifically identified teaching and learning needs and academic problems of low-achieving students within the district's schools.
- Identify why the previous plan did not bring about sufficient increased student academic achievement.
- Incorporate, as appropriate, extended time learning opportunities.
- Describe the technical assistance the district will require from the ODE.
- Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement.

The Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS) provides each district in improvement status with a district improvement coach to build leadership capacity at the district level to leverage and sustain improvements across the district. The coaches receive extensive training and time for networking with each other from Education Northwest through the Oregon School and District Improvement Network (OSDIN). ODE and its partners provide improvement workshops throughout the year for districts needing technical assistance with various aspects of their CIPs or for other technical assistance. With Oregon's ESEA waiver approval, Districts were no longer identified as in improvement status for the 2012-13 school year.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under ESEA were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

Entity	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	
Schools	0	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oregon was granted a waiver 7-19-12. AYP Status will not be reported for 2011-2012.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.00%

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During SY 2010-11, ODE collected progress reports from all Cohort 1 SIG schools including three Quarterly Reports, a Year End Report and a Budget Expenditures Spreadsheet showing how all Year 1 money was spent.

In the Spring of 2011, ODE sent a monitoring team to each of the schools to perform interviews with district staff, school administration, teachers and students and to determine which of the requirements were being met and which of the requirements schools were struggling with. After each of the monitoring visits, each district received a summary report with feedback from ODE as to the quality of implementation happening in each of its schools and the level of district support each of the schools received. A final report was written summarizing the visits and the implementation progress for Cohort

1 during Year 1. AYP data has been tracked for all SIG schools to determine if any early correlations can be drawn between improved AYP and SIG implementation. SIG districts were also visited by a designated ODE staff member assigned to the School Improvement Resource Team (SIRT), which is a team exclusively organized to provide a single point of contact at ODE for districts needing technical assistance.

During the Summer of 2011, ODE hosted a workshop for teams from each of the SIG schools (including both Cohort 1 and 2 schools) and districts. Superintendent Joshua Powell from Kentucky was the keynote speaker and provided practical advice for district-wide improvement strategies on how to reform and turnaround a low-performing district.

ODE has provided all SIG schools with a school improvement leadership coach and all SIG districts with a district improvement leadership coach to build leadership capacity at both the district and school levels for leveraging improvements across SIG districts sustaining improvements at SIG schools. The coaches are provided through the Oregon School and District Improvement Network (OSDIN) which is a part of the Oregon Statewide System of Support (OSSS). The coaches received ten days of intensive training and professional development and on one of those days the SIG principals were invited to attend with their coaches to collaboratively develop improvement strategies.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Actions taken by Oregon in SY 2010-11 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA - NONE

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

Public School Choice	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	45,666
Applied to transfer	2,627
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,324
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

Transportation for Public School Choice	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,613,136

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

Unable to Provide Public School Choice	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	11

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
 - o Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - o Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - o Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

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

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

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

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

Supplemental Educational Services	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	28,997
Applied for supplemental educational services	13,823
Received supplemental educational services	9,012
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

Spending on Supplemental Educational Services	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 13,745,303
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified
All classes	107,644	105,774	98.26	1,870	1.74
All elementary classes	18,214	17,871	98.12	343	1.88
All secondary classes	89,430	87,903	98.29	1,527	1.71

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We give districts the option. They can (and most do) use the self-contained classroom where the full day is counted once. However, some districts do choose to schedule their elementary schools and submit using the departmentalized approach.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

Elementary School Classes	Percentage
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	25.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	7.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	55.00
Total	94.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reason Not Highly Qualified are self-reported reported. Institutions have the ability to select any of the codes which results in miscoding. The "Other" count is based on all the Reason Non Highly Qualified Codes excluding 1, 2 and 3 that are associated with elementary course records.

As for 1.5.2 the Other represents the code set that Oregon uses to describe Reason Not Highly Qualified if it does not fit in any of the elementary or secondary code descriptions. In the 11/12 data Oregon used a 1-9 code set. One through 3 were used to describe reasons why elementary school teachers are not highly qualified. Four through 8 were used to describe reason why secondary school teachers are not highly qualified. Code 9 - "Other" can be used for either elementary and secondary. The Reason Not Highly Qualified is self-reported by the district during the collection process.

