

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 2012-13**

OREGON



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2013
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2014**

**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) 2012-13 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 200~~06~~6, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2012-13 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 20, 2013**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 14, 2014**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2012-13, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2012-13 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 2012-13 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2012-13 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2012-13	
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: Russ Sweet	
Telephone: 503-947-5638	
Fax: 503-378-5156	
e-mail: russ.sweet@state.or.us	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Russ Sweet	
_____ Signature	
_____ Friday, April 4, 2014, 4:15:33 PM	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2012-13



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 17, 2012
5PM EST**

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	23,789	S	55.9
4	23,408	S	58.5
5	23,276	S	52.3
6	11,839	S	52.0
7	6,701	S	53.4
8	6,326	S	58.0
High School	1,827	S	67
Total	97,166	S	55.3
Comments:			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	23,597	S	61.6
4	23,263	S	69.8
5	23,140	S	63.1
6	11,781	S	55.3
7	6,652	S	64.7
8	6,297	S	56.1
High School	1,835	S	80
Total	96,565	S	63.4
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	4,154	S	63.6
4	4,231	S	65.9
5	4,162	S	59.8
6	2,203	S	58
7	1,708	S	61
8	1,709	S	61
High School	539	S	50
Total	18,706	S	61.7
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	4,142	S	71.5
4	4,223	S	77.7
5	4,145	S	72.0
6	2,202	S	67
7	1,702	S	76
8	1,710	S	68
High School	542	S	78
Total	18,666	S	72.8
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 (<i>IDEA</i>)	36,034
Limited English proficient students	40,557
Students who are homeless	9,537
Migratory students	9,036
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	9,090
Asian	5,731
Black or African American	6,710
Hispanic or Latino	59,484
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1,646
White	103,695
Two or more races	8,222
Total	194,578
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)	22	328	42	3	395
K	1,381	25,807	118	37	27,343
1	1,653	25,589	155	35	27,432
2	1,536	24,484	166	45	26,231
3	1,487	23,926	126	62	25,601
4	1,093	23,505	147	59	24,804
5	1,030	22,764	111	54	23,959
6	457	11,341	120	63	11,981
7	517	7,116	94	37	7,764
8	423	6,845	101	63	7,432
9	39	2,360	128	138	2,665
10	81	2,260	140	130	2,611
11	105	2,115	155	167	2,542
12	91	2,102	211	68	2,472
Ungraded	22	597		33	652
TOTALS	9,937	181,139	1,814	994	193,884

Comments: We do not collect data on ~~2~~ year olds.

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	2,603
Reading/language arts	6,302
Science	180
Social studies	109
Vocational/career	52
Other instructional services	22
Comments:	

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	
Supporting guidance/advocacy	
Other support services	3
Comments: We do not collect data on these support services.	

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	98	
Paraprofessionals ¹	79	99.40
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	1	
Clerical support staff	1	
Administrators (non-clerical)	1	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

- a. 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:
 - (a) 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;
 - (b) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (c) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (d) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (e) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (f) Acting as a translator; or
 - (g) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. 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	1,842.70	93.40
Comments:		

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

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2012 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal fiscal year (FY) 2012 (School Year 2012–2013) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs *	137	60
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental Involvement	71,788	1,528,583
Sum of LEAs' FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations	19,385,650	120,283,656
Percentage of LEA's FY 2012 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.40	1.30

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2012 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 2012–2013.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- 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

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 performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. 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 performance period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the performance period would only be performance in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school in the previous performance period (September 1, 2011 v August 31, 2012), youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Oregon does not have any concern's regarding eligibility determination on which the counts are based.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is

calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,980
K	1,405
1	1,408
2	1,382
3	1,296
4	1,275
5	1,146
6	1,129
7	1,091
8	1,027
9	1,068
10	866
11	842
12	875
Ungraded	54
Out-of-school	1,389
Total	19,233
Comments:	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Oregon had an increase for performance year 2012.2013. The 19 Regional Programs responded with possible reasons that contributed to the increase in Category 1 count: programs made extra efforts to contact families, changing recruitment strategies (more door-to-door recruitment, recruiting in pairs, exploring new apartment complexes, increase OSY recruitment in camps, explore new camps, conducting radio announcements, etc.), increased number of families moving for the strawberries harvest, cross checking the LEA's student information system against OMSIS, and etc. The Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) met and work with the 19 MEP regional programs to review and modify regional ID&R plans. The consultation created awareness of what works and what needed changes.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children from age birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	948
Comments:	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August 31, 2013. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	771
K	687
1	791
2	736
3	683
4	631
5	504
6	402
7	340
8	235
9	236
10	200
11	156
12	41
Ungraded	40
Out-of-school	0
Total	6,453
Comments: Oregon does not include out-of-school children as part of the PFS calculation.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Below are the responses/strategies used by the 19 regional programs regarding the increase to the Category 2 count: communicating to parents about the importance of having their child attend summer school, concentrating and reaching out to PFS students, motivating student's interest by providing incentives for attending summer school; binational teachers multicultural attributes, involvement and participating during summer school attracted and involved parents and students; had an influx of families moving to harvest strawberries; follow-up and confirmation phone calls to families reminding them of summer school dates and bus routes; explored new camps; etc.

