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)*
- 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 EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 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 mor 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

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
___Part I, 2011-12 _X_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

_____ Friday, April 5, 2013, 2:44:02 PM
Signature

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	23,658	S	60
4	23,308	S	61
5	23,662	S	54
6	11,659	S	54
7	6,417	S	59
8	5,933	S	61
High School	1,602	S	60
Total	96,239	S	58
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	23,468	S	66
4	23,163	S	71
5	23,548	S	65
6	11,607	S	59
7	6,376	S	66
8	5,894	S	60
High School	1,612	S	75
Total	95,668	S	66
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,533	S	65
4	4,598	S	67
5	4,721	S	60
6	2,883	S	57
7	2,189	S	58
8	2,190	S	62
High School	538	S	54
Total	21,652	S	62
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,523	S	74
4	4,586	S	78
5	4,716	S	71
6	2,879	S	64
7	2,177	S	74
8	2,190	S	66
High School	552	S	80
Total	21,623	S	72
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	33,145
Limited English proficient students	39,763
Students who are homeless	10,064
Migratory students	7,597
Comments:	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	10,180
Asian	8,068
Black or African American	10,062
Hispanic or Latino	61,857
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3,277
White	130,886
Two or more races	11,684
Total	236,014
Comments:	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	8	517	36	29	590
K	1,411	25,119	121	55	26,706
1	1,641	24,872	158	58	26,729
2	1,546	24,052	125	68	25,791
3	1,324	24,083	141	80	25,628
4	1,161	23,756	131	120	25,168
5	1,050	23,990	127	124	25,291
6	830	11,779	77	110	12,796
7	717	6,546	66	62	7,391
8	667	6,058	6	82	6,813
9	92	2,500	73	76	2,741
10	100	2,200	16	98	2,414
11	106	2,105	2	101	2,314
12	98	2,052	13	116	2,279
Ungraded	52	2,301			2,353
TOTALS	10,803	181,930	1,092	1,179	195,004

Comments: The sum of students reported as participating (195,004) is less than the number of students reported in the race, ethnicity section (236,041) resulting in a discrepancy of 41,010. The difference is due to reporting discrepancies at the School District level and is currently in the process of being addressed. Additionally, changes are being made to the collection that will flag inconsistent entries at the School District level requiring responses to be logically consistent. This will help to ameliorate such inconsistencies on future reports.

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

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

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

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

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	3,661
Reading/language arts	7,549
Science	519
Social studies	306
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	67
Comments: No data available for vocational/career.	

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

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

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	311
Supporting guidance/advocacy	78
Other support services	8
Comments:	

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

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

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

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	117	//////////////////////
Paraprofessionals[1]	110	85.30
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance)[2]	1	//////////////////////
Clerical support staff	2	//////////////////////
Administrators (non-clerical)	3	//////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

1. What is a *"paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
   (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
   (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
   (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
   (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
   (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
   (6) Acting as a translator; or
   (7) Providing instructional services to students.
2. What is an GÇ£other paraprofessional?GÇ¥ Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
3. Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc

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

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals[3]	1,823.50	95.60
Comments:		

2.1.4.1 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received an FY 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of $500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2011 (School Year 2011-2012) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than $500,000
Number of LEAs*	136	61
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	54,707	1,532,321
Sum of LEAs' FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations	17,834,231	119,651,446
Percentage of LEA's FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.30	1.30

[1] *The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2011 Title I, Part A allocation.In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2011-2012.

- Family nights on math, science and literacy -how to support students
- Parenting classes
- ESL and computer classes for parents
- Understanding academic standards and common core standards
- Summer parenting and student workshops
- Books and math manipulatives to take home and work with child

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

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012.

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	1
Comments:	

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2011. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages.

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

Participating Groups	**# Participants**
1. Families participating	47
2. Adults participating	47
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	4
4. Participating children	36
a. Birth through 2 years	31
b. Ages 3 through 5	5
c. Ages 6 through 8	0
c. Above age 8	0
Comments:	

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

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

Enrolled Families	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	47
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	47
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	47
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	47
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	0
Comments:	

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2012). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. **Report each family only once in lines 1-4.** Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	24
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	14
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	9
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	0
5. Total families enrolled	47
Comments:	

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

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

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

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

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

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

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	10	5	
Other			
Comments: Gain of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours or more in the program.			

