

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

OREGON



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

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

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- 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 IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

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

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

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

| | |
|---|--|
| | OMB Number: 1810-0614 |
| | Expiration Date: 10/31/2010 |
| <p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p> | |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07 | |
| 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: Helen Maguire | |
| Telephone: 503-947-5877 | |
| Fax: 503-378-5156 | |
| e-mail: helen.maguire@state.or.us | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Salam Noor | |
| _____ Signature | <u>Friday, March 7, 2008, 7:21:06 PM</u> Date |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon revised its K-8 Mathematics standards in 2007 and these will be adopted by the State Board of Education in December 2007. The high school mathematics standards will be adopted in March 2008. The new standards will be implemented in the 2008-09 school year but not subject to state assessment until 2010.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No revisions to the General Education Mathematics assessments made or planned.

No revisions to the General Reading/Language arts assessments made or planned.

In 2006-07 Oregon revised its alternate assessment for Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts. The revised assessment is linked to academic content standards reduced in depth breadth and complexity and is individually administered by a trained assessor who evaluates student performance on a set of standardized tasks. In 2006-2007 there were 2 grade bands for the assessment: Elementary (grades 3-5) and Middle/High School (6-8 and 10). The items from the assessment are calibrated and banked using an IRT model. Achievement Levels were established for each grade through a bookmarking process.

In 2007-08 the assessment will be revised by splitting the assessment in a total of three grade bands: Elementary (grades 3-5) Middle (grades 6-8) and High School (grade 10). Achievement standards for each grade will be recommended by stakeholders in June 2008 after the administration is completed.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2006-07 Oregon used a bookmarking process to revise its achievement standards for grades 3-8 and 10 in Mathematics and Reading/Literature. These standards were adopted by the state board on March 15th 2007 and placed into effect during for 2006-07 school year. In addition Oregon used a bookmarking process to create alternate achievement standards for its alternate assessment. These achievement standards were adopted by the State Board on August 24 2007 and placed into effect for the 2006-07 school year.

Due to the planned revision of the alternate assessment Oregon will be re-setting standards for its alternate assessments in 2007-08 for the 2007-08 school year results.

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon has in place science assessments for students in grades in 5 8 and 10. The items that comprise the science assessment underwent an independent alignment study in Spring 2007. Oregon also implemented in 2006-07 revised alternate assessments in Science for Elementary students (grades 5) and Middle/High School students (8 and 10). The alignment of this assessment to grade level science standards was conducted in spring 2007.

The Alternate Science assessment will be revised in 2007-08 to assess grades 5 8 and 10 separately.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2006-07 Oregon gathered over 40 representative stakeholders to participate a bookmarking process to revise its achievement standards for grades 3-8 and 10 in science. These standards were adopted by the State Board in March 2007 and placed into effect for all tests administered in the 2006-07 school year. In addition Oregon gathered approximately 10 stakeholders used a bookmarking process to create alternate achievement standards for its alternate science assessment.

Due to the planned revision of the alternate assessment Oregon will be re-setting the achievement standards for its alternate science assessment in 2007-08 for the 2007-08 school year results.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| All students | 298984 | 295499 | 98.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6412 | 6283 | 98.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 13730 | 13599 | 99.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8930 | 8751 | 98.0 |
| Hispanic | 48777 | 48169 | 98.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 209776 | 207481 | 98.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 44231 | 43172 | 97.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 32172 | 31919 | 99.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 133684 | 132271 | 98.9 |
| Migratory students | 6579 | 6528 | 99.2 |
| Male | 153442 | 151445 | 98.7 |
| Female | 145542 | 144054 | 99.0 |

Comments: The data is pulled from EDEN N81. Per the EDEN Coordinator, the specification for this is: The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment. The problem with this is that N81 pulls all students regardless of the performance level. This information is being compared to EDEN N75 which pulls only those tests that fell within performance level 1-5. Thus CSPR 1.3.1 is looking at a smaller universe of students. The number of all students tested (regardless of performance levels) is the same data used for the state level AYP report.

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 0 | 0.0 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 38561 | 89.2 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 4674 | 10.8 |
| Total | 43235 | |
| Comments: The data is pulled from EDEN N81. Per the EDEN Coordinator, the specification for this is: The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment. The problem with this is that N81 pulls all students regardless of the performance level. This information is being compared to EDEN N75 which pulls only those tests that fell within performance level 1-5. Thus CSPR 1.3.1 is looking at a smaller universe of students. The number of all students tested (regardless of performance levels) is the same data used for the state level AYP report. | | |

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|--|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| All students | 299004 | 295931 | 99.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6418 | 6310 | 98.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 13714 | 13617 | 99.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 8937 | 8794 | 98.4 |
| Hispanic | 48763 | 48239 | 98.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 209695 | 207628 | 99.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 44278 | 43246 | 97.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 32169 | 32019 | 99.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 133719 | 132501 | 99.1 |
| Migratory students | 6607 | 6573 | 99.5 |
| Male | 153455 | 151633 | 98.8 |
| Female | 145549 | 144298 | 99.1 |

Comments: The data is pulled from EDEN N81. Per the EDEN Coordinator, the specification for this is: The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment. The problem with this is that N81 pulls all students regardless of the performance level. This information is being compared to EDEN N75 which pulls only those tests that fell within performance level 1-5. Thus CSPR 1.3.1 is looking at a smaller universe of students. The number of all students tested (regardless of performance levels) is the same data used for the state level AYP report.

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 0 | 0.0 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 38561 | 89.2 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 4674 | 10.8 |
| Total | 43235 | |

Comments: The data is pulled from EDEN N81. Per the EDEN Coordinator, the specification for this is: The unduplicated number of students who were enrolled during the period of the state assessment. The problem with this is that N81 pulls all students regardless of the performance level. This information is being compared to EDEN N75 which pulls only those tests that fell within performance level 1-5. Thus CSPR 1.3.1 is looking at a smaller universe of students. The number of all students tested (regardless of performance levels) is the same data used for the state level AYP report.