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2012 through August

31, 2013. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received Q!lly referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	0
Comments: Data will be reviewed and updated as necessary for resubmission.	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	No Response
MIS 2000	No Response
COEStar	No Response
MAPS	No Response
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	Yes
Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS)	

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	Yes

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable

2.3.1.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Data Collection and Management Procedures	(Yes/No)
Does the State collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	Ye

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period . In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- Children who were age 3 through 21
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity)
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31)
- Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods
- Children counted once per age/grade level for each child count category
- Children two years of age that turned three years old during the performance period.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Children who were age 3-21

All eligible children ages 0-21 are listed on the COE and entered on OMSIS. When COEs are processed on OMSIS, each child is assigned a unique OMSIS number. Before OMSIS appends the record, the system validates the student's age and QAD. The system validates for children who were born after the QAD, who are over 22yrs as of the enroll/out-of-school (OOS) date, and who have a QAD before 09/01/09 for the year 09/01/12 - 08/31/13.

When Cat. 1 and 2 counts are generated, students between 0-2yrs as of the enroll or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned 3yrs old between 09/01/12 and 08/31/13--staff generates and distributes the 2 Turning 3 reports twice a year.

Recruiters' follow-up, make contacts, and update the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters and data clerks contact the families to verify residency of the child. Once residency at age three is determined the data clerks re-enrolls the child back on OMSIS with the contact date as the new enroll or OOS date. The contact date must be greater than the child's third birthday. The data clerk reenrolls and updates the GR level to P3. The OMSIS checks the latest enrollment ID and validates the enroll/OOS date against the child's DOB to verify if the age is 3yrs old.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria...

All children that meet the definition of MEP are listed on the COE. The COE is used to document new qualifying moves and used as an initial Enrollment Form (EF) on OMSIS. Other EF used to update a child's school enrollment on OMSIS are: 1) the Mass Enrollment (ME) List and 2) the Change of Residency/School Enrollment Form (CRSEF). The ME list all students eligible as of September 1, 2012 (QAD => 09/01/2009 and validate for termination codes) and the CRSEF form document changes to the child's enrollment status not related to a new qualifying move (e.g. re-enrollment for a new school year, transfer, or a move to a new address.)

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

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day...

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

Verifying child's residency is done through a face-to-face contact, telephone contact, checking the LEA SIS, or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children are done with the aid of the ME list which lists all OOS children from 2011-12 SY that are eligible for 2012-13 SY. Before re-enrolling OOS children for 2012.13 SY, the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the ME list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move, a new COE is completed. No documentation is needed if the family cannot be found.

Children who - in the case of Cat. 2 - were served for one ore more days...

Cat. 2 counts include children enrolled in a Title IC SS and Inters. programs, who have received supplemental instruct./support services. Like the RSY program, recruiters complete one of the 3 enrollment forms to enroll and enter the data on OMSIS. Students must be eligible and 3yrs old on the first day of SS and inters. Enrollments entered are flagged with an enrollment type "S" to distinguish from RSY enrollments.

SS and Inters. programs are required to complete a "SS Title IC Withdrawal Form" for each student enrolled. The form captures withdrawal dates, days enrolled/present, and supplemental instruct./support services the student received. The completed form is forwarded to the data clerks for entry on OMSIS. The data is stored in the Enrollment and Service tables. The enrollment table is compared against the service table to verify that students enrolled have at least 2 or more services reported. Records with no services are excluded from the Cat. 2 count.

Children counted once per age/grade level for each...

Before enrollment is accepted on OMSIS, the following is validated for each student: (1) enroll or OOS date is => the QAD date; (2) age is < 22yrs as of the enrolled or OOS date; (3) previous school does not contain a termination flag of G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased; (4) and is 3yrs old and has an enrollment or OOS date on or after their 3rd birthday.

Cat. 1

Data is verified in two tables for Cat. 1 count: Student Information (SI) table and the Enrollment (EN) tables. The SI table has the primary key (OMSIS ID), student names, and demographics. This ensures only one OMSIS ID for each student. The EN table has student's enrollments, withdrawals, and all enrollment IDs for separate enrollment periods and types. These two tables have the OMSIS ID in common which allows for the relationship.

The criteria for Cat. 1 count are as follows: student must be enroll or OOS between 09/01/12-08/31/13; age between 3-21yrs between 09/01/12-08/31/13; age = 3yrs between 09/01/12-08/31/13 must have a new enrollment ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3yrs greater than student's DOB; recorded date (which stores the value of either the enroll/OOS date) between the start and end dates. The start date is 09/01/12; the end date 09/30/2013; QAD => 09/01/09; residency date between 09/01/2012 to 08/31/13; student identified after 09/01/13, residency between 09/01/2012 and 08/31/13; and for a student whose RSY started in August 2012, the 2012-13 enrollment must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/12.

All 8 conditions must be met before a child is counted for Cat. 1. The results of the above criteria are stored in the 1213_FederalRegularCount.dbf table. The table is then manually scanned for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and removed from the Cat. 1 count.

Cat. 2

We use the two tables mentioned in Cat. 1 and in addition the Services table. The Services table contains instruct. and support services provided during inters. and SS programs.

Using the 2 tables for Cat. 1, the criteria are: student enrolled between 01/01/12 and 08/31/12; 3yrs as of the enroll date; age is < 22yrs as of the enroll date; recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 01/01/12 and 08/31/12; enroll type = "S"; at least 2 or more service codes; previous enrollment do not = G/graduated, E/received GED, or D/deceased.

All 7 conditions must be met for a student to be counted for Cat. 2. The results are stored 1213_FederalSummerCount.dbf table, where it is manually scanned. Any duplicates found are removed from the Cat. 2 count.

Children two years of age that turned three years...

Re-enrolling of children 2yrs turning 3yrs old. The OMESC assist the districts with this re-enrollment process by generating a list twice a year of children who turned 3yrs during the performance year. The process for re-enrolling requires the recruiters to make a phone call or visit the family's residence after the child's 3rd birthday.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file?