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

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

Test	# Pre- and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	N<	N<	
BEST			
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			
Comments: Changed "# Who Met Goal" to 0 no learning gain to define.			

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

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

School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	7	5	
GED	40	11	
Other			
Comments:			

Non-School-Age Adults	# With Goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	0	0	
GED	0	0	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

The following terms apply:

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

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

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

The following terms apply:

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

Language Development Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Pre- and Post-	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT- III	0				We did not serve any children who were eligible based on age to be able to take the PPVT-III or the PPVY-IV.
PPVT- IV	0				
TVIP	0				
Comments:					

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

The following terms apply:

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

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

Language Development Measure	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	0				The program did not serve any children in this agre group.
PPVT-IV	0				
TVIP	0				
Comments:					

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

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year and who have been enrolled in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2011 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

Letter Identification Measure	# Age-Eligible	#	#	Average Number of Letters	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case					We did not have any eligible children.
Comments:					

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

The following terms apply:
1. "# in Cohort" includes school-aged children who have participated in Even Start for at least 6 months.

Grade	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	0		
1	0		
2	0		
3	0		
Comments:			

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

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

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

Measure of Parental Support	# in Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			Throughout our school year we used and provided informal assessments, parenting classes and ILA specific times every week as well as monthly home visits based on the Parents as Teachers curriculum for all of our enrolled parents in the program.
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other			
Comments:			

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	871
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	19,698
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4
K	740
1	640
2	581
3	407
4	351
5	395
6	388
7	401
8	430
9	435
10	499
11	517
12	476
Ungraded	53
Out-of-school	
Total	6,317
Comments: Oregon does not include out-of-school children as part of the PFS calculation.	

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	107
K	1,024
1	991
2	961
3	904
4	785
5	653
6	464
7	407
8	384
9	309
10	338
11	261
12	225
Ungraded	2
Out-of-school	3
Total	7,818
Comments:	

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*)
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	87
1	117
2	105
3	117
4	137
5	140
6	121
7	129
8	112
9	82
10	74
11	72
12	48
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	2
Total	1,350
Comments: Oregon does not collect SPED data for Age birth through 2.	

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within 12 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 13 – 24 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 25 – 36 Months from the last day of the reporting period	Last Qualifying Move Is within Previous 37 – 48 Months from the last day of the reporting period
Age birth through 2	440	319	110	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	891	838	744	407
K	380	430	400	229
1	327	388	404	230
2	324	391	351	267
3	284	400	352	247
4	262	366	321	236
5	282	345	338	224
6	221	331	321	247
7	250	307	302	219
8	209	344	305	232
9	189	271	252	224
10	167	278	277	205
11	165	228	255	218
12	105	227	236	211
Ungraded	59	14	5	4
Out-of-school	811	190	157	123
Total	5,366	5,667	5,130	3,525
Comments:				

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2011. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	501
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,929
K	1,013
1	939
2	917
3	865
4	825
5	827
6	765
7	739
8	748
9	647
10	658
11	618
12	555
Ungraded	42
Out-of-school	688
Total	13,276
Comments:	

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	N<
8	N<
9	5
10	8
11	34
12	51
Ungraded	
Total	101
Comments: Oregon did not have students with a grade UG that are marked as dropout.	

FAQ on Dropouts:
How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2010-11 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	4
Comments: Four students were reported as receiving their GED on the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS) this year. We do not have an explanation about the decrease.	

2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	1,035	1,028
4	967	964
5	989	986
6	957	956
7	905	901
8	954	947
HS	685	670
Total	6,492	6,452
Comments:		

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	1,035	1,034
4	967	964
5	989	985
6	958	958
7	906	903
8	955	949
HS	688	667
Total	6,498	6,460
Comments:		

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	25
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	356
K	535
1	554
2	563
3	550
4	547
5	559
6	500
7	492
8	515
9	481
10	492
11	444
12	391
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	34
Total	7,046
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services- During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	2
K	304
1	268
2	258
3	163
4	150
5	188
6	178
7	189
8	211
9	218
10	278
11	254
12	228
Ungraded	7
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,896

Comments: Out-of-school should be zero. The regional program accidently entered instructional services for the two OOS children that fall under the PFS criteria. This column should be zero. Even though Oregon does not include Out-of-school children as part of the PFS formula, OOS records are flagged on the table regardless.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten	263
K	349
1	379
2	367
3	356
4	343
5	369
6	279
7	242
8	236
9	267
10	287
11	261
12	216
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	6
Total	4,226
Comments:	