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does not include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41515 | 28812 | 69.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 876 | 539 | 61.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1888 | 1488 | 78.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1250 | 678 | 54.2 |
| Hispanic | 7391 | 3806 | 51.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 28275 | 21034 | 74.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6576 | 2917 | 44.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5707 | 2703 | 47.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20353 | 11976 | 58.8 |
| Migratory students | 947 | 429 | 45.3 |
| Male | 21245 | 14925 | 70.3 |
| Female | 20270 | 13887 | 68.5 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41487 | 33791 | 81.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 876 | 659 | 75.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1884 | 1582 | 84.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1253 | 884 | 70.6 |
| Hispanic | 7374 | 4808 | 65.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 28272 | 24367 | 86.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6567 | 3400 | 51.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5706 | 3284 | 57.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 20337 | 14821 | 72.9 |
| Migratory students | 975 | 579 | 59.4 |
| Male | 21223 | 16659 | 78.5 |
| Female | 20264 | 17132 | 84.5 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students | 41116 | 29199 | 71.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 832 | 508 | 61.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1916 | 1516 | 79.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1238 | 693 | 56.0 |
| Hispanic | 7124 | 3681 | 51.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 28253 | 21557 | 76.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6866 | 2932 | 42.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5306 | 2341 | 44.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19746 | 11771 | 59.6 |
| Migratory students | 919 | 411 | 44.7 |
| Male | 20825 | 14987 | 72.0 |
| Female | 20291 | 14212 | 70.0 |
| Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students | 41127 | 32457 | 78.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 836 | 622 | 74.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1915 | 1611 | 84.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1241 | 857 | 69.1 |
| Hispanic | 7119 | 4298 | 60.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 28243 | 23640 | 83.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6871 | 3263 | 47.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 5300 | 2634 | 49.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19754 | 13671 | 69.2 |
| Migratory students | 910 | 459 | 50.4 |
| Male | 20819 | 15868 | 76.2 |
| Female | 20308 | 16589 | 81.7 |
| Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41825 | 28406 | 67.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 875 | 504 | 57.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1950 | 1558 | 79.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1221 | 632 | 51.8 |
| Hispanic | 7003 | 3514 | 50.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29067 | 21055 | 72.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6874 | 2547 | 37.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4880 | 2039 | 41.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19873 | 11183 | 56.3 |
| Migratory students | 1019 | 428 | 42.0 |
| Male | 21449 | 14525 | 67.7 |
| Female | 20376 | 13881 | 68.1 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41845 | 29822 | 71.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 878 | 581 | 66.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1949 | 1463 | 75.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1225 | 694 | 56.7 |
| Hispanic | 7006 | 3228 | 46.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29069 | 22604 | 77.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6872 | 2613 | 38.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 4868 | 1533 | 31.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19882 | 11617 | 58.4 |
| Migratory students | 1026 | 346 | 33.7 |
| Male | 21463 | 14757 | 68.8 |
| Female | 20382 | 15065 | 73.9 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students | 41739 | 29322 | 70.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 921 | 567 | 61.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1819 | 1452 | 79.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1277 | 676 | 52.9 |
| Hispanic | 6686 | 3304 | 49.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29419 | 22178 | 75.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6246 | 2140 | 34.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3980 | 1491 | 37.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19159 | 11032 | 57.6 |
| Migratory students | 931 | 362 | 38.9 |
| Male | 21310 | 15002 | 70.4 |
| Female | 20429 | 14320 | 70.1 |
| Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|--|
| All students | 41738 | 30997 | 74.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 920 | 599 | 65.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1811 | 1463 | 80.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1276 | 770 | 60.3 |
| Hispanic | 6687 | 3583 | 53.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29405 | 23329 | 79.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 6244 | 2253 | 36.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3983 | 1445 | 36.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 19165 | 11906 | 62.1 |
| Migratory students | 927 | 384 | 41.4 |
| Male | 21313 | 15063 | 70.7 |
| Female | 20425 | 15934 | 78.0 |
| Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41669 | 30861 | 74.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 899 | 585 | 65.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1853 | 1549 | 83.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1228 | 714 | 58.1 |
| Hispanic | 6483 | 3636 | 56.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29649 | 23241 | 78.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5755 | 2000 | 34.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3606 | 1615 | 44.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 18320 | 11398 | 62.2 |
| Migratory students | 862 | 433 | 50.2 |
| Male | 21469 | 15901 | 74.1 |
| Female | 20200 | 14960 | 74.1 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 41673 | 31810 | 76.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 901 | 594 | 65.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1851 | 1530 | 82.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1232 | 806 | 65.4 |
| Hispanic | 6472 | 3598 | 55.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 29645 | 24068 | 81.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5743 | 2096 | 36.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3601 | 1382 | 38.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 18316 | 11852 | 64.7 |
| Migratory students | 865 | 406 | 46.9 |
| Male | 21459 | 15575 | 72.6 |
| Female | 20214 | 16235 | 80.3 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 42238 | 29562 | 70.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 908 | 545 | 60.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1900 | 1557 | 82.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1255 | 638 | 50.8 |
| Hispanic | 6285 | 3132 | 49.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 30499 | 22736 | 74.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5641 | 1737 | 30.8 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3273 | 1191 | 36.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 17908 | 10233 | 57.1 |
| Migratory students | 833 | 362 | 43.5 |
| Male | 21715 | 15307 | 70.5 |
| Female | 20523 | 14255 | 69.5 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 42207 | 28736 | 68.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 914 | 510 | 55.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1893 | 1426 | 75.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1249 | 666 | 53.3 |
| Hispanic | 6258 | 2752 | 44.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 30497 | 22447 | 73.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5642 | 1602 | 28.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 3266 | 787 | 24.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 17903 | 9657 | 53.9 |
| Migratory students | 826 | 265 | 32.1 |
| Male | 21698 | 14109 | 65.0 |
| Female | 20509 | 14627 | 71.3 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 42611 | 23464 | 55.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 954 | 369 | 38.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1809 | 1260 | 69.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1157 | 328 | 28.4 |
| Hispanic | 5386 | 1756 | 32.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 32034 | 19068 | 59.5 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5019 | 830 | 16.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2381 | 429 | 18.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 14692 | 5526 | 37.6 |
| Migratory students | 697 | 202 | 29.0 |
| Male | 21931 | 12327 | 56.2 |
| Female | 20680 | 11137 | 53.9 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 42959 | 27981 | 65.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 966 | 509 | 52.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1829 | 1251 | 68.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1184 | 488 | 41.2 |
| Hispanic | 5447 | 2126 | 39.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 32199 | 22732 | 70.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 5108 | 1203 | 23.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2400 | 360 | 15.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 14842 | 7169 | 48.3 |
| Migratory students | 712 | 210 | 29.5 |
| Male | 22098 | 13609 | 61.6 |
| Female | 20861 | 14372 | 68.9 |

Comments: The cut scores and standards changed between 0506 and 0607 which would have an impact.

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | # That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|---------|-------------------------------|--|
| Schools | 1232 | 956 | 77.6 |
| Districts | 196 | 95 | 48.5 |
| Comments: Several districts made progress as a result of their Continuous Improvement efforts. | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Title I School | # Title I Schools | # Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|-------------------|---|---|
| All Title I schools | 600 | 525 | 87.5 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 350 | 308 | 88.0 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 250 | 217 | 86.8 |
| Comments: | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|--|--|--|
| 183 | 83 | 45.4 |
| Comments: Please note there was an error in the 2005-2006 number of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2005-2006. The correct number is 73 districts, not 54 districts. | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Based on 2006-2007 data Oregon identified 35 Title I A schools in improvement status: 14 were in Year 1, 4 were Year 1 Holding, 4 were Year 2, 2 were Year 2 Holding, 5 were in Year 3 (Corrective Action), 3 were Year 3 Holding, 2 were in Year 4 (Plan for Restructuring), and 1 in Year 6 (Restructuring status).

The Oregon Department of Education has established a statewide system of support, Regional School Improvement Coordinators (RSIC) that assists schools/districts in improvement status. The RSICs are seasoned administrators with experience in school improvement strategies and processes as well as facilitation of school teams. The goal of the RSIC program is to support and facilitate sustainable school improvement by assisting districts/schools in moving along a continuum of steps: build readiness, collect and analyze data, set goals based on data, investigate and incorporate action plans based on best practices, and implement, monitor, and evaluate effectiveness.