Secondary School Classes	Percentage
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	49.40
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	7.60
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.60
Other (please explain in comment box below)	35.40
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Reason Not Highly Qualified are self-reported reported. Institutions have the ability to select any of the codes which results in miscoding. The "Other" count is based on all the Reason Non Highly Qualified Codes excluding 4, 6, 7 and 8 that are associated with secondary course records

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

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

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	3,833	3,798	99.09
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	5,631	5,503	97.73
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	11,745	11,544	98.29
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	31,572	31,118	98.56

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	74.00	41.00
Poverty metric used	(1.3) Free and Reduced Price Lunch The data is accurate as reported by the District(s). ODE has been working more intensely with our high poverty schools to ensure all teachers are highly qualified.	
Secondary schools	67.00	42.00
Poverty metric used	(2.3) Free and Reduced Price Lunch	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

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

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	58,580
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

LEP Students Receiving Services	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	55,408
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	45,157
Russian	2,222
Vietnamese	1,834
Chinese	953
Somali	760

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

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

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

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

All LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	54,977
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,246
Total	57,223
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1,314 students were not enrolled during the official ELPA testing window, therefore these students were unable to participate in the annual English Language Proficiency Assessment, 234 students exited as proficient prior to the official ELPA testing window. 95 students have an IEP that exempts the student from participating in ELPA.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

All LEP Results	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	9,053
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	16.48
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

Title III LEP Testing	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	52,426
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	1,781
Total	54,207
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1,172 students were not enrolled during the official ELPA testing window, therefore these students were unable to participate in the annual English language Proficiency Assessment, 213 students exited as proficient prior to the official ELPA testing window. 95 students have an IEP that exempts the student from participating in ELPA.	

In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

Title III First Time Tested	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	11,056

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

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

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

Title III Results	Results #	Results %	Targets #	Targets %
Making progress	22,298	53.90		57.00
Attained proficiency	8,733	16.66		17.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oregon does not have number targets. Attained proficiency is 17% and 27% - 2 targets and both must be met).				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

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

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

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

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	Yes
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish bilingual (English/Spanish on screen)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish (3rd grade only)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Spanish bilingual (English Spanish on screen)
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

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

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
10,144	9,558	19,702
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

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

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,156	S	54	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

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

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
14,475	S	58	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

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

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,394	S	39	S
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

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

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

Title III Subgrantees	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	66
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	2
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	11
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	42
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	5
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	25
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	14
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	14
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	4

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Consortia members are counted based on their consortia. Each consortium is counted as a single subgrantee. This count was used for all responses on this section.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

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

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
7,730	22	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

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

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

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

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

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

Title III Teachers	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	863
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	300

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics** = Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees** = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	52	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	11	////////////////////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	18	////////////////////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	2	////////////////////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	1	////////////////////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	2	////////////////////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	37	1,987
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	66	772
PD provided to principals	7	155
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	7	88
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	6	54
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
Total	123	3,056

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/11	08/15/11	45
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beginning with the 2011-12 school year, districts were asked to provide an intent to participate in Title III at the end of the 2010-11 school year. The SEA used this information to assist districts with consortium membership decisions prior to the receipt of the federal allocations. The SEA has refined the above practice for 2012-13 and the SEA has revised its ELPA assessment dates as well as student data collection dates. These changes will allow the Title III allocations to be disseminated earlier in future years.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

Persistently Dangerous Schools	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

LEAs	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	132	132
LEAs with subgrants	65	65
Total	197	197
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	835	176
K	1,451	194
1	1,355	177
2	1,366	193
3	1,335	177
4	1,254	157
5	1,223	174
6	1,198	181
7	1,189	194
8	1,180	179
9	1,208	205
10	1,254	204
11	1,330	238
12	2,373	345
Ungraded		
Total	18,551	2,794

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Oregon has not had Ungraded since 2008. Oregon does not recognize the category, so that's why it's never counted.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

Primary Nighttime Residence	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	2,381	203
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	13,938	2,129
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	1,480	314
Hotels/Motels	752	148
Total	18,551	2,794

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	321
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	417
K	575
1	519
2	513
3	518
4	496
5	448
6	494
7	485
8	456
9	472
10	512
11	541
12	984
Ungraded	0
Total	7,751
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

Subgroup	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	1,300
Migratory children/youth	320
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	1,110
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	394
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	532	320
4	500	298
5	480	287
6	516	222
7	503	307
8	496	245
High School	498	341

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	532	274
4	505	240
5	484	202
6	522	180
7	508	202
8	500	203
High School	478	213