We ensure the accuracy of the data by applying several stages of validations.

Regional Programs

Eligible student data are entered on the OMSIS by the 19 local data clerks. Data clerk's duties are to maintain the accuracy, consistency and integrity of their regional data on OMSIS. When a new COE is completed and handed to the clerks, they review the COE for completeness, accuracy, and then search the OMSIS for a possible match. If there is a match then the ID is recorded on the COE. If the student doesn't exist, the data clerk takes the necessary steps to search the system before creating a new record. Because OMSIS is a web base the data clerks have immediate access to generate reports on either LEA or school level to ensure that all students are accounted for in each school. Monthly MEP print-outs are sent to school building principles for verification and information purposes.

OMSIS System Validation

The OMSIS performs the following steps for validation:

Step 1: check authorized region IDs and users.

Step 2: check for new student's names, DOB, and mother's maiden name for duplicate record: If record exists, notify the users.

Step 3: check for dates: (DOB, EOE, enroll, residency, OOS, QAD, signature dates).

Step 4: data clerks performs cross-tabulation of names search before they request new OMSIS IDs.

Step 5: OMSIS is a relational database that contains many records arranged in different tables. All tables are related using two key elements; OMSIS ID (Primary key) and enrollment key. The two keys combined identify a student and a specific enrollment period. The ID is assigned when the student is first enrolled on OMSIS. This ID can never be assigned to another student, and follows the student everywhere he attends school in Oregon.

State Level Validation

The OMESC provides the 19 regional MEPs with counts of eligible students in their districts on a monthly basis. Counts are broken down by age/grade, program data, enroll children and OOS children. The OMESC staff, ED Facts/CSPR Coordinators work closely to review and resolve issues relating to Title IC data.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	(Yes/No)
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	Yes
If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.	
The response is limited to 8,000 characters.	
Oregon uses MSIX to: resolve conflicting information (names, DOB, parents name, etc.); to verify student's eligibility; to search for history of Qualifying Moves; to notify states of student arrival and departure, to obtain information from other states; to review students testing and high school transcripts, etc. We are active users of MSIX.	

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	Yes
Do the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	Yes
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	Yes
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	Yes
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	Yes
Does the SEA review student attendance at summer/inter-session projects?	Yes
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	Yes
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	Yes
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	Yes

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	75
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	75
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	73

Describe any reasons children were determined ineligible in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We had two samples that we determined ineligible. The first ineligible sample revealed that the worker had permission to leave and was guaranteed the same job when he returned; the second ineligible sample, revealed that the worker performed a job that was not related to agriculture/fishing/forestry.

Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	Yes
Was the sampling statewide?	Yes

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's re-interview procedures are as follows:

1. Monthly the OMESC generates a list from OMSIS of COEs signed in the last four weeks.
2. The OMESC then appends the student list to an Excel spreadsheet. Computerized selections of random names are generated through a formula. The formula used to determine random sample for re-interviews are as follows:
 - a. Random number generation,
 - b. The number of variables is 1,
 - c. The number of random numbers is the number of students recruited from the previous year,
 - d. Uses a binomial distribution,
 - e. With a probability of success (p Value) of .003%,
3. The Excel spreadsheet identifies the samples for the month.
4. The formula identifies the records for re-interviews. The state re-interview process is by regional clusters; doing this reduces travel and benefits the state economically.
5. The regional program notifies the families to be re-interviewed.
6. The recruiter sets-up the date and time for the re-interview to occur.
 - a. If a family is not available, the recruiter will document efforts made on the Re-interview Contact Denied form and proceed to

the next student on the sample list.

7. After the appointment is scheduled, the OMESC conducts the re-interview.

8. The local recruiter accompanies the OMESC re-interviewer. The recruiter does not have any interaction with the family during the re-interview.

9. The re-interviewer documents the outcomes on the Title I-C MEP Eligibility Re-Interview Questionnaire.

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

a. Determined to be eligible

i. The OMESC notifies the regional program of the result.

b. Determined to be ineligible

i. The OMESC notifies the regional program of any findings.

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

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

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

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

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's sample replacement records are selected with the same monthly file. The computer first selects the records for re-interviews and in addition pulls an additional ten oversample records by the cluster area that are then placed on a stand-by list in case of no contact.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	Face re-interviews
Phone Interviews	
Both	
Obtaining Data From Families	
Yes/No	
Was there a standard instrument used?	<u>Yes</u>
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<u>Yes</u>
Were re-interviewers trained and provided instruments?	<u>Yes</u>
Did the recruitment personnel who made the initial eligibility determinations also conduct the re-interviews with the same families?	<u>No</u>
When were the most recent independent re-interviews completed (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LOA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	(MM/YY) 10/10

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this performance period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Not Applicable for 2012.2013 performance year. The last Independent re-interviews was conducted in 2010.2011 performance year.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For 2012-2013 performance year Oregon performed a retrospective re-interview. The following are the results of the 75 re-interviews conducted in Oregon:

2012-2013 School Year:

Findings Total

Total COEs found to be Eligible 54

Total of COEs found to be Eligible with Change 19

Total of COEs found to be Not Eligible 2

Total of COEs Reviewed 75

Definitions of COE results terminology is as follow:

1. Eligible.-Indicate the eligibility determination was correct and accurately documented.
2. Eligible with changes.-indicates the eligibility determination was correct; however, some of the data documented on the COE was not accurately documented.
3. No Eligible. - indicates the family was incorrectly identified as eligible for MEP services.