Technical assistance has been provided to schools and districts through the RSIC school specific work, ODE video-conferences, the development of a School Improvement Manual, district grants, data collection and analysis, and monitoring and evaluation of strategies. Monthly meetings are held for the RSICs that provide professional development in school improvement methodology and implementation, strategizing about school change techniques, and sharing of challenges, barriers, and successes while working in the identified schools/districts.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|---|--|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | |
| Extension of the school year or school day | |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 2 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | |
| Replacement of the principal | |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | 2 |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 4 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Restructuring Action | # of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented |
|--|---|
| Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal) | 1 |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school | |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school | |
| Take over the school by the State | |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | 2 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon currently has ten districts that have been identified as a district in improvement status: 4 are in Year 1 Holding, 2 are in Year 2 Holding, and 4 are in Year 3 Holding. Districts in improvement status are required to revise their Continuous Improvement Plans (CIP) within 90 days of being identified. Oregon Department of Education (ODE) created the CIP to coordinate district planning of state and federal programs and to develop a comprehensive document that assisted districts in examining the overall goals of the district and implementing instruction to help all students achieve.

Districts identified in improvement status are provided technical assistance by ODE Specialists and Regional School Improvement Coordinators. The technical assistance includes one-on-one work with the district to assess strategies, analyze data, and monitor the effectiveness of school improvement efforts. ODE hosts a meeting of all districts in school improvement to facilitate conversations, share resources and research-based practices, and determine additional approaches to consider in working through the barriers to moving out of improvement status.

Currently, all districts identified have shown progress in moving out of improvement or corrective action. ODE is proud of the progress districts made last year and will continue efforts to assist them in the positive steps they have taken.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|--|--|
| Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards | 3 |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district | 0 |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds | 0 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | 4 |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district | 0 |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district | 0 |
| Restructured the district | 3 |
| Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

| | Districts | Schools |
|--|-----------|---------|
| Final AYP and identification determinations | 9/28/07 | 9/28/07 |
| Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable) | 8/27/07 | 8/27/07 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

| | |
|---|--|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete | |
|---|--|

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon Department of Education's (ODE) method of distributing Section 1003 (a) funds to schools identified for improvement is currently decided by a formula of a base allocation and ADM. Decisions related to the base allocation for schools in improvement is calculated based on the federal priorities: serving lowest achieving schools, greatest need, and commitment to meeting school targeted progress goals.

Schools identified for improvement are requested to work with their districts to develop a School Improvement Plan (SIP) focusing on improving the specific areas that resulted in the school being identified as needing improvement. Each SIP is aligned to the district Continuous Improvement Plan (CIP), a comprehensive document that coordinates district planning for state and federal programs. ODE requires that districts develop and implement a CIP every two years. When a school does not meet AYP they are asked to evaluate and assess themselves through a seven step school improvement process to revise their SIP and explain how they will address the specific academic issues that caused them to be identified.

ODE has developed and implemented a statewide system of support that provides Regional School Improvement Coordinators (RSIC) to assist schools in improvement. Many schools utilize RSICs to help facilitate the school improvement process, collect and analyze school data, investigate curriculum and instructional strategies, and coordinate professional development sessions to focus on the student performance problems. Schools and districts work in teams to focus on the academic areas that need improvement and create action plans to implement and monitor their work.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

| | # Schools |
|---|-----------|
| Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice | 31 |
| Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice | 49 |
| Comments: Charter Schools are included in the Public Schools to which students transferred for public school choice. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

| | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for public school choice | 18980 |
| Who applied to transfer | 2543 |
| Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions | 2543 |

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

| | Yes/No |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement | Yes <u> </u> |
| 2. Transferred in the current school year, only | No Response <u> </u> |
| 3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year | No Response <u> </u> |
| Comments: The LEA survey did not require the information for Items 2 and 3. We do not have that information. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

| | Amount |
|--|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ |
| Comments: ODE does not collect these data. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

| | # LEAs |
|---|---------------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | |
| Comments: ODE does not collect these data. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)?* For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

| | # Schools |
|---|-----------|
| Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services | 22 |
| Comments: 24 Schools were eligible. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

| | # Students |
|---|------------|
| Eligible for supplemental educational services | 10725 |
| Who applied for supplemental educational services | 2031 |
| Who received supplemental educational services | 2031 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

| | Amount |
|--|--------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services | \$ |
| Comments: ODE does not collect these data. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

| School Type | # of Core Academic Classes (Total) | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| All schools | 64025 | 57559 | 89.9 | 6466 | 10.1 |
| Elementary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 3527 | 3414 | 96.8 | 113 | 3.2 |
| Low-poverty schools | 4030 | 3634 | 90.2 | 396 | 9.8 |
| All elementary schools | 15201 | 14418 | 94.8 | 783 | 5.2 |
| Secondary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 8656 | 7573 | 87.5 | 1083 | 12.5 |
| Low-poverty schools | 16732 | 15021 | 89.8 | 1711 | 10.2 |
| All secondary schools | 48381 | 42847 | 88.6 | 5534 | 11.4 |

Comments: Some schools do not have a designation of either elementary or secondary, therefore are only counted in the total number for all schools, but not in either the elementary or secondary category.

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

| | |
|---|------------|
| Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects. | <u>Yes</u> |
|---|------------|

If the answer above is no, please explain:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| |
|---|
| Elementary classes are counted as a full day self contained equals one class. |
|---|

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 77.3 |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 5.3 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 3.3 |
| Other (please explain) | 14.1 |
| Total | 100.0 |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

| | Percentage |
|--|------------|
| Secondary School Classes | |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 85.3 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 3.4 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 1.6 |
| Other (please explain) | 9.6 |
| Total | 100.0 |
| Comments: Elementary and Secondary - Other: Percent that didn't fit in categories identified above. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

| | High-Poverty Schools (more than what %) | Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %) |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Elementary schools | 64.0 | 30.9 |
| Poverty metric used | Free and reduced lunch percentage. | |
| Secondary schools | 53.1 | 28.1 |
| Poverty metric used | Free and reduced lunch percentage. | |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

| # Using Program | Type of Program | Other Language | % Language of Instruction | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------|---------------------------|------|
| | | | English | OLOI |
| 24 | Dual language | Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 14 | Two-way immersion | Mandarin Russian Spanish | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 19 | Transitional bilingual | Spanish | 90.0 | 10.0 |
| 0 | Developmental bilingual | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Heritage language | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Sheltered English instruction | | | |
| 0 | Structured English immersion | | | |
| 0 | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) | | | |
| 0 | Content-based ESL | | | |
| 0 | Pull-out ESL | | | |
| 0 | Other (explain) | | | |

Comments: Developmental bilingual or Heritage language program data are not available.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

| | # |
|--|-------|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 52683 |
| Comments: | |

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

| Language | # LEP Students |
|------------|----------------|
| Spanish | 50850 |
| Russian | 3236 |
| Vietnamese | 1850 |
| Ukrainian | 905 |
| Korean | 678 |