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			//////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	17	16	//////////////////////////////
K	237	142	//////////////////////////////
1	265	157	//////////////////////////////
2	259	178	//////////////////////////////
3	223	170	//////////////////////////////
4	226	154	//////////////////////////////
5	260	158	//////////////////////////////
6	188	85	//////////////////////////////
7	156	82	//////////////////////////////
8	157	79	//////////////////////////////
9	121	114	261
10	124	122	284
11	104	89	254
12	96	75	216
Ungraded			1
Out-of-school	3	3	6
Total	2,436	1,624	1,022

Comments: Oregon experienced a decrease with category 1 totals this year; therefore, the totals for Reading and Math MEP services decreased. Also, math instructions were mainly provided by non-MEP staff.

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

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	23	1
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	282	4
K	456	109
1	464	126
2	484	125
3	453	123
4	456	102
5	466	122
6	410	94
7	421	105
8	445	114
9	408	170
10	416	173
11	350	147
12	320	139
Ungraded	8	1
Out-of-school	34	3
Total	5,896	1,658

Comments: Oregon experienced a decreased with category 1 totals this year; therefore the totals for Supportive Services and Counseling Services also decreased. The total number of students served during the regular school year also experienced a decrease. Staff is periodically reminded to only document Counseling Services when the actual service involves a Title I-C funded personnel.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	146
K	208
1	211
2	221
3	209
4	183
5	209
6	184
7	187
8	222
9	199
10	199
11	171
12	161
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	24
Total	2,751

Comments: Oregon experienced a decrease with category 1 totals this year; therefore the totals for Referred Services also decreased. The total number of students served during the regular school year also experienced a decrease. Staff is periodically reminded to only document Counseling Services when the actual service involves a Title I-C funded personnel.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation- Summer/Intersession Term

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

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
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:	

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services -During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	387
1	314
2	281
3	208
4	162
5	196
6	141
7	107
8	95
9	87
10	109
11	105
12	33
Ungraded	42
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,267
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments:	

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarter	700
K	759
1	713
2	683
3	652
4	573
5	563
6	401
7	283
8	253
9	179
10	196
11	188
12	41
Ungraded	60
Out-of-school	
Total	6,244
Comments: Oregon changed the coding for this report to maintain the grade levels reported under the Regular school year an not what was reported during the summer session.	

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2			//////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	413	392	//////////////////////////////
K	729	660	//////////////////////////////
1	693	630	//////////////////////////////
2	658	587	//////////////////////////////
3	613	539	//////////////////////////////
4	542	474	//////////////////////////////
5	535	488	//////////////////////////////
6	334	317	//////////////////////////////
7	237	230	//////////////////////////////
8	178	173	//////////////////////////////
9	90	55	177
10	99	46	196
11	104	44	186
12	11	5	28
Ungraded	21	21	37
Out-of-school			
Total	5,257	4,661	624
Comments:			

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

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	633	2
K	738	63
1	694	62
2	668	93
3	641	40
4	560	114
5	552	115
6	394	56
7	267	43
8	235	47
9	162	51
10	177	68
11	166	75
12	24	9
Ungraded	40	1
Out-of-school		
Total	5,951	839
Comments:		

FAQs on Support Services:

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

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	230
K	243
1	200
2	236
3	205
4	142
5	176
6	86
7	77
8	71
9	59
10	78
11	76
12	3
Ungraded	3
Out-of-school	
Total	1,885
Comments:	

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	26
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	919
K	1,010
1	954
2	956
3	929
4	862
5	829
6	702
7	606
8	640
9	546
10	588
11	517
12	421
Ungraded	69
Out-of-school	35
Total	10,609
Comments:	

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	713
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	14,300
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: These are 0- because MEP funds are not consolidated with Schoolwide Programs.	

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	60	2,019
Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	93	14,376
Comments:		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Teachers	41	6	359	266
Counselors	1	0	0	0
All paraprofessionals	83	24	231	178
Recruiters	61	38	51	33
Records transfer staff	26	14	25	14
Administrators	17	9	26	16
Comments: One of our local MEP regional program hired 50% more Paraprofessionals and 6 additional teachers but fewer FTE for teachers than last year (2010-2011) to build capacity to provide services in two new after-school programs in two districts. Another reason could be the communication given to regional program detailing the difference and definitions between Paraprofessional and Qualified Paraprofessional.				