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	473	277
6		
7		
8	494	251
High School	462	230

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

- a. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.
- b. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,880
K	1,439
1	1,350
2	1,333
3	1,283
4	1,187
5	1,189
6	1,121
7	1,078
8	1,092
9	937
10	929
11	866
12	780
Ungraded	82
Out-of-school	1,281
Total	18,827
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's 2011-2012 Category 1 count decreased slightly from the 2010-2011 performance year. The decrease can be attributed to: staff turnover, immigration raids, new driver license requirements, weather, housing - one of the biggest problems, crops natural cycle is changing

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	705
K	762
1	714
2	685
3	653
4	575
5	569
6	404
7	287
8	255
9	182
10	198
11	189
12	41
Ungraded	60
Out-of-school	0
Total	6,279
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's 2011-2012 Category 2 count increased slightly for summer 2012. The increase was due to continuing leadership at the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) challenging regional programs to promote and encourage all migrant students, especially Priority for Services students to participate in summer school. Also, LEAs were required to incorporate into their local ID&R Plans, strategies for summer recruitment. As a result, many LEAs identified new families in their programs.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS) to generate the 2011-2012 Category 1 and Category 2 Child Counts.

Yes, Oregon also used the OMSIS to generate the 2010-2011 child count.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

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

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

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

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

a. What data were collected?

The OMSIS system collects the following data: student demographics; student enrollment history; enrollments and withdrawals; LEP and SPED flag, medical alert; supplemental instructional and support services; language assessment; reclassification flag and date; days enrolled and present; education interruption flag, health immunizations, etc. The OMSIS data is matched up with the State Assessment System to extract state assessment data on migrant students.

b. What activities were conducted to collect the data?

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

Identification: Oregon provides extensive training to recruiters on the Non-Regulatory Guidance (NRG), the MEP eligibility criteria and determination, and the completion of Oregon's COE. Newly hired recruiters are engaged in a full-day, six-hour COE/eligibility training in which they are taught the eligibility criteria, techniques for interviewing, proper completion of the COE, overview of Chapter 2 of the NRG, etc. Veteran recruiters must attend fall and summer ID&R and eligibility training sessions annually. Recruiters are trained to collect necessary information required on the COE to establish eligibility for the MEP. Types of data collected are: student demographics, eligibility data, parent/guardian data, mailing address, and phone number. The combination of the data will establish a unique identifier for each student. The information is then entered on OMSIS by the local data specialists.

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

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

Re-enrolling out-of-school (OOS) children: The process for re-enrolling out-of-school children requires the recruiters

and/or the local data specialists to call or make home visits to verify the student's residency in the district as of September 1; and also to identify potential new qualifying move.

Re-enrolling of children two years old turning three years old. The OMESC assist the local districts with this re-enrollment process by generating a list twice a year of children who turn three years of age during the performance year. The process for re-enrolling requires the recruiter/HSC to make a phone call or visit the family's residence after the child's third birthday.

Withdrawal and supplemental service delivered: Local districts employ necessary staff to provide supplemental instructional and support services to students in need of extra academic services or social services. Staff is trained to use the Title I-C Withdrawal Form to record all Title I-C funded services provided to migrant students. Other information requested on the form includes the language proficiency data, withdrawal date, days enrolled/present, ELL/LEP and SPED flagged, etc. The Title I-C Withdrawal Form is completed when the student withdraws from school or at the end of the school year, whichever comes first.

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

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

The OMSIS is Oregon's web-based migrant student information system. This system is continuously updated and made available 24/7 for users of all access levels. Data on migrant students are collected and updated on the system daily by authorized users.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon has 19 regional MEP offices throughout the state. Eligible migrant student data are entered on the OMSIS by the 19 local data specialists. Each regional office is required to hire or assign an OMSIS data specialist. The OMSIS data specialist works along-side the local recruiters, home school consultants, instructional assistants, teachers, school secretaries, USDA coordinators, and local MEP coordinators. All are responsible to ensure that migrant student records are kept up-to-date on OMSIS.

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

Student records are maintained and kept up-to-date by the local MEP offices. The local OMSIS specialist checks all COEs and other enrollment forms before the forms are entered on OMSIS. The OMSIS system validates and authenticates the user account. All local OMSIS specialists have full access to their district's student records.

When a new COE is completed and handed to the local OMSIS specialists, they review the COE for completeness, accuracy, and then search the OMSIS for a possible match. If there is a match then the OMSIS ID is recorded on the COE.