The findings from the retrospective re-interviews are evaluated, incorporated and shared with staff at the Fall and Summer ID&R trainings. Preventive actions are also discussed and communicated through the monthly ID&R/OMSIS/MSIX Webinar, MEP State Symposium, OACE Conference, and in the monthly ID&R newsletter.

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 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.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	736
1	654
2	629
3	446
4	360
5	356
6	406
7	405
8	427
9	531
10	457
11	396
12	559
Ungraded	8
Out-of-school	
Total	6,376
Comments: Oregon does not include out-of-school in this 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.

2.3.2.2 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) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69
K	952
1	996
2	973
3	874
4	769
5	594
6	424
7	304
8	254
9	277
10	251
11	209
12	198
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	1
Total	7,146
Comments:	

2.3.2.3 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) During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6
K	85
1	109
2	136
3	115
4	137
5	144
6	134
7	108
8	120
9	120
10	74
11	71
12	68
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,427
Comments:	

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2013 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age birth through 2	467
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	976
K	359
1	348
2	362
3	335
4	321
5	275
6	240
7	241
8	217
9	191
10	186
11	161
12	137
Ungraded	43
Out-of-school	822
Total	5,681
Comments:	

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose most recent qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2012-13 regular school year) The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	339
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	754
K	293
1	285
2	309
3	270
4	250
5	242
6	213
7	206
8	182
9	162
10	159
11	140
12	118
Ungraded	27
Out-of-school	429
Total	4,378
Comments:	

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	8
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	176
K	241
1	253
2	247
3	257
4	248
5	227
6	222
7	187
8	204
9	205
10	173
11	187
12	187
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	11
Total	3,033
Comments:	

2.3.2.7 Referrals — During the Summer/ Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** 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 received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	158
K	96
1	86
2	112
3	155
4	115
5	68
6	57
7	51
8	36
9	47
10	36
11	31
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	1,055
Comments:	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	5
8	5
9	7
10	24
11	39
12	121
Ungraded	
Total	201
Comments:	

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "drop outs of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the performance 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 2011-12 performance period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.8.2 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 GED	#
Obtained a GED in your State During the Performance Period	5
Comments:	

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data Regular School Year

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant children in MEP-funded services during the regular school year.

Participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Eligible migrant children and children who continued to receive MEP-funded 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 Schoolwide Program (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were only served 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.

2.3.3.1 MEP Children 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 the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	21
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	371
K	509
1	528
2	539
3	596
4	543
5	521
6	467
7	394
8	372
9	513
10	387
11	380
12	361
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	30
Total	6,533
Comments:	

2.3.3.2 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 MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5	5
K	293
1	268
2	258
3	206
4	165
5	149
6	167
7	148
8	171
9	259
10	212
11	183
12	235
Ungraded	1
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,720
Comments: This data will be reviewed and if necessary corrected upon resubmission.	

2.3.3.3 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 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 During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	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:	

2.3.3.4 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	Instructional Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	3
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	272
K	355
1	357
2	379
3	442
4	388
5	367
6	279
7	208
8	193
9	333
10	247
11	260
12	233
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	3
Total	4,319
Comments:	

2.3.3.4.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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 During the Regular School Year	Mathematics Instruction During the Regular School Year	High School Credit Accrual During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	1		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	40	30	
K	184	159	
1	187	159	
2	211	187	
3	243	238	
4	239	210	
5	199	202	
6	124	122	
7	99	62	
8	91	45	
9	101	101	303
10	91	93	229
11	96	89	246
12	84	66	230
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	3	2	3
Total	1,993	1,765	1,011
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.

2.3.3.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Regular School Year

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	Support Services During the Regular School Year	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	18	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	283	20
K	330	111
1	357	121
2	351	141
3	366	141
4	332	131
5	322	109
6	321	139
7	293	105
8	282	122
9	380	135
10	300	142
11	294	145
12	304	168
Ungraded	1	1
Out-of-school	28	5
Total	4,562	1,736
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.

2.3.4 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.

2.3.4.1 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 the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	771
K	687
1	791
2	736
3	683
4	631
5	504
6	402
7	340
8	235
9	236
10	200
11	156
12	41
Ungraded	40
Out-of-school	0
Total	6,453
Comments:	

2.3.4.2 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 MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5	0
K	336
1	343
2	307
3	215
4	163
5	151
6	133
7	117
8	88
9	110
10	103
11	74
12	31
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	2,171
Comments: Data will be reviewed and if necessary, corrected upon resubmission.	

2.3.4.4 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	Instructional Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	770
K	687
1	791
2	735
3	682
4	628
5	500
6	400
7	337
8	213
9	234
10	200
11	153
12	41
Ungraded	40
Out-of-school	
Total	6,411
Comments:	

2.3.4.4.1 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 During the Summer/ Intersession Term	Mathematics Instruction During the Summer/ Intersession Term	High School Credit Accrual During the Summer/ Intersession Term
Age birth through 2			
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	421	357	
K	594	520	
1	676	592	
2	621	547	
3	552	491	
4	531	466	
5	407	339	
6	324	309	
7	271	244	
8	167	165	
9	126	90	234
10	91	57	200
11	92	54	153
12	23	17	41
Ungraded	39	1	39
Out-of-school			
Total	4,935	4,249	667
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.

2.3.4.4.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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	Support Services During the Summer/Intersession Term	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	585	57
K	578	112
1	683	87
2	626	77
3	596	78
4	559	92
5	440	34
6	329	60
7	327	89
8	224	73
9	196	86
10	161	75
11	136	67
12	31	10
Ungraded	23	16
Out-of-school		
Total	5,494	1,013
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.