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| ALL LEP Testing Status | # |
|-------------------------------|----------|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 60575 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 0 |
| Subtotal | 60575 |
| LEP/One Data Point | 13737 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| Title III LEP Testing Status | # |
|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 60214 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 0 |
| Subtotal | 60214 |
| | |
| LEP/One Data Point | 13569 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

| | |
|---|------------|
| State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | <u>Yes</u> |
| State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | <u>Yes</u> |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

| | Target | Results | | Met |
|------------------|--------|---------|------|-----|
| | % | # | % | Y/N |
| Making progress | 35.0 | 10131 | 51.5 | Y |
| No progress | | 9537 | | |
| ELP attainment | 50.0 | 8861 | 39.2 | N |
| Comments: | | | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

| | Target | Results | | Met |
|---|--------|---------|---|--------|
| | % | # | % | Yes/No |
| Making progress | | | | |
| No progress | | | | |
| ELP attainment | | | | |
| Comments: Response in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2) is YES so this table is N/A. | | | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

| | |
|------------------|------------|
| MFLEP | <u>Yes</u> |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

| | # |
|------------------|-------|
| Total MFLEP | 10697 |
| MFLEP/AYP grades | 8462 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

| Grade | # |
|------------------|-------|
| LEP K-2 | 22980 |
| LEP HS/Non-AYP | 8532 |
| LEP other grades | 22 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

| | |
|--|-----|
| State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | Yes |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

| Grade | Language |
|--|----------|
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| HS | |
| Comments: The State's Mathematics test is provided for each AYP grade in a side-by-side version in Spanish/English and Russian/English. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

| Grade | Language |
|--|----------|
| 3 | Spanish |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| HS | |
| Comments: Oregon does not have native language tests for grades 4 5 6 7 8 and HS. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 5782 | 1787 | 30.9 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| 821 | 554 | 67.5 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

| # Year One | # Year Two | Total |
|------------------|------------|-------|
| 5338 | 5178 | 10516 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 5663 | 2558 | 45.2 | |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The # Below Proficient does not automatically calculate. According to our information, the number should be 3105.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|----------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 5447 | 2558 | 47.0 | |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The # Below Proficient does not automatically calculate. According to our information, the number should be 2889.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

| | # |
|---|----|
| Total number of subgrantees for the year | 61 |
| Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 13 |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs | 27 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment | 15 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP | 11 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP | 1 |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO | 21 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress | 20 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP | 0 |
| Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP | 1 |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs | 0 |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years | 3 |
| Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs | 44 |
| Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08) | |
| Comments: The State will identify LEAs that have not met AMAOs for 4 consecutive years in school year 2008-09. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated for failure to reach program goals. | <u>No</u> |
| If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> programs and activities for immigrant children and youth terminated. | |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 4255 | 4255 | 1 |

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

Comments: The state does not collect information related to country of origin as it could reveal students' legal status and may cause adverse consequences for the students and their families. Our experience in collection proficiency data shows that students who enter the LEA's English Language Development Program with a proficiency of 1 are students who are newcomers or new arrivals. The count above shows that count.

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

| Subgrant award cycle | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Annual | <u>Yes</u> | Multi-year | <u>No</u> |
| Type of subgrant awarded | | | |
| Competitive | <u>No</u> | Formula | <u>Yes</u> |

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

| | # |
|--|-----|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 113 |
| Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement. | 0 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 0 |

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

Comments: 2nd item: The State does not require core content teachers who teach Limited English Proficient students to have an ESOL endorsement. Therefore the State does not collect such data.

3rd Item: ESOL endorsed teachers are specialists who teach English Language Development in districts that have chosen the ESL Pull-out model. Elementary teachers without an ESOL endorsement who are classroom teachers with a basic or standard multiple-subject endorsement type license may also teach ESOL. Due to these allowances by the State Licensing Commission Teacher Standards and Practices Commission it is difficult to estimate the number of teachers needed for the next 5 years.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 39 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 25 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 0 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 38 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 0 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 0 | |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 29 | 89 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 39 | 147 |
| PD provided to principals | 0 | 0 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 38 | 38 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 0 | 0 |
| PD provided to community-based organization personnel | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 274 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 07/01/06 | 08/01/06 | 173 |
| Comments: Subgrantees: 20% of funds were available August 1, 2006. Remaining funds were available to subgrantees on December 21, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

It is the expressed goal of the Oregon Department of Education (ODE) to shorten the distribution time of Title III funds to subgrantees.

Historically a delay in distribution has occurred due to the time it takes for districts to report on their Spring LEP collection. Fortunately the testing window now closes earlier resulting in an earlier reporting of the collection. Currently the Spring LEP Collection is due May 21. Receiving this information earlier will shorten the process overall.

Secondly once districts are able to determine and report accurate numbers of students eligible for funding in a timely fashion the ODE will be able to deliver funds within a shorter timeframe. Currently districts across the state are incorporating common assessment methods using the state English Language Proficiency Assessment (ELPA) which will produce quality standardized exit data. With the adoption of this valid and reliable assessment throughout the state LEP student data will be collected and processed more efficiently and effectively than in previous years.

Thirdly the state's electronic application for sub-grants is now connected to the state's electronic grants management system streamlining the process and allowing for a quicker distribution of funds.

Additionally the ODE increased Title III staff to assist in the distribution process. Adding additional staff will ultimately shorten the time needed to process funds.

The ODE is determined to improve the distribution time of Title III funds and is committed to achieving this goal. It is our intention to have funds available to districts by July 15.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

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

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Persistently Dangerous Schools | 1 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|---|------------------------|
| All Students | 81.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 68.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 88.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 69.5 |
| Hispanic | 63.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 85.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 71.6 |
| Limited English proficient | 75.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 74.4 |
| Migratory students | |
| Male | |
| Female | |
| Comments: The 0405 and 0506 data were handled by different people, thus possibly used different methods to arrive at the data produced. We feel confident that the 0506 data is correct and have validated the data through the EDEN process (N41). Data not available by Migratory, Male, Female. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|--|--------------|
| All Students | 4.1 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 6.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 6.4 |
| Hispanic | 8.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 3.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 4.2 |
| Limited English proficient | 4.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 4.4 |
| Migratory students | 0.0 |
| Male | 4.5 |
| Female | 3.7 |
| Comments: Migratory students Dropout Rate is Not Available therefore we input (0). The 0405 and 0506 data were handled by different people, thus possibly used different methods to arrive at the data produced. We feel confident that the 0506 data is correct. | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

| | # | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|------------------------|-----|-----------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 177 | 187 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 20 | 20 |
| Total | 197 | 207 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

| Age/Grade | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 | 0 |
| K | 438 | 721 |
| 1 | 478 | 758 |
| 2 | 494 | 791 |
| 3 | 486 | 699 |
| 4 | 460 | 699 |
| 5 | 422 | 732 |
| 6 | 379 | 652 |
| 7 | 397 | 653 |
| 8 | 438 | 716 |
| 9 | 369 | 733 |
| 10 | 415 | 837 |
| 11 | 472 | 762 |
| 12 | 622 | 894 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 5870 | 9647 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

| | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care | 585 | 1263 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 4197 | 6540 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | 687 | 1325 |
| Hotels/Motels | 401 | 519 |
| Total | 5870 | 9647 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

| Age/Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 353 |
| K | 641 |
| 1 | 657 |
| 2 | 721 |
| 3 | 628 |
| 4 | 641 |
| 5 | 650 |
| 6 | 608 |
| 7 | 604 |
| 8 | 664 |
| 9 | 681 |
| 10 | 774 |
| 11 | 703 |
| 12 | 820 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Total | 9145 |