If the student doesn't exist, the OMSIS specialist takes the necessary steps to thoroughly search the system before creating a new record.

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

The state OMSIS system performs the following steps for validation:

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

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

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

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

Specific crosswalk or tabulation are:

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

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

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

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

Step 6: On a monthly basis, the OMESC provides the 19 regional MEPs with counts of eligible migrant students in their districts. Counts are broken down by 0-21 years and 3-21 years, enrolled, out-of-School, preschool, ELL, SPED.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Oregon, all eligible children ages 0-21 are listed on the COE and all qualifying children who moved with, to join, or on own are entered on OMSIS. When COEs are processed on OMSIS, each child is assigned a unique OMSIS ID number. Before OMSIS appends the record, the system validates the student's age and qualifying arrival date. The system filters out: children who were born after the qualifying arrival date, children who are age 22 or over as of the enroll date or out-of-school (OOS) date, and children who have a qualifying arrival date before 09/01/08 for the year 09/01/11 - 08/31/12.

- Children who were between age 3 through 21

When category 1 and 2 counts are generated, all students between the ages of 0-2 as of the enroll date or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned three years old between 09/01/11 and 08/31/12, OMESC staff generates and distributes the 2 Turning 3 Report. This report is produced two times during the school year for local programs to follow-up, make contacts, and update the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters and local data specialists contact the families to verify the residency of the child. Once residency at age three is established the recruiters or data specialist re-enrolls the child back on the system with the contact date as the new enrollment or OOS date. The contact date must be greater than the child's third birthday. The data specialist reenrolls and updates the grade level to P3. The OMSIS checks the latest enrollment line ID and validates the enroll or OOS date against the child's date of birth to verify if the age is three years.

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

- Children who were resident in your State for at least one day during the eligible period (09/01/2011 - 08/31/2012)

Recruiters verify students' residency in their regional programs before completing a COE, mass enrollment list, or

CRSEF

form for input onto OMSIS. Students are not automatically re-enrolled on OMSIS.

Verifying a child's residency can be done through face-to-face contact, telephone contact, checking the LEA student information system, or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children is done with the aid of the mass enrollment list which lists all OOS children identified during the previous school year (2010-11) that are eligible for the new school year (2011-12). Before re-enrolling OOS children for the new school year, the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the mass enrollment list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move, a new COE is completed. No documentation is needed if the family cannot be found.

- Children who - in the case of category 2 - received an MEP-funded service during the summer (SS) or intersession term: Oregon's category 2 count includes every child enrolled in a Title I-C funded SS program and who received supplemental instructional/support services. Like the RSY program, recruiters complete one of the 3 enrollment forms to enroll and enter the information on OMSIS. Students must be eligible and 3 years old as of the first day of SS. SS enrollments entered on OMSIS are flagged with an enrollment type "S" to distinguish from RSY enrollments. This year

Oregon had one intersession program during Winter Break.

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

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

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

Category 1

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

The criteria for determining the category 1 count are as follows: student must be enrolled or OOS between 09/01/11-08/31/12; student must be between the age of 3-21 during the period of 09/01/11-08/31/12; student who turns 3 between 09/01/11-08/31/12 must have a new enrollment line ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3 years greater than student's date of birth; student must have a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrollment date, or OOS date) between the start date and end date. The start date is 09/01/11; the end date 09/30/2012; student must have a QAD on or after 09/01/08; student must have a residency date between 09/01/2011 to 08/31/12; student enrolled after 09/01/12, must have a residency between 09/01/2011 and 08/31/12; and for a student whose regular school year started in August 2011, the 2011-12 enrollment line must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/11.

All eight conditions must be met before a child is counted under category 1. The results of the above criteria are stored in the 1112_FederalRegularCount.dbf table. The table is then manually scanned by OMESC staff for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and deducted from the category 1 count.

Category 2

For category 2 we use the two tables mentioned in category 1 in addition to the Supplemental Services table. The Supplemental Services table contains instructional and support services provided during regular, intersession and summer programs.

Using the two tables used for category 1, the criteria below are coded: student is enrolled between 06/01/12 and 08/31/12; student is 3 years as of the enrolled date; student is less than 22 as of the enrolled date; student has a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 06/01/12 and 08/31/12; student enrollment type equal to S- Intersession/Summer with at least two or more supplemental service codes reported; student previous enrollment lines do not have a value of G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased.