2.3.5 MEP Participation – Performance Period

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 performance period. 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 Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	19
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	996
K	933
1	1,024
2	999
3	965
4	902
5	800
6	702
7	613
8	522
9	643
10	495
11	459
12	382
Ungraded	41
Out-of-school	27
Total	10,522
Comments:	

2.3.6 School Data During the Regular School Year

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

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

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 regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	715
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	14,648
Comments:	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in School Wide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

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 regular school 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:	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 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 from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State 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.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	73	1,630
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	97	13,802
Comments:		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- 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.
- 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).
- What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.8.1 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 performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

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 performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the performance period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a Statewide basis.

2.3.8.2 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.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	59	8	329	238
Counselors	3	2	1	1
All paraprofessionals	89	29	209	186
Recruiters	60	37	43	31
Records transfer staff	25	14	23	16
Administrators	14	8	31	22
Comments:				

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 CSRP 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.

2.3.8.3 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.

Type of Professional funded by MEP	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified Paraprofessionals	82	22.40	182	153.20
Comments:				

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.
- 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	30	122
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	9	78
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	39	
Comments:		

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 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	30
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	9
Adult Corrections	0
Other	0
Total	39
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 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (IDEA) and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	1,594		1,231		
Total Long Term Students Served	864		449		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	801		309		
LEP Students	19		40		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaskan Native	104		54		
Asian	11		10		
Black or African American	94		133		
Hispanic or Latino	157		267		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	11		6		
White	1,088		760		
Two or more races	129		1		
Total	1,594		1,231		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	933		1,136		
Female	661		95		
Total	1,594		1,231		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	42				
6	17				
7	32				
8	46				
9	65				
10	57				
11	74				
12	89		3		
13	134		10		
14	177		54		
15	249		80		
16	277		199		
17	241		375		
18	68		301		
19	20		137		
20	6		60		
21			12		
Total	1,594		1,231		

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 is used to fund Long Term Care and Treatment programs (Neglected) and Juvenile Corrections programs only. Therefore, no data that would populate the Juvenile Detention, Adult Corrections and Other Programs categories is collected.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	No	0	0	0	0
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.	316		20	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Facilities currently do not have the resources available to collect data 90 days after a student leaves the program. Issues such as confidentiality of the systems involved and student's frequent movement adds to the difficulty.

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school	1,044	264			149	12	0	0	0	0
Earned high school course credits	660	41			1,187	S	0	0	0	0
Enrolled in a GED program	38	4			15	S	0	0	0	0
Earned a GED	24	S			20	S	0	0	0	0
Obtained high school diploma	20	4			150	S	0	0	0	0
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	4	S			S	8	0	0	0	0
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	48	S			234	S	0	0	0	0
Obtained employment	15	5			S	S	0	0	0	0

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 is used to fund Long Term Care and Treatment programs (Neglected) and Juvenile Corrections programs only. The data for students after they left the facility were for "enrolled in local district school" and "accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education - after exit." Via records requests, etc. the facilities were able to determine that some students did in fact enroll and were accepted into educational programs.

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 four 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, 2012, 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	446		275		
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	490		220		

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	50		61		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	162		55		
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	150		36		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	105		73		
Comments: For JC, the correct data is 225 with pre and post-tests. 61 had negative change, 55 had no change, 36 had improvement of 1 grade level, and 73 had more than 1 grade level improvement. For N, due to the unanticipated leave of the data owner and roll-up tool not accurately working, the discrepancy of 23 students could not be found.					

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

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	479		297		
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	501		226		

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	62		69		
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	163		58		
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	140		42		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	94		65		

Comments: Our data shows that there were 0 LEP students reported for ARisk programs. The reason no data was reported for Juvenile Detention long-term students is that both Juvenile Detention and Juvenile Corrections are aggregated under Juvenile Corrections. ODE is correcting this in the state data collection for 2013-14. Our data shows that Students with Disabilities for Other programs is 0.

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	11	118
Neglected programs	5	46
Juvenile detention	14	30
Juvenile corrections	6	91
Other	1	1
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	11
Neglected programs	5
Juvenile detention	14
Juvenile corrections	6
Other	1
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 disability (IDEA), and limited English proficiency (LEP), 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	2,309	183	524	672	8
Total Long Term Students Served	222	17		244	0

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (IDEA)	18	21	84	65	
LEP Students			2	5	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	54	3	50	10	
Asian	22	2	2	14	
Black or African American	43	10	25	28	
Hispanic or Latino	851	54	65	136	5
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	19		1	3	
White	1,247	110	364	343	3
Two or more races	73	4	15	13	
Total	2,309	183	522	547	8

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1,321	113	392	460	7
Female	988	70	132	85	1
Total	2,309	183	524	545	8

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11				1	
12	11	5	10	2	
13	48	10	43	20	
14	111	30	81	77	
15	220	43	108	94	
16	460	47	125	132	
17	575	33	148	139	
18	827	15	9	71	
19	39			9	4
20	18				4
21					

Total	2,309	183	524	545	8
-------	-------	-----	-----	-----	---

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

The discrepancy between the total Unduplicated Students served in JD (524) and Race/Ethnicity (522) has been corrected in our data, but an error in transferring files prevented it from being populated in to CSPR. A ticket to EdFacts (#200221) has been issued. The actual number of Asian Students should have been "4" instead of "2" bringing the Race/Ethnicity total to "524."