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

FAQs on MEP staff:

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

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

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

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

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

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

g. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year Headcount	Regular School Year FTE	Summer/Intersession Term Headcount	Summer/Intersession Term FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	70	16.30	204	149.20
Comments: The reasons for the increase to Qualified Paraprofessionals are due to the following: One of the 19 regional program hired 50% more Qualified Paraprofessionals to provide services in two new after-school programs in two districts. Another reason could be the communication given to regional program detailing the difference and definitions between Paraprofessional and Qualified Paraprofessional.				

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated
  - children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students.

Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	27	148
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	8	139
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	1	67
Total	36	
Comments: 1 is a Multipurpose Facility. 11 are number of facilities rolled up.		

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	27
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	8
Adult Corrections	0
Other	1
Total	36
Comments:	

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1,848		825	0	51
Long Term Students Served	893		547	0	12

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native	113		25	0	25
Asian	15		3	0	0
Black or African American	150		104	0	0
Hispanic or Latino	135		182	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	26		3	0	0
White	1,243		502	0	16
Two or more races	166		6	0	10
Total	1,848		825	0	51

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,096		734	0	26
Female	738		91	0	25
Total	1,834		825	0	51

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	33		0	0	0
6	37		0	0	0
7	60		0	0	0
8	81		0	0	0
9	96		0	0	0
10	106		0	0	0
11	85		0	0	3
12	120		1	0	3
13	136		3	0	5
14	176		25	0	4
15	235		59	0	16
16	287		123	0	6
17	274		250	0	13
18	78		233	0	1
19	8		98	0	0
20	3		31	0	0
21	33		2	0	0
Total	1,848		825	0	51

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Data received from sites was erroneous. Corrections are underway.

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

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	724	0	659	0	26
Enrolled in a GED program	38	0	27	0	N<
Comments:					

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	314	0	218	0	11
Earned a GED	23	0	49	0	N<
Obtained high school diploma	21	0	121	0	N<
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	21	0	76	0	N<
Comments:					

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 1

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention Facilities	Juvenile Corrections Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training course/programs	288	0	62	0	N<
Obtained employment	24	0	28	0	N<
Comments:					

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year.Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	585		N<	0	N<
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	528		N<	0	N<

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	47		35	0	N<
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	115		25	0	N<
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	151		30	0	N<
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	126		39	0	N<
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	89		12	0	N<
Comments: Date received from facilities contained errors. Data will be corrected and resubmitted.					

FAQ on long-term students:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	595		N<	0	N<
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	511		N<	0	N<

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	37		40	0	N<
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	102		30	0	N<
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	139		26	0	N<
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	115		26	0	N<
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	118		12	0	N<
Comments: Date received from facilities contained errors. Data will be corrected.					

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students.

Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	16	55
Neglected programs	4	31
Juvenile detention	5	143
Juvenile corrections	8	107
Other	4	66
Total	37	
Comments:		

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	16
Neglected programs	4
Juvenile detention	5
Juvenile corrections	8
Other	4
Total	37
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2,183	176	893	338	145
Total Long Term Students Served	332	46		201	42

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	23	8	50	16	6
Asian	3	3	1	8	3
Black or African American	25	7	16	21	7
Hispanic or Latino	146	54	72	64	46
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5			1	3
White	435	93	377	221	72
Two or more races	42	11	377	7	2
Total	679	176	893	338	139

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,239	137	413	270	104
Female	944	39	121	68	41
Total	2,183	176	534	338	145

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11			2		
12	4	5	23		2
13	60	13	40	4	5
14	95	22	79	25	25
15	188	34	92	64	32
16	421	46	113	92	28
17	544	41	153	94	37
18	827	14	29	48	3
19	35	1	2	10	4
20	9		1	1	4
21					
Total	2,183	176	534	338	140

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

Comments: The AR Race subtotal discrepancy is due to several districts that undereported in the Race/Ethnicity Section. However, one district, Salem-Keizer School District under-reported by 1504 students. We are working with the district to clear up this discrepancy. Other districts were easily corrected. Additionally, changes are being made to the collection that will flag inconsistent entries at the School District level requiring responses to be logically consistent. This will help to ameliorate such inconsistencies on future reports.