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

| | # Homeless Students Served |
|--|----------------------------|
| Unaccompanied youth | 1413 |
| Migratory children/youth | 993 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1552 |
| Limit English proficient students | 1847 |

Comments:

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

| | # McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer |
|---|--|
| 1. Tutoring or other instructional support | 20 |
| 2. Expedited evaluations | 15 |
| 3. Staff professional development and awareness | 18 |
| 4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 19 |
| 5. Transportation | 18 |
| 6. Early childhood programs | 8 |
| 7. Assistance with participation in school programs | 18 |
| 8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 17 |
| 9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 18 |
| 10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 17 |
| 11. Coordination between schools and agencies | 18 |
| 12. Counseling | 14 |
| 13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 18 |
| 14. Clothing to meet a school requirement | 17 |
| 15. School supplies | 20 |
| 16. Referral to other programs and services | 19 |
| 17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 18 |
| 18. Other (optional) | 0 |
| 19. Other (optional) | 0 |
| 20. Other (optional) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

| | # Subgrantees Reporting |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Eligibility for homeless services | 0 |
| 2. School Selection | 0 |
| 3. Transportation | 0 |
| 4. School records | 0 |
| 5. Immunizations | 0 |
| 6. Other medical records | 0 |
| 7. Other Barriers | 0 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3 | 453 | 287 |
| 4 | 453 | 292 |
| 5 | 469 | 226 |
| 6 | 416 | 212 |
| 7 | 375 | 191 |
| 8 | 413 | 154 |
| High School | 341 | 112 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|------------------|--|---|
| 3 | 458 | 229 |
| 4 | 456 | 240 |
| 5 | 470 | 207 |
| 6 | 420 | 189 |
| 7 | 379 | 176 |
| 8 | 416 | 168 |
| High School | 345 | 78 |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

Please note that 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:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | 12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 2527 |
| K | 1251 |
| 1 | 1279 |
| 2 | 1299 |
| 3 | 1203 |
| 4 | 1106 |
| 5 | 1150 |
| 6 | 1097 |
| 7 | 1075 |
| 8 | 1038 |
| 9 | 1085 |
| 10 | 1022 |
| 11 | 807 |
| 12 | 589 |
| Ungraded | 99 |
| Out-of-school | 1694 |
| Total | 18321 |
| Comments: | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The reporting year of September 1 2006 to August 31 2007 was a period of great difficulty and turmoil for Oregon recruiters and migrant workers. During this time the State of Oregon decided to implement the proposed changes to the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The interpretations of these proposals were left to the states along with the difficulties of understanding the new policies as well as the reasoning for their conceptualization. Oregon like many states decided to implement these changes not foreseeing the confusion the unrest and the instability that these unexplained proposals would cause within its recruiting force.

Many of the trained recruiters who had felt confident in their ability to identify migrant children students and families all of the sudden felt that they could no longer make proper judgments. The State through its service provider the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center began to issue clarification notices and bulletins. Additional forms were created in an effort to explain and clarify every new proposal. The recruiters were being requested to fill out many of these forms in order to "pre-qualify" the migrant families; and once the Certificate of Eligibility was completed a battery of forms were required to follow-up the children's enrollment documenting the recruiter's decision to fill out the COE.

Also based on the news that some state directors were being charged with negligence and fraud nationwide the burden of proper identification and qualification of migrant students was placed on the shoulders of the recruiters and the possibility of the recruiters being charged with fraudulent misconduct based on a document where they felt they had little or no control due to the fact that they had to rely on the interviewee for the information and documentation the recruiters became hesitant to go out and find the qualifying students.

At the same time that the State of Oregon decided to implement the new proposals the country as a whole was going through a policy change in terms of the border security between Mexico and the United States. The local media exploded into a frenzy of anti-immigration reporting. Many of our migrant workers refused to talk to the recruiters in fear of being identified as undocumented aliens. The raids held by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency (ICE) in Colorado and at Portland Oregon's Fresh Del Monte Produce Plant infused fear in the migrant worker population. Many felt forced to literally go underground and stay in their homes; and to remain in the jobs they currently hold. Many employers (including farmers canneries and nurseries) are requesting additional documentation for employment. These new requirements obligate our migrant families to hold on to the job they have fearing that if they apply at other locations they may not have all the currently required documentation to present. The local law enforcement agencies throughout Oregon are now requesting proof of residency if they suspect a person to be undocumented.

In conclusion the two main reasons for the decrease in the number of identified migrant students in the state of Oregon during the September 1 2006 through the August 31 2007 year are: (1) Implementation of proposed policies from the non-regulatory guidance without the proper clarification of the changes and definitions included in them. (2)The fear caused by the new policies on immigration and border control throughout the United States causing many qualifying migrant children students and families to a) change their stories about their qualification to shed the label "migrant" therefore causing them to be disqualified b) refuse to talk to our "migrant" recruiters for fear of being identified as undocumented or illegal workers and c) the media frenzy on requiring additional documentation and raids of places of employment.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

| Age/Grade | Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 365 |
| K | 554 |
| 1 | 499 |
| 2 | 472 |
| 3 | 441 |
| 4 | 373 |
| 5 | 365 |
| 6 | 315 |
| 7 | 254 |
| 8 | 175 |
| 9 | 180 |
| 10 | 139 |
| 11 | 97 |
| 12 | 31 |
| Ungraded | 56 |
| Out-of-school | |
| Total | 4316 |
| Comments: Oregon counts only those students enrolled in a Title I-C Summer Program in which they receive instructional and support services. Any Out-of-School children identified as migrant during the summer time are counted under Category 1 12-months Eligibility section. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As stated earlier the reporting year of September 1 2006 to August 31 2007 was a period of great difficulty and turmoil for Oregon recruiters and migrant workers. During this time the State of Oregon had decided to implement the proposed changes to the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The interpretations of these proposals were left to the states along with the difficulties in understanding the proposed policies as well as the reasoning for their conceptualization.

During this time of confusion it was extremely difficult for regional programs to make eligibility determinations based on new and unclear policies which were a cause for many of the qualifying students not to be recruited and qualified into the migrant programs.

Another reason why the decrease in number of students reported for Category 2 is that many of the migrant camps reported a lower number of migrant families traveling to the areas. When migrant families were interviewed at the camp sites they stated the following reasons why many did not make the trip: (1) Fear of being caught and deported. They had heard that if a car was stopped for any moving violation (which could be anything from not using a seatbelt or having a missing or broken tail light to more serious infractions) the police officer had the right to place an immigration hold and detain any passenger or driver in the vehicle if legal residency could not be proven. (2) Price of gas. For many migrant workers the cost of transportation became prohibitively high. (3) Less fields to pick. The strawberry fields in Oregon are beginning to disappear. Since this fruit requires a great deal of manual labor farmers are switching to other crops for fear they won't have the pickers to pick their berries. (4) Wages. Low wages in relation to the high price of temporary housing is another reason why many of the migrant workers are not traveling to traditional migrant areas in search of summer work. Many small towns who used to be farming communities have become bedroom communities for adjacent sprawling urban cities. This has decreased the places of employment for migrant workers such as farms and nurseries; and has made the availability of affordable housing hard to find.