The discrepancy between the total Unduplicated Students served in JC (672) and Race/Ethnicity (547) has been corrected in our data, but an error in transferring files prevented it from being populated in to CSPR. A ticket to EdFacts (#200221) has been issued. The total of Unduplicated Students Served is "545", not "672." The actual number of Asian students is "12", not "14." The total Race and Ethnicity is now "545."

The discrepancy between the total Unduplicated Students served in JC (672) and Sex (545) has been corrected in our data, but an error in transferring files prevented it from being populated in to CSPR. A ticket to EdFacts (#200221) has been issued. The total of Unduplicated Students Served is "545", not "672." The total Unduplicated Students Served and Sex equal.

The discrepancy between the total Unduplicated Students served in JC (672) and Age (545) has been corrected in our data, but an error in transferring files prevented it from being populated in to CSPR. A ticket to EdFacts (#200221) has been issued. The total of Unduplicated Students Served is "545", not "672." The total Unduplicated Students Served and Age equal.

For other discrepancies between Total Long-Term Students Served and what is reported in Section 2.4.2.6.1 and 2.4.2.6.2, please see comments in that section.

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, 2012 through June 30, 2013.

2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are able to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. If not, provide more information in the comment field. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state able to collect data on student outcomes after exit?	No	No	No	No	No
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: LEAs are unable to provide data for transitional services, however, some LEAs are able to track some students. We are working to resolve this issue through training.

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, for each program type, first provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility and next provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be counted once in each column separately.

Outcomes	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school		37		15				554		22
Earned high school course credits	1,299		79				801		59	
Enrolled in a GED program	205						31			
Earned a GED	234						30		S	
Obtained high school diploma	398		6				113		S	
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education	16	13					10	7		
Enrolled in job training courses/programs	37	21	11				223	6		
Obtained employment		32						82		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: LEAs have been inconsistent in being able to collect transitional data follow a student's exit from the facility. We are providing additional training on this data set. Furthermore, ODE is revising its collection tool to acquire data that is missing. The out-of-range figure of 801 is an aggregate of both Juvenile Corrections and Juvenile Detention data reported by LEAs. Juvenile Detention data has been included into the data for Juvenile Corrections. The data for Other Programs was erroneously entered by an LEA that does not have an Other Program. The "59" should be "0" and the "22" should be "0." This data was corrected in our data collection, however the transmittal status of EDFacts 181 is in "Received" status. A ticket (#200221) from EdFacts has been issued.

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 four change categories in the second table below. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the tables below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2012, 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	247	61		290	S
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	150	13		165	S

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	17			16	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	32			47	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	76	10		51	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	25	S		51	
Comments: The discrepancy between the total Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry for AR (247), Neglected (61), JC (290) and the Total Long-term Students Served in 2.4.2.2 for AR (222), Neg. (17), JC (244) and OP (0) is due to inconsistent data from districts that is affecting EdFacts Reports 135 and 127. We mitigated this through a formula in 2011-12, but not in 2012-13. We are placing new validations in the data collection to correct this. For the current year, we will resubmit the corrected EdFacts 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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre-posttest data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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	111	57		303	S
Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	64	16		177	S

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	11	S		22	
No change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	26			34	
Improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	24	8		72	S
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	S	7		49	

Comments: The discrepancy between the total Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry for Neglected (57), JC (303) and the Total Long-term Students Served in 2.4.2.2 for Neg. (17), JC (244) is due to inconsistent data from districts that is affecting EdFacts Reports 135 and 127. We mitigated this through a formula in 2011-12, but not in 2012-13. We are placing new validations in the data collection to correct this. For the current year, we will resubmit the corrected EdFacts reports. The figure of "3" for Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results should be actually "0"

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, 2012, through June 30, 2013.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	2012 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 0.5%	2010-11: 1.4%	1.2%	2002-03
				2011-12: 1.4%	2011-12: 1.4%		
				2012-13: 1.4%	2012-13: 1.4%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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	2012 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 0.5%	2010-11: 1.6%	0.5%	2002-03
				2011-12: 0.5%	2011-12: 1.6%		
				2012-13: 0.5%	2012-13: 1.5%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	2012 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 13%	2010-11: 21.4%	15.9%	2002-03
				2011-12: 13%	2011-12: 21.4%		
				2012-13: 13%	2012-13: 28.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 0.5%	2010-11: 10.1%		
				2011-12: 0.5%	2011-12: 10.1%		

% of 11th gr. students who engaged in a phys. fight on school property during the past 12 months	2012 Oregon Student Wellness Survey (SWS)	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2012-13: 10.1%	2012-13: 18.3%	10.1%	2002-03
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 10%	2010-11: 18.8%	13.1%	2002-03
				2011-12: 10%			
				2012-13: 10%	2012-13: 9.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 22%	2010-11: 25.6%	25.1%	2002-03
				2011-12: 22%			
				2012-13: 22%	2012-13: 16.5%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13 OHT questions changed by asking for usage by drug type (i.e. - Marijuana, Inhalants, stimulants, depressants, hallucinogenic, prescription).	2010-11: 13.5%	2010-11: 16.7%	15.9%	2003-04
				2011-12: 13.5%			
				2012-13: 13.5%	2012-13: 3.7% (Marijuana & Prescription drugs)		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:	Average all other illegal drugs.		