Juvenile Detention/Total Unduplicated Students Served -the number 893 should be 534.
Other Programs/ Total Unduplicated Students Served- the number 145 should be 140.
Juvenile Detention/Two or more races, it looks like the number 377 was duplicated from the count for "White" directly above it. The correct number should be zero (0). How are you populating 2.4.2.2, Box 1, Row 1 (Total Unduplicated Students Served)? We are trying to understand how you came up with numbers that differ from our unduplicated student counts. Since 2.4.2.2 is pulled from ED127 and ED135 - how did you get 893 for Juvenile Detention and 145 for other Programs Total Unduplicated Students Served? We noticed that in both instances of disagreement the numbers in question correspond with the highest reported total from Boxes 2, 3, and 4. Is your script looking for the highest reported column total in any of the boxes in 2.4.2.2 and using that number to populate 2.4.2.2, Box 1, Row 1 (Total Unduplicated Students Served)?

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	1,472	125	N<	434	99
Enrolled in a GED program	392	7	N<	72	6

Comments: The JC count of the number of students who earned high school course credits includes JD students. The collection that populates this count does not disaggregate JD and JC. The collection that populates the unduplicated student count from 2.4.2.2 does include separate counts for JD and JC. The combined unduplicated student count for JD and JC from 2.4.2.2 is 872. The number of students who earned high school course credits is 434, again representing a combined count of JD and JC students, and is well below the combined unduplicated student count of 872. The same is true for students who enrolled in their local district school: the count of 348 represents JD and JC combined and is well below the combined unduplicated count of 872.
We are currently in the process of separating JD and JC in the collection that populates 2.4.2.4 so that separate counts can be provided in future years.

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	47	27	N<	348	44
Earned a GED	353	6	N<	28	N<
Obtained high school diploma	222	N<	N<	16	N<
Accepted or enrolled in post-secondary education	N<	N<	N<	15	N<

Comments: The JC count of the number of students who earned high school course credits includes JD students. The collection that populates this count does not disaggregate JD and JC. The collection that populates the unduplicated student count from 2.4.2.2 does include separate counts for JD and JC. The combined unduplicated student count for JD and JC from 2.4.2.2 is 872. The number of students who earned high school course credits is 434, again representing a combined count of JD and JC students, and is well below the combined unduplicated student count of 872. The same is true for students who enrolled in their local district school: the count of 348 represents JD and JC combined and is well below the combined unduplicated count of 872.
We are currently in the process of separating JD and JC in the collection that populates 2.4.2.4 so that separate counts can be provided in future years.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes- Subpart 2

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	9	N<	N<	124	N<
Obtained employment	16	N<	N<	54	N<
Comments:					

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance- Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

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

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2011, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the tables is an FAQ about the data collected in these tables.

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	195	29		211	26
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	160	36		129	29

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	23	4		17	N<
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	29	8		17	N<
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	52	14		17	6
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	23	6		19	6
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	33	4		59	10
Comments: The sum of students demonstrating test results (211) is greater than the number of students reported as long term students (201). The difference is due to reporting both JD and JC as an aggregated number in this field. Steps are being taken to ensure we are able to disaggregate between these two categories in the future. Additionally, changes are being made to the collection that will flag inconsistent entries at the School District level requiring responses to be logically consistent. This will help to ameliorate such inconsistencies on future reports.					

FAQ on long-term:
What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent testing data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	182	29		123	48
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	147	28		152	33

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data).	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	N<		17	6
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	42	8		15	12
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	52	10		51	N<
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	27	N<		29	N<
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	N<	5		37	9
Comments: The sum of students demonstrating test results (332) is less than the number of students reported as having complete pre- and post-test results (356). The difference is due to reporting discrepancies at the School District level and is currently in the process of being addressed. Additionally, changes are being made to the collection that will flag inconsistent entries at the School District level requiring responses to be logically consistent. This will help to ameliorate such inconsistencies on future reports.					

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

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (TITLE IV,PART A).