These are but a few of the reasons reported by regional directors and migrant families for the decrease in the reported number of students for Category 2.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS.net) to generate the 2006-07 child count Category 1 and category 2 child counts.

Yes Oregon used OMSIS to generate the 2005-06 child count.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count data are first collected on paper using the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). All eligible children that fit the definition for the MEP are listed on the COE; the COE is then forwarded to the local MEP offices for input onto the OMSIS.net. Once the student's record exists on the OMSIS he/she is eligible for MEP services for up to three years from the QAD date. A child's record cannot exist on OMSIS.net without a valid COE. The COE is used to document a new qualifying move and also used as an enrollment form to enter on OMSIS.net.

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

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

The enrollment type field on OMSIS has two acceptable values; "S" and "R". Enrollment type "S" is for summer school and enrollment type "R" could be interpreted in two ways; Regular school year enrollment or Out-of-School (OOS). The logical value in the OOS field determines if the child is an out-of-schooler or not.

a. What data were collected?

The OMSIS system collects the following data: Student demographics; Student enrollment history; Enrollments and withdrawals; ELL special education medical alert; Supplemental instructional and support services; Language assessment; Reclassification flag and date; Days enrolled and present; Education Interruption flag; Oregon Statewide Assessment data; and Health immunizations. etc.

b. What activities were conducted to collect the data?

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

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

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

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

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

The CRSF documents a change to the child(s) enrollment as a result of a transfer of school and/or a change of address.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

All inputting and updating of student records is done at the local MEP office. A local data specialist checks all COEs and other enrollment forms before they are entered onto the OMSIS.net. The system validates and authenticates the user account on OMSIS.net. All local OMSIS data specialists have full access to their district's student records.

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

The State OMSIS system follows these steps for validation:

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

Step 2: Validating new student's last name first name date of birth and mother's maiden name for duplicate student record: If record

exists the system will display a message on the screen saying "Student already exists".

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

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

Specific crosswalk or tabulation are:

English cognates: (e.g. James/Jaime Francisco/Frank Pedro/Peter); Similar spellings or misspellings: (e.g. Sanchez vs. Sanches Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names.(e.g. Yesenia vs. Jesenia Evelia vs. Ebelia Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names: (e.g. Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez Sanches-Rodrigues ; Sanches- Rodriguez Sanchez vs. Sanches Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double first names: (e.g. Juan vs. Juan Carlos Jose vs. Jose Luis Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names: (Rodriguez Maria 01/01/84 vs. 10/01/84.); Last names that can be written with or without spaces: (e.g. A la Torre vs. Alatorre De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated: (e.g. Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus)

Step 5: There are several databases created to store student data. OMSIS.net is a relational database. A relational database such as OMSIS contains many records which pertain to a given student arranged in different data tables. All databases are related using two key elements; Student key and enrollment key. The two keys combined identify a specific student and enrollment period.

A student is identified in the OMSIS data tables by their OMSIS ID number which is also called the primary key. This OMSIS ID is a key value which is unique to the student. The OMSIS ID is the primary key which uniquely identifies those records in the different tables which provide the relational profile of the student. The OMSIS ID is assigned when the student is first enrolled on OMSIS.net. This primary key can never be assigned to another student and follows the student everywhere he/she attends school in Oregon.

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

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

Step 7: OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a list of qualifying migrant children who turned 3 years old between September 1 2006 and August 31 2007. This list is produced three times a year. Some local programs generate this report once a month to quickly locate families that fall under this category. Families are contacted by either the telephone or with a home visit by the recruiter to verify eligibility.

Step 8: Local MEPs were given October 1 2007 as the deadline date for processing all 2006-2007 regular school year and 2007 summer enrollments and withdrawals. All reporting is done on the Title I-C withdrawal form.

Step 9: State category 1 and category 2 counts were generated on November 01 2007. Numbers from both counts are produced along with a hard copy print-out of all student names. Manual checking and cross-tabulation are done by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found will be carefully analyzed and subtracted from the final count.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In Oregon all eligible children 0-21 are listed on the COE and all qualifying children (children who move with to join or on own etc.) are entered on OMSIS.net. When COEs are processed on OMSIS each child is assigned a unique OMSIS ID number. Before OMSIS appends the record the system validates the student's age and qualifying arrival date. The system filters out children who: were born after the qualifying arrival date are age 22 or over as of the enroll date or OOS date or with qualifying arrival dates before 09/01/03 for the year 09/01/06 - 08/31/07.

When the category 1 and 2 counts are generated all students between the ages of 0-2 as of the enroll date or OOS date are filtered out. For students who turned three years old between 09/01/06 and 08/31/07 OMSIS checks the latest enrollment line ID and validates the enroll or OOS date against the date of birth to verify it is three years after the date of birth. Before generating the final count OMESC generates the 2 Turning 3 Report three times during the year and distributes it to the programs for follow-up and updating the child's residency status on OMSIS. Recruiters and local data specialists contact the families to verify the residency of the child. Once residency at age three is established the recruiter or data specialist updates the child's enroll or OOS date changes the grade level to P3 and checks the "2 Turning 3" box on OMSIS.

The system automatically creates a database which stores all records that justify both counts. The databases are checked manually by OMESC staff including checking single last names against double last names similar spelling of both first/last names etc. Any conflicting record is identified researched and corrective action taken. Records are corrected on OMSIS and counts are adjusted on the child count report.

Children who were resident in OR for at least one day during the eligible period 09/01-08/31:

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

Verifying a child's residency can be done face-to-face telephone contact checking the LEA student information system or in the classroom. Verifying OOS children is done with the aid of the mass enrollment list which lists all OOS children identified the previous school year and are eligible for the new school year. Before re-enrolling OOS children for a new school year the recruiter calls or visits each child to verify his/her residency in the district. As a result of the contact the recruiter enrolls the child on the mass enrollment list. If they determine that the family made a new qualifying move a new COE is completed. Nothing is done if the family cannot be found or moved out of the area.

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

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

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

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

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

third birthday.

Category 1: Information is verified in two databases for the category 1 count- the Student Information database and the Enrollment database. The Student Information database has the primary key (OMSIS ID) student names and demographics. The primary key is coded with a unique index command. With a unique index command the same value cannot be contained within that field (OMSIS ID). This ensures there is only one OMSIS ID for each student. The Enrollment database contains information on each student's enrollments and withdrawals and stores all enrollment history line IDs for separate enrollment periods and types. These two databases have the OMSIS ID in common which allows the relation of the two databases.

The criteria for determining the category 1 count are as follows: student must be enrolled or OOS between 09/01/06-08/31/07; student must be between the age of 3-21 during the period of 09/01/06-08/31/07; student who turns 3 between 09/01/06-08/31/07 must have a new enrollment line ID showing enrolled or OOS date 3 years greater than student's DOB and there must be a check in the 2 turning 3 box; student must have a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrollment date or OOS date) between start date and end date. The start date is 09/01/06; the end date would be the run date 11/01/07; student must have a QAD on or after 09/01/03; student must have a residency date on or before 08/31/07; student enrolled after 09/01/07 must have a residency date earlier than 08/31/07; and for a student whose regular school year started in August 2006 the 2006-07 enrollment line must have a withdrawal date after 09/02/07.