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-			

% 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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13 OHT questions changed by asking for usage by drug type (i.e. - Marijuana, Inhalants, stimulants, depressants, hallucinogenic, prescription).	2010-11: 20%	2010-11: 27%	24.3%	2003-04
				2011-12: 20%	2011-12: 28% (Marijuana & Prescription drugs)		
				2012-13: 20%	2012-13: 8% Marijuana at least once;		
				2013-14:	1.9% - Average all other illegal drugs.		
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13, OHT questions changed to had at least 1 drink of alcohol in past 30 days, or had 5 or more drinks at least one day in past 30 days.	2010-11: 22%	2010-11: 20%	24.7%	2002-03
				2011-12: 22%	2011-12: 20%		
				2012-13: 22%	2012-13: 9.4% (drink) & 2.9% (5 or more drinks)		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13, OHT questions changed to had at least 1 drink of alcohol in past 30 days, or had 5 or more drinks at least one day in past 30 days.	2010-11: 35%	2010-11: 32%	43.4%	2002-03
				2011-12: 35%	2011-12: 35%		
				2012-13: 35%	2012-13: 18.3% (1 drink) & 7.8% (5 or more drinks)		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 8%	2010-11: 15%	14.6%	2004-05
				2011-12: 8%	2011-12: 14%		
				2012-13: 8%	2012-13: 15.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 9.5%	2010-11: 12%		
				2011-12: 9.5%	2011-12: 13%		

% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2012-13: 9.5%	2012-13: 14.6%	12.5%	2004-05
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 38%	2010-11: 38%	48.1%	2004-05	
				2011-12: 38%				2011-12: 37%
				2012-13: 38%				2012-13: 16%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 20%	2010-11: 27%	41.2%	2004-05	
				2011-12: 20%				2011-12: 28%
				2012-13: 20%				2012-13: 10.4%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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?. (2013 question broke it down by days felt unsafe; %s reflect felt unsafe at least 1 day in the past 30 days)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 3.5%	2010-11: 6%	6.7%	1004-05	
				2011-12: 3.5%				2011-12: 6%
				2012-13: 3.5%				
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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?). (2013 question broke it down by days felt unsafe; %s reported reflect felt unsafe at least 1 day in the past 30 days)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 2.5%	2010-11: 3%	4.7%	2004-05
				2011-12: 2.5%	2011-12: 4%		
				2012-13: 2.5%	2012-13: 2.8%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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. (OHT 2013 question was broken down by days of use in past 30 days. This year's report reflects used marijuana at least 1-2 days in past 30 days).	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 8%	2010-11: 11%	12.7%	2002-03
				2011-12: 8%	2011-12: 11%		
				2012-13: 8%	2012-13: 3.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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. (OHT 2013 question was broken down by days of use in past 30 days. This year's report reflects used marijuana at least 1-2 days in past 30 days).	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 14.5 %	2010-11: 21%	23.4%	2002-03
				2011-12: 14.5 %	2011-12: 21%		
				2012-13: 14.5 %	2012-13: 8%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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				2010-11: 7.5%	2010-11: 7%		
				2011-12: 7.5%	2011-12: 7%		

(how many days did you smoke cigarettes '05). SWS, 2012 asked for and have broken responses down for use of cigarettes, other tobacco products, and hookah in past 30 days.	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2012-13: 7.5%	2012-13: 5.6% smoked cigarettes; 3.7% used other tobacco products; 0% smoked a hookah.	10.5%	2002-03
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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. SWS, 2012 asked for and have broken responses down for use of cigarettes, other tobacco products, and hookah in past 30 days.	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 14.5%	2010-11: 11%	18.7%	2002-03
				2011-12: 14.5%			
				2012-13: 14.5%			
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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 "great" risk in using tobacco (1 or more packs of cigarettes per day, SWS 2012).	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 90%	95.1%	2002-03
				2011-12: 95%			
				2012-13: 95%			
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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 "great" risk in using tobacco (1 or more packs of cigarettes per day, SWS 2012).	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 94%	95.3%	2002-03
				2011-12: 95%			
				2012-13: 95%			
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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

% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04) (high changed to great '05). [SWS, 2012 - question changed to smoking marijuana once or twice a week is risky].	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, Even	2012-13	2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 66%	85.5%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 95%				2011-12: 65%
				2012-13: 95%				2012-13: 70.2%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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 great '05). [SWS, 2012 - question changed to smoking marijuana once or twice a week is risky].	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 90%	2010-11: 60.1%	78.4%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 90%				2011-12: 55%
				2012-13: 90%				2012-13: 51.7%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. [OHT, 2013 - Perceived moderate or Great Risk to use prescription drugs not prescribed to them].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 96.2% 93.9% A 79.6% M	98.3%	2003-04	
				2011-12: 99%				2011-12: 89% T 79% A 65% M
				2012-13: 99%				2012-13: 88%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established	
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk. [OHT, 2013 - Perceived moderate or Great Risk to use prescription drugs not prescribed to them].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 96.2% 93.9% A 79.6% M	97.4%	2003-04	
				2011-12: 99%				2011-12: 92% T 64% A 55% M
				2012-13: 99%				2012-13: 88%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 20090 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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

Performance Indicator	Data Source	Collection	collection	Targets	Performance	Baseline	Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive a Moderate to Great Risk in using alcohol regularly (OHT, 2013: 1-2 alcoholic beverages daily). (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2011	2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 79%	88.4%	2002-03
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 59%		
				2012-13: 95%	2012-13: 69.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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. (OHT, 2013: 1-2 alcoholic beverages daily). (High changed to Great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 95%	2010-11: 83%	86.8%	2002-03
				2011-12: 95%	2011-12: 64%		
				2012-13: 95%	2012-13: 66.9%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99.2%	2010-11: 96.6%	95.9%	2002-03
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 96.6%		
				2012-13: 99%	2012-13: 96.9%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of smoking cigarettes (their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 92.4%	91.3%	2002-03
				2011-12: 99%	2011-12: 92.4%		
				2012-13: 99%	2012-13: 93.5%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