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual, even	2010	2009-10: .5%	2009-10: 1.7%	1.2	2002-03
				2010-11: .5%	2010-11: 1.4%		
				2011-12: 1.4%	2011-12: 0%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual even	2010	2009-10: .5%	2009-10: 1.2%	.5%	2002-03
				2010-11: .5%	2010-11: 1.6%		
				2011-12: .5%	2011-12: 1.6%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who engaged in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual even	2010	2009-10: 13%	2009-10: 17.3%	15.9%	2002-03
				2010-11: 13%	2010-11: 21.4%		
				2011-12: 13%	2011-12: 21.4%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who engaged in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months	2010 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual even	2010	2009-10: .5%	2009-10: 10.1%	10.1%	2002-03
				2010-11: .5%	2010-11: 10.1%		
				2011-12: .5%	2011-12: 10.1%		
				2012-13: 10.1%			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
*% of 8th grade students offered, sold or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2009 (2011 OHT did not contain this question)	2009-10: 10%	2009-10: 18.8%	13.1%	2002-03
				2010-11: 10%	2010-11: 18.8%		
				2011-12: 10%	2011-12: 18.8%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
*% of 11th grade students offered, sold or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2009 (2011 OHT did not contain this question)	2009-10: 22%	2009-10: 25.6%	25.1%	2002-03
				2010-11: 22%	2010-11: 25.6%		
				2011-12: 22%	2011-12: 25.6%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who used illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 13.5%	2009-10: 18.2%	15.9%	2003-04
				2010-11: 13.5%	2010-11: 16.7%		
				2011-12: 13.5%	2011-12: 1 4 % (Marijuana &Prescription drugs)		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who used illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 20%	2009-10: 26.1%	24.3%	2003-04
				2010-11: 20%	2010-11: 27%		
				2011-12: 2 0 %	2011-12: 2 8 % (Marijuana &Prescription drugs)		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 22%	2009-10: 22.5%	24.7%	2002-03
				2010-11: 22%	2010-11: 20%		
				2011-12: 22%	2011-12: 20%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 35%	2009-10: 36.3%	43.4%	2002-03
				2010-11: 35%	2010-11: 35%		
				2011-12:	2011-12:		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 8%	2009-10: 13.9%	14.6%	2004-05
				2010-11: 8%	2010-11: 15%		
				2011-12: 8%	2011-12: 14%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 9.5%	2009-10: 12.6%	12.5%	2004-05
				2010-11: 9.5%	2010-11: 12%		
				2011-12: 9.5%	2011-12: 13%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 38%	2009-10: 52.5%	48.1%	2004-05
				2010-11: 38%	2010-11: 38%		
				2011-12: 38%	2011-12: 37%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 20%	2009-10: 40.4%	41.2%	2004-05
				2010-11: 20%	2010-11: 2 7 %		
				2011-12: 20%	2011-12: 28%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05 (2011 question read: Did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 3.5%	2009-10: 18.5%	6.7%	2004-05
				2010-11: 3.5%	2010-11: 6 %		
				2011-12: 3.5%	2011-12: 6%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05 (2011 question read: Did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 2.5%	2009-10: 15.2%	4.7%	2004-05
				2010-11: 2.5%	2010-11: 3 %		
				2011-12: 2.5%	2011-12: 4%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 8%	2009-10: 12.2%	12.7%	2002-03
				2010-11: 8%	2010-11: 1 1 %		
				2011-12: 8%	2011-12: 11%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 14.5%	2009-10: 23.7%	23.4%	2002-03
				2010-11: 13.5%	2010-11: 2 1 %		
				2011-12: 24.5%	2011-12: 21%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month (how many days did you smoke cigarettes'05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 7.5%	2009-10: 9.8%	10.5%	2002-03
				2010-11: 7.5%	2010-11: 7 %		
				2011-12: 7.5%	2011-12: 7%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 14.5%	2009-10: 20%	18.7%	2002-03
				2010-11: 14.5%	2010-11: 1 1 %		
				2011-12: 14.5%	2011-12: 12%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to smoke one or more packs of cigaretts a day '05) (Perceived usage greater than 10%, Moderate to High risk of smoking cigarettes. OHT 2011)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 85.8%	95.1%	2002-03
				2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 9 0 %		
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 89%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to smoke one or more packs of cigaretts a day '05) (Perceived usage greater than 10%, Moderate to High risk of smoking cigarettes. OHT 2011)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 85.1%	95.3%	2002-03
				2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 9 4 %		
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 92%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to grea '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 74.2%	85.5%	2002-03
				2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 6 6 %		
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 65%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to grea '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 90%	2009-10: 6 5 . 8 %	78.4%	2002-03
				2010-11: 90%	2010-11: 6 0 . 1 %		
				2011-12: 90%	2011-12: 55%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05) How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to smoke one to two packs of cigarettes (T) a day?; …to have one to two drinks of an alcoholic (A) beverage nearly every day?; … for someone to use marijuana (M) once or twice & to use marijuana (M) once or more a month?'05) (OHT, 2011: How much people risk harming themselves from usage of different substances (Tobacco [T], Alcohol [A], Marijuana [M]) in specific quantities over defined time periods?, as listed above)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2011 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2010	Annual	2011& 2010	2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 98.5%	98.3%	2003-04
				2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 96.2% T 93.9% A 79.6% M		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 89% 79% A 65% M		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. (some one your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05) How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to smoke one to two packs of cigarettes (T) a day?; …to have one to two drinks of an alcoholic (A) beverage nearly every day?; … for someone to use marijuana (M) once or twice & to use marijuana (M) once or more a month?'05) (OHT, 2011: How much	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2011 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2010	Annual	2011& 2010	2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 97.8%	97.4%	2003-04
				2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 96.2% T 93.9% A 79.6% M		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 92% 64% A 55% M		
				2012-13:			