All seven conditions must be met for a student to be included in the category 2 count. The results of the codes are written to the table 1112_FederalSummerCount.dbf, where it is manually scanned by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are deducted from the category 2 count.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) contracts with the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) to carry out the required trainings. All new recruiters must attend a New Recruiter Certification training on top of attending the annual Fall and Spring ID&R Refresher trainings.

I.
Trainings

New Recruiter Certification
Procedures

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

- A. Attend the New Recruiter's Training conducted by OMESEC staff (equivalent to a full-day, six-hour training). This training includes a pre-test, quizzes, and a post-test. Attendees must have an 80% accuracy level or better.
- B. Fieldwork: New recruiters will begin field work by shadowing and being mentored by a veteran recruiters and simultaneously conduct a minimum of three interviews and successfully complete two COEs.

Annual Refresher
Trainings

- A. Recruiters working during regular school year must attend the Fall Refresher training; and
- B. Recruiters working during the summer months must attend the Summer Training;
- C. Regional program coordinators may also request additional training sessions based upon

needs. II. COE Quality Control

The OMESEC reviews 100% of COEs submitted by Oregon's 19 regional migrant education programs. If a COE passes the "Certificate of Eligibility Review - Errors/Issues", it is placed in the official state files at the OMESEC to be held for 10 years. If a COE does not pass the review, the OMESEC staff will follow the protocols below:

- A. The COEs with errors/issues are compiled and logged each month by OMESEC staff. A report is generated and distributed to the 19 regional programs monthly on the accuracy of their COEs.
- B. The COEs in questions are returned to the regional programs for corrections. Regional programs have 30 days to resolve issues.
- C. Regional programs must document all corrections on the COE Correction Form.
- D. All corrections are properly initialed by the recruiter, OMSIS specialist, or parent/guardian.
- E. The COE Correction Form is then digitally/manually signed to verify corrections done by either the recruiter or OMSIS specialist.
- F. The local recruiter or OMSIS specialist makes the necessary changes/comments to the COE and on OMSIS system. G. The recruiter or OMSIS specialist returns the Form to the OMESEC. The Form is kept on file for reference and training needs.

If a COE is determined to be ineligible, the OMESEC staff follows the steps below:

1. A letter is sent to the regional program explaining the findings.
2. The regional program has 30 days to contest findings. All supportive materials or evidences are submitted to the OMESEC.

If the regional program does not contest the findings, then the OMESEC voids the COE and follows-up with a formal letter

to the regional program.

III. Recruiter Review and Evaluation

Annually, OMESC staff disseminates an electronic identification and recruitment assessment to all active recruiters. The assessment incorporates the following categories for evaluation:

1. Questions on leading practices for COE documentation
2. Questions on eligibility criteria
3. Questions on eligibility case studies
4. Questions on interviewing leading practices

The results of the assessments are compiled, evaluated and then applied toward future identification and recruitment trainings. The 2011-2012 assessment showed recruiters scored an average of 80% or better.

The 19 regional programs complete recruitment logs monthly, but are only required to submit the November and February logs to the OMESC for compilation. The recruitment log documents the total time worked in correlation to the total time spent in active identification and recruitment of migrant students and services to their families. The recruitment logs are used to evaluate recruiters time spent on recruitment in an effort to meet the state recruitment goal of 60% FTE spent on active recruitment. This year's results showed recruiters spent an average of 81% in active identification and recruitment.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For 2011-2012 performance year Oregon performed a prospective re-interview. The maximum records randomly selected for reinterview was 100; 74 maximum successful reinterviews and an additional 26 record pool in case of an unsuccessful contact.

Oregon's re-interview procedures are as follows:

1. Monthly the OMESC generates a list from OMSIS of COEs signed in the last four weeks.
2. The OMESC then appends the student list to an Excel spreadsheet. Computerized selections of random names are generated through a formula. The formula used to determine random sample for re-interviews are as follows:
 - a. Random number generation, b. The number of variables is 1,
 - c. The number of random numbers is the number of students recruited from the previous year, d. Uses a binomial distribution,
 - e. With a probability of success (p Value) of .003%,
3. The Excel spreadsheet identifies the samples for the year.
4. The formula identifies the records for re-interviews. The state reinterview process is by regional clusters; doing this reduces travel and benefits the state economically.
5. The regional program notifies the families to be re-interviewed.
6. The recruiter sets-up the date and time for the re-interview to occur.
 - a. If a family is not available, the recruiter will document efforts made on the Re-interview Contact Denied form and proceed to the next student on the sample list.
7. After the appointment is scheduled, the OMESC conducts the re-interview.
8. The local recruiter accompanies the OMESC re-interviewer. The recruiter does not have any interaction with the family during the re-interview.
9. The re-interviewer documents the outcomes on the Title I-C MEP Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire.
10. The OMESC examines the re-interview results and sends a memo to the regional program coordinator informing them of the outcome.
 - a. Determined to be eligible
 - i. The OMESC notifies the regional program of the result.
 - b. Determined to be ineligible
 - i. The OMESC notifies the regional program of any findings.
 - ii. The findings must be contested within 30 days and submitted on the "Contesting Re-interview Findings Form".
 - iii. If the regional program cannot provide sufficient written evidence to successfully contest the re-interview findings within 30 days of notification, the OMESC will VOID that child's COE.
 - iv. The OMESC sends a memo to the Title I-C regional program coordinator confirming that the child's COE information has been voided and deleted from the OMSIS.
 - v. The OMESC retains copies of the re-interview paperwork to serve as verification to USED/OME that Oregon has implemented a re-interview process according to regulation CFR 200.89.

Total Re-interviews conducted for 2011-2012 Performance Year

Total Number of COEs Reviewed: 74

Total COEs Found to be Eligible: 64

Total COEs Found to be Eligible with Changes: 9

Total COEs Found to be Not Eligible: 1

Additionally: Oregon performed a prospective re-interview for the school year 2011-2012. The re-interview was conducted by Statewide Recruiter at the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC). The Statewide Recruiter has 13 years' experience as a recruiter and has six years' experience as re-interviewer. The Statewide Recruiter is very knowledgeable about ID&R regulations and is required to attend all required trainings; she is bilingual and bicultural and provides state level mentoring and support local recruiters with recruitment efforts and strategies. The Statewide Recruiter has also performed retrospective interviews in Washington State.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Throughout the year, the OMESC provides the 19 regional programs with a monthly MEP child count for their records; therefore they are aware of how many MEP children they've identified to date. In addition, the local OMSIS data specialist generates a monthly list and distributes the list to the recruiters, home-school consultants, principals, and USDA coordinators. Any discrepancies identified by the participating staff are reported to the local OMSIS data specialists for correction onto OMSIS.

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

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

This process is ongoing, year-round.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC staff provides the 19 regional MEPs with a running total of migrant children identified in their local region on a monthly basis. Corrective actions are taken immediately when discrepancies are found. After the September 15, 2012 deadline, OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs additional validations and cross-tabs of information and checks for human errors, i.e. names misspelled, etc. This year, Category 1 and Category 2 were generated November 28, 2012.

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

Local projects are given a deadline of September 15, 2012 to enroll and withdraw migrant students on OMSIS. Following the deadline, the OMESC staff generates reports to confirm withdrawals on all students enrolled in K-12 institutions. Regional programs are notified if withdrawals are missing.

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Other support for corrective actions are:

1. The OMESC staff is available at all times for local recruiters/OMSIS specialists to call with questions.
 2. The OMESC has the I&R Helpdesk and the OMSIS Helpdesk e-mail accounts, for local MEP staff to e-mail questions on eligibility or request OMSIS corrections.
 3. The state recruiter/re-interviewer and the quality control manager review and verify the eligibility of the COE and its content.
 4. The OMESC implemented the COE Correction Form to allow immediate feedback from the local programs and/or recruiters on corrections needed on the COE.
 5. When filing the COEs, occasional discrepancies are found followed by immediate corrective actions.
 6. The OMESC provides professional development opportunity for staff at the state's ID&R Symposium, at the winter Oregon Association for Comprehensive Education Conference (OACE) and at the regional program, upon request.
 7. The OMESC provides a monthly report card to the 19 regional programs illustrating the total number of COEs submitted, the total number of COEs that are correct, the total number of COEs with errors, and a summary sheet explaining the types of errors.
 8. The OMESC provides a monthly Q & A webinar covering ID&R, OMSIS, and MSIX. All MEP staff are encouraged to participate and share questions or concerns.
- All of the findings are logged and corrective actions are taken at the OMESC for staff to incorporate and integrate in future trainings and mentorship.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon currently does not have any concerns regarding the accuracy of reporting the child count.