		Frequency	Year of				Year
--	--	-----------	---------	--	--	--	------

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	of Collection	most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Baseline Established	
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05). [OHT 2013 - Parents feel it to be wrong or very wrong drinking wine, beer, or liquor regularly].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 90.3%	94.1%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 99%				2011-12: 90.3%
				2012-13: 99%				2012-13: 90.3%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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). [OHT 2013 - Parents feel it to be wrong or very wrong drinking wine, beer, or liquor regularly].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 97%	2010-11: 79.4%	88.8%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 97%				2011-12: 74.9%
				2012-13: 97%				2012-13: 80.4%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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). [OHT 2013 - Parents feel it would be wrong or very wrong to use prescription drugs not prescribed to you].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 99%	2010-11: 94.1%	96.3%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 99%				2011-12: 94.1%
				2012-13: 99%				2012-13: 96.4%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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). [OHT 2013 - Parents feel it would be wrong or very wrong to use prescription drugs not prescribed to you].	Oregon Healthy Teens (OHT) Survey, 2013	Bi-Annual, odd	2012-13	2010-11: 98.5%	2010-11: 88.2%	94.8%	2002-03	
				2011-12: 98.5%				2011-12: 88.2%
				2012-13: 98.5%				2012-13: 94.4%
				2013-14:				
				2014-15:				

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05) [SWS 2012: Been threatened with a weapon...]	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 2.5%	2010-11: 7.5%	4.8%	2002-03
				2011-12: 2.5%	2011-12: 6%		
				2012-13: 2.5%	2012-13: 10%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
% of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property (during past 12 months added '05). [SWS 2012: Been threatened with a weapon...]	Student Wellness Survey (SWS), 2012	Bi-Annual, even	2012-13	2010-11: 3%	2010-11: 4.9%	5.2%	2002-03
				2011-12: 3%	2011-12: 4%		
				2012-13: 3%	2012-13: 6.7%		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
# of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2012 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS)	Annual	2012	2010-11: 16,000	2010-11: 14,008	17,804	2003-04
				2011-12: 16,000	2011-12: 11,754 youth (out of 15,591 referrals)		
				2012-13: 16,000	2012-13: 11,754		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2010-11: 5,900	2010-11: 4,894		
				2011-12: 5,900	2011-12: 3,807 (out of 5,840 referrals)		

# of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2012 reporting year.	Juvenile Justice Information System (JJIS)	Annual	2012	2012-13: 5,900	2012-13: 3,807	6,462	2003-04
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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	2010-11:	2010-11: 0	1	2002-03
				2011-12:	2011-12: 0		
				2012-13:	2012-13: 0		
				2013-14:			
				2014-15:			

Comments: Data for 2009-10 in the "Targets" and "Actual Performance" is also available.

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	3,879	197
6 through 8	7,219	197
9 through 12	4,135	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	293	197
6 through 8	495	197
9 through 12	450	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	692	197
6 through 8	595	197
9 through 12	199	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	34	197
6 through 8	43	197
9 through 12	31	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	318	197
6 through 8	317	197
9 through 12	287	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	24	197
6 through 8	109	197
9 through 12	162	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	10	197
6 through 8	190	197
9 through 12	396	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	S	197
6 through 8	33	197
9 through 12	58	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	19	197
6 through 8	593	197
9 through 12	2,206	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	S	197
6 through 8	211	197
9 through 12	556	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
No Responses	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
No Responses	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
No Responses	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 Responses	Other Specify 1
No Responses	Other Specify 2

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

"Yes" was answered for the five most common efforts underway in our state.

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	19
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	15
Parental involvement activities	6
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	16
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	14
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 thirty-four RLIS school districts in 2012-13. Graduation rates for 2012-13 were not available at the time of submission. No districts are in District Improvement.

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

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2012-13?	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified that state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	6
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)	6	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		6

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)	241,601.00	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		241,601.00
Total	241,601.00	241,601.00
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 ⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort 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 2012-13). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

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

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	52
Asian or Pacific Islander	81
<i>Asian</i>	84
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	64
Black or African American	57
Hispanic or Latino	60.8
White	71.0
Two or more races	67
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	37.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	49.1
Economically disadvantaged students	60.4

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/hsgguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

⁴ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbook. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 LIST OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved ESEA Flexibility requests 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 ED*Facts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for ESEA Flexibility States

2.12.1.1 List of Reward Schools

Instructions for States that identified reward schools⁶ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through ED*Facts* files and compiled in the EDEN030 "List of Reward Schools" report in the ED*Facts* Reporting System (ERS). The ED*Facts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN030 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁶ The definition of reward schools is provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁸ under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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 2013-14 (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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁸ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.1.3 List of Other Identified Schools

Instructions for States that identified non- priority, focus, or reward schools⁹ with State-specific statuses under ESEA flexibility for SY 2013-14 : 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN032 "List of Other Identified Schools" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN032 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

⁹ The definitions of reward, priority, and focus schools are provided in the document titled, ESEA Flexibility. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>.

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 assessment
- Whether 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹⁰
- 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).

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

¹⁰ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

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 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through EDFacts files and compiled in the EDEN034 "List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuse's report in the EDFacts Reporting System (ERS). The EDFacts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

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 action¹¹ under ESEA section 1116 for SY 2013-14: 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 2013-14 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through ED Facts files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the ED Facts Reporting System (ERS). The ED Facts files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

¹¹ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.