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
people risk harming themselves from usage of different substances (Tobacco [T], Alcohol [A], Marijuana [M]) in specific quantities over defined time periods?, as listed above)				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 6 4 . 9 %	88.4%	2002-03
				2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 7 9 %		
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 59%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey	Bi-annual odd	2011	2009-10: 95%	2009-10: 6 4 . 9 %	86.8%	2002-03
				2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 8 3 %		
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 64%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 99.2%	2009-10: 96.6%	95.9%	2002-03
				2010-11: 99.2%	2010-11: 96.6%		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 96.6%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 92.4%	91.3%	2002-03
				2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 92.4%		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 92.4%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 97.5%	94.1%	2002-03
				2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 90.3%		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 90.3%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 97%	2009-10: 79.4%	88.8%	2002-03
				2010-11: 97%	2010-11: 79.4%		
				2011-12: 97%	2011-12: 74.9%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 99%	2009-10: 94.1%	96.3%	2002-03
				2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 94.1%		
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 94.1%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04) (their added '05)	Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-annual even	2010	2009-10: 98.5%	2009-10: 88.2%	94.8 %	2002-03
				2010-11: 98.5%	2010-11: 88.2%		
				2011-12: 98.5%	2011-12: 88.2%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05) (OHT 2011 only asked: How many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be your way to or from school?) unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey	Bi-annual odd	2009 & 2011	2009-10: 2.5%	2009-10: 7.5%	4.8 %	2002-03
				2010-11: 2.5%	2010-11: 6%		
				2011-12: 2.5%	2011-12: 6%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05) (OHT 2011 only asked: How many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be your way to or from school?) unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey	Bi-annual odd	2009 & 2011	2009-10: 3%	2009-10: 4.9%	5.2%	2002-03
				2010-11: 3%	2010-11: 4.9%		
				2011-12: 3%	2011-12: 4%		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baselin	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2011 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS)	Annual	2012	2009-10: 16,000	2009-10: 16,667	17,804	2003-04
				2010-11: 16,000	2010-11: 14,008		
				2011-12: 16,000	2011-12: 11,754 youth (out of 15,591) referrals)		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS)	Annual	2012	2009-10: 5,900	2009-10: 5,939	6,462	2003-04
				2010-11: 5,900	2010-11: 4,894		
				2011-12: 5,900	2011-12: 3,807 youth (out of 5,840 referrals)		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
# of persistently dangerous schools	ODE Disciplinary Incidents Collection	Annual	2012	2009-10: 11:0	2009-10: 11:0	1	2002-03
				2010-11: 11:0	2010-11: 11:0		
				2011-12: 12:0	2011-12: 12:0		
				2012-13:			
				2013-14:			
Comments:							