All eight conditions must be met for a child to be counted as category 1. Coding results are written to a database 200607_FederalRegularCount.dbf where information is manually scanned by OMESC staff for duplicate records. Duplicates found are researched and deducted from the category 1 count.

Category 2: For category 2 we use the two databases used for category 1 plus an additional database the Supplemental Services database. The Supplemental Services database contains instructional and support services provided during regular and summer programs.

Using the two databases used for category 1 the criteria below are coded in: student is enrolled between 05/15/07 and 08/31/07; student is 3 as of the enrolled date; student is less than 22 as of the enrolled date; student has a recorded date (which stores the value of either the enrolled or OOS dates) between 05/15/07 and 08/31/07; student enrollment type must be (S-summer); student previous enrollment lines do not have a value of G/graduated E/received GED or D/deceased; and must have in the Supplemental Services database at least two instructional services codes.

All seven conditions must be met for a student to be included in the category 2 count. The coding result is written to a database 20062007_FederalSummer.dbf where it is manually scanned by OMESC staff. Any duplicates found are deducted from the category 2 count. Oregon does not operate an Intersession.

The two files 200607_FederalRegularCount.dbf and 20062007_FederalSummer.dbf are transferred to the SEA to populate onto the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN).

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

N/A

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Department of Education (ODE) and Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) created a Quality Control Plan for the State based on the Quality Control recommendations in Chapter III of the 2003 Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance. The Plan is shown below:

I. Training for Recruiters

Draft NRG Ch. III A13.1: Training for recruiters on various aspects of the job.

State Actions: OMESC certifies new recruiters based on required training job-shadowing and written practice of information from the state's I&R Manual (done monthly); OMESC provides one day of training for experienced recruiters and all data entry specialists in the fall and a half-day in the spring(done Fall and Spring); OMESC provides extra training upon request (done as needed); and OMESC provides training for Lead Recruiters (done quarterly).

II. Designated Reviewer for each COE

Draft NRG Ch. III A12.2: A designated reviewer for each COE to verify that based on the recorded data the child is eligible for MEP services.

State Actions: SEA requires regional programs to identify/assign a designated reviewer usually the regional coordinator (designated in August).

III. Process for Resolving Eligibility Questions

Draft NRG Ch. III A13.3: A formal process for resolving eligibility questions raised by recruiters and their supervisors and for transmitting responses to all local operating agencies in written form.

State Actions: SEA requires that regional programs identify/assign a Lead Recruiter (October); OMESC trains and offers technical support for Lead Recruiters (Quarterly meetings); OMESC maintains regular contact with Lead Recruiters to gather eligibility questions from the field (ongoing); OMESC's COE Team meets monthly to review questions and make eligibility rulings for the State (monthly); OMESC emails all rulings to Regional Coordinators and data entry specialists immediately; and provides Regional Coordinators data entry specialists and recruiters with written copy of all rulings once a year (annually).

IV. Process to Validate Eligibility Determinations

Draft NRG Ch. III A13.4: A process for the SEA to validate that eligibility determinations were properly made.

Draft NRG Ch III A16: Review eligibility determinations at least annually including: an examination by qualified individuals at the SEA level of a representative sample of COEs for sufficiency of the written documentation; a process for improvement as needed to eliminate the causes of common errors on COEs; and a process for corrective action if the SEA finds COEs that do not sufficiently document a child's eligibility.

Draft NRG CH III A17: Re-interviewing parents or guardians from a representative sample of COEs on an annual basis should be part of an SEA's quality control system. SEAs are encouraged to use an outside contractor to perform this task at least once every 3 years.

State Actions: OMESC examines a 100% sample of COEs for sufficiency of the written document (ongoing); OMESC provides semi-annual reports to the regional programs on the accuracy levels of their COEs (quarterly); OMESC revises training agendas for recruiters based on frequent problems on COEs (annually); OMESC returns copies of insufficient COEs to regional data entry specialists with a form explaining what is missing and communicates with regional staff to resolve those problems (ongoing); OMESC re-interviews a 1% sample of all new COEs statewide (monthly); OMESC has a process to remove any non-eligible students from the child count (ongoing); and OMESC provides a report of re-interview results to ODE and Regional Coordinators (quarterly).

V. Monitor I&R Practices of Recruiters

Draft NRG CH. III A13.5: Monitor at least annually the identification and recruitment practices of individual recruiters.

State Action: SEA will review general recruiter practices during monitoring of LEAs (during regular school year).

VI. Document QC System and Actions Taken to Improve

Draft NRG: Ch. III A13.6: Documentation that supports the SEA's implementation of this quality control system and a record of actions taken to improve the system where periodic reviews and evaluations indicate a need to do so.

State Actions: OMESC maintains electronic and paper records of actions taken by OMESC (ongoing) and SEA monitors programs on a regular schedule and keeps records (ongoing).

VII. Process to Implement Corrective When Needed

Draft NRG Ch. III A13.7: A process for implementing corrective action in response to internal audit findings and recommendations.

State Action: SEA makes findings on the regional I&R plans and follows the corrective process (annually).

All training relating to ID&R and the Oregon Migrant Student Information System is done by State trainers. This ensures that information is delivered in a consistent manner. Oregon continues to work with Lead Recruiters who receive additional training in quarterly meetings. The Lead Recruiters will support other recruiters in the field by reviewing COEs in group meetings and helping to answer eligibility questions. They will also lead the development of local I&R Action Plans.

The SEA provides recruiters with a copy of Chapter II (Child Eligibility) of the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance published by OME and an ID&R Manual published by the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Oregon Migrant Education Service Center (OMESC) used the Oregon Migrant Student Information System (OMSIS) to select a random sample from all the COEs for the year 2003- 2004 as directed by the requirements set forth by the Re-interview Initiative. This random sample was double the number of interviews needed to allow for "no contact" attempts. The size of the random sample followed the recommendations from the USED Office of Migrant Education.

The re-interviews were conducted by a team of re-interviewers hired and supervised by the SEA and trained by the OMESC. The OMESC through the OMSIS provided the re-interviewers with the COEs for re-interviewing. The re-interviewers brought the re-interview information to the OMESC where the information was reviewed by the COE Determination Team composed of SEA and OMESC staff. The COEs were then verified by SEA and OMESC staff.

Defective COE: Begin 30-day response process. Record information on the two re-interview databases. Check OMSIS for any previous COEs and pull those. Determine whether the re-interview information might also invalidate the earlier COEs. Write memo to regional Title I-C director giving the area 30 days to respond to the finding that the children do not qualify. Make copies of the memo all pertinent COEs and re-interview form. Send the memo and the copies of the COE and re-interview form to the regional Title I-C director. File the copy of the memo with the original COE and re-interview form in the pending box for re-interviews. Put a note in the re-interview file drawer folder with the name of the first child on the COE and a reminder that the COE is in the pending file. Note to self on calendar when the 30 days will be up.

If there is no response after 30 days send an e-mail reminder to the regional Title I-C director with a cc to the OMSIS specialist and recruiter. If they choose not to contest the findings ask them to say so in writing by e-mail and print it out. If they simply never respond after a reasonable time note on the paperwork that they did not respond within 30 days to contest the findings. If the regional program responds to the findings discuss their response with the State Re-interviewer. Bring the issue to the COE Working Group if necessary.