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	Violation of school policy or law relating to alcohol which includes Violation of laws or ordinances prohibiting the manufacture, sale, purchase, transportation, possession, or consumption of intoxicating alcoholic beverages or substances represented as alcohol.
Illicit drug related	Violation of school policy or law relating to other drugs, which includes the use, possession, sale or solicitation of drugs as identified in 21 U.S.C. Section 812(c). These offenses do NOT include use, possession, sale, or solicitation of alcohol or tobacco.
Violent incident without physical injury	Expelled from your school and arrested for any of the following criminal offenses on school grounds, on school sponsored transportation, and/or school sponsored activities that do not result in physical injury and could include the following: • Assault (ORS 163.160, ORS 163.165, ORS 163.175, ORS 163.185) • Manufacture or delivery of a controlled substance (ORS 475.992 (1-3)) • Sexual crimes using force, threatened use of force or against incapacitated person (ORS 163.375, ORS 163.395, ORS 163.411, ORS 163.427) • Arson (ORS 164.315, ORS 164.325) • Robbery (ORS 164.395, ORS 164.405, ORS 164.415), • Hate/Bias Crime (ORS 166.155, ORS 166.165) • Coercion (ORS 163.275), • Kidnapping (ORS 163.225, ORS 163.235).
Violent incident with physical injury	Expelled, not arrested, for any of the following behaviors resulting in physical injury: • battery/other forms of physical fighting; • sexual battery (assault); • homicide; • suicide; • arson; and • robbery; • hate/bias crime; • coercion/extortion; • intimidation; threats of violence or harm; • kidnapping; • school threat; • vandalism, damage to school or private property.
Weapons possession	Means possessing a weapon, firearm, knife or sharp object, device, instrument, material or substance, animate or inanimate, that is used for, or is readily capable of causing death or serious bodily injury, except that it does not include a pocket knife with a blade of less than 2 ½ inches in length.
Comments:	

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	3,968	197
6 through 8	7,580	197
9 through 12	4,777	197
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	5	197
6 through 8	128	197
9 through 12	162	197
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	636	197
6 through 8	533	197
9 through 12	211	197
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	197
6 through 8	17	197
9 through 12	25	197
Comments:		

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	341	197
6 through 8	269	197
9 through 12	276	197
Comments:		

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	20	197
6 through 8	98	197
9 through 12	106	197
Comments:		

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	9	197
6 through 8	124	197
9 through 12	360	197
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	197
6 through 8	17	197
9 through 12	49	197
Comments:		

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	23	197
6 through 8	765	197
9 through 12	2,365	197
Comments:		

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<	197
6 through 8	203	197
9 through 12	555	197
Comments:		

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Coordinated efforts among the ODE, OHA, DHS, Juvenile Justice, state and local community partners, and school personnel continue to work towards involving the parents and local community members and stakeholders in safe schools initiatives, violence and substance abuse prevention and positive discipline intervention strategies.

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

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEA
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	5
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	17
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	14
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	7
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	11
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	6
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

During the 2011-12 school year, Oregon used the new approved cohort method for calculating graduation rates. The new cohort graduation rate calculation implementation saw an increase in districts failing to meet the target of graduation. The AYP targets also increased in the 2011-12 school year, which meant that in the state of Oregon more districts went into district improvement than in previous years. RLIS districts reflect the trend of increased number of districts failing to meet new graduation targets and falling into district improvement.

Oregon got an approved ESEA waiver during the 2011-12 school year, which means that the calculation for district improvement will not exist for 2012-13. The calculation for adequate yearly progress has also change to a modified growth model.

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

Outcomes:
Oregon had twenty-four RLIS school districts in 2011-12. Eleven met the graduation rate. Eight of the districts are in District Improvement. One district that had been in District Improvement is no longer in District Improvement status. ODE monitors how the RLIS funds are utilized to ensure that the funds are targeted towards the issues that put the district into District Improvement status.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2011-12?	_____No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	8
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

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

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	8	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	//////////////////////////////	8
In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2012 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.		

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	284,993.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	//////////////////////////////	284,993.00
Total	284,993.00	284,993.00
Comments:		

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

2.11 GRADUATION RATES

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2011-12). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	68
American Indian or Alaska Native	51
Asian	81
Black or African American	53
Hispanic or Latino	60
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	66
White	71
Two or more races	69
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	38
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49
Economically disadvantaged	61

FAQs on graduation rates:

- What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf.

  The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States granted ESEA Flexibility should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to EDFacts.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to reward (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the school was identified as a high progress or high performing reward school
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(g).

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

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

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

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13 : Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific designation (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessmentWhether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- Status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement v Year 1, School Improvement v Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (This information must be provided by all States.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved ESEA flexibility request
- State-specific status for SY 2012-13 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2012-13: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2012-13 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.