Successfully contested: If the regional program's response is deemed acceptable make copies of all correspondence and notes regarding the COE. Send the memo to the regional Title I-C director that the re-interview findings have been successfully contested and the COE is accepted. Process the COE back by removing it from the pending file updating the databases filing copies in the re-interview file drawer and originals in the regular file drawer. File all copies of the correspondence regarding the COE with the COE

so that an auditor could see why it was questioned and why it was eventually accepted.

COE not contested/not successfully contested: If the COE is still deemed defective after the 30-day response process void the COE. Decide if the re-interview also invalidates any previous COEs. Give all COEs correspondence and information to the OMSIS data analyst to remove the appropriate COE(s) from the OMSIS. When that has been done update the re-interview databases. Write the memo that a COE has been voided and make two copies of the COE re-interview form and all correspondence. Send one set of copies to the regional Title I-C director with the memo. File the second set of copies in the re-interview file drawer. File all the originals in the VOID file. If earlier COEs were pulled and deemed valid file those back into the regular files.

Voided COEs: Remove all invalid COEs/QADs/students from database. If the children have been included in the previous year count inform OME that the children have been disqualified and removed from the system thus changing the student count. Put the voided COE and all information in the Quality Control Manager's box.

Report/Maintain information. Create Quarterly report to the regional Title I-C directors and SEA using the information on the database "New COE Received 0607". Send out by e-mail or distribute as printed copies in regional coordinator meetings. File copies of all reports in the re-interview file drawer. Maintain "Re-interview Database" in case more specific information is ever required by SEA or OME auditors.

During SY 2006-07 20 COEs from 14 of Oregon's 18 regional programs were selected to undergo the re-interview process. Of these fifteen (75%) were verified outright; three (15%) were verified once correction was made to the COE; and 2 (10%) were subsequently voided. This resulted in a 10% defect rate for COEs that underwent the re-interview process for SY 2006-07.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The OMESC provides the regional MEPs with a running total of migrant children identified in their local region on a monthly basis. Corrective actions are taken immediately in the local regions when discrepancies are found. After the October 1 2007 deadline OMESC staff carefully analyzes the data and performs additional validations and cross-tabs of information and checks for human errors i.e. names misspelled etc. This year category 1 and category 2 were generated November 01 2007.

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

Local projects are given a deadline of October 1 2007 to enroll and withdraw migrant students on OMSIS. Following the deadline the OMESC staff runs a query to confirm all withdrawals for students enrolled in a K-12 institution. Local projects are notified if data is missing for any enrolled student.

A query is run to generate the number of students enrolled in the summer program with no supplemental services reported. This list is then forwarded to local projects with a request for information. If no information is submitted the enrollment line will be removed from OMSIS.

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

Cross tabulation is done for children places in an out-of-school site where they are actually enrolled in a school building.

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

The checks involve the following: English cognates (e.g. James/Jaime Francisco/Frank Pedro/Peter.); Similar spellings or misspellings (e.g. Sanchez vs. Sanches Gonzalez vs. Gonzales); Alternate spelling of names (e.g. Yesenia vs. Jesenia Evelia vs. Ebelia Giovanni vs. Jovanny); Double family names (e.g. Rodriguez-Sanchez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez Sanches-Rodrigues Sanches-Rodriguez Sanchez vs. Sanches Rodriguez vs. Rodrigues Sanchez Rodriguez vs. Sanchez-Rodriguez); Double family names against single family names (e.g. Sanchez-Rodriguez Maria vs. Sanchez Maria); Double first names (e.g. Juan vs. Juan Carlos Jose vs. Jose Luis Maria Dolores vs. Maria); Similar date of birth and with the same first and last names (Rodriguez Maria 01/01/85 vs. 10/01/85); Last names that can be written with or without spaces (e.g. A la Torre vs. Alatorre De Jesus vs. Dejesus); First names that might be abbreviated (e.g. Ma De Jesus vs. Maria De Jesus vs. Maria vs. Maria J vs. Ma Dejesus).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

When the COE arrives at the OMESC the COE Quality Control Manager and the Statewide Recruiter verify the validity of the COE and randomly compare the information against the OMSIS.net. Any discrepancies found will be reported to the regional programs and the corrections will be made on OMSIS.

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

This process takes place year-round.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

When the State of Oregon decided to conduct its own re-interview process it contacted Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory an outside provider to help with the set-up. The State of Oregon and NWREL brought together a committee of directors and Oregon Migrant Education Service Center personnel who worked with ID&R and Quality Control. A process was set up and protocol for dealing with eligibility determinations was outlined.

The State of Oregon hired and trained recruiters not associated with the OMESC or any of the existing regional migrant areas.

At the conclusion of the re-interview process we learned several things such as:

(a) Training alone was not sufficient for external recruiters to know how to properly interview complete a COE make a qualification determination of the migrant families and understand the migrant population culture. Experience was a must and it was lacking in the re-interviewers.

(b) The re-interviewers were trained with and expected to follow the new proposals to the Draft NRG rather than with the existing 2003 Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance which was in place and in use by the recruiters statewide. (c) Accurate account of the non-contacted families was not kept. When a COE was randomly selected for re-interview as stated in the process and the family was not found the re-interviewer proceeded to "draw" another COE without annotating the reason or finding out why they were not found. In looking through our records we find that many of those families are constantly on the move and were hard to find.

The end result of this re-interviewing project was a high defect rate mixed messages and directions were given to the recruiting in a project that lacked direction.

In light of these results the state has revamped its ID&R trainings to include the following:

(a) Provide a systematic preparation program that will give new and veteran recruiters an opportunity to receive continuous staff development. The trainings include education on background and overview of the MEP recruiting techniques which include the interview developing plans for recruiting and contacting families using a referral system and a self analysis of the recruiter-characteristics of a good recruiter. We have also included in the training child eligibility and determinations filling out a COE quality control at the state level and the role of the recruiter; and a section on services provided for migrant students by MEPs and where to obtain additional resources. At the director's level regional directors and area coordinators are being trained on effective ways to hire retain and utilize recruiters how to build an ID&R plan quality control and monitoring.

(b) Oregon has been active in the training of its recruiters through the participation in the National ID&R Forum and we are working closely with the MERC to provide statewide training to all the recruiters in the month of January.

(c) The state will continue to use the 2003 Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance as a resource from which to train all recruiters in the state.

(d) A quality control system has been set up in place for maintaining accurate records proper determination of migrant children students and families' eligibility and a re-interview process that is done by an experienced well-trained recruiter.

(e) The state of Oregon has contracted with an external national agency to review assess and recommend a process and protocol to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations and for identifying and re-interviewing the correct percentage of families with proper designation.

Although this system has only been in effect for three months we are beginning to see positive results in the identification and proper determination of qualifying eligible migrant youth and their families.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The technology the process in place for inputting the numbers of qualifying children and the personnel trained to achieve the tasks on which the counts are based are very reliable in our state. However the accuracy of having identified and made proper eligibility determinations to enroll all migrant qualifying students in Oregon is of concern due to the fact that many of our recruiters were confused about the child eligibility requirements and many migrant youth have not been properly identified.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.