

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

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2006-07 X 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

Friday, April 18, 2008, 6:11:54 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART II DUE FEBRUARY 22, 2008

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

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

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

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

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment & a Performance Level Reported	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	17840	11605	65.1
4	17305	11425	66.0
5	17079	10744	62.9
6	7537	4800	63.7
7	4311	2931	68.0
8	4358	2794	64.1
High School	1497	648	43.3
Total	69927	44947	64.3
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDfacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X075 that is data group 583. In addition, the SEA submits the data in file N/X101 that includes data group 22.

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment & a Performance Level Reported	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	17827	13948	78.2
4	17308	12930	74.7
5	17074	11104	65.0
6	7539	5158	68.4
7	4314	3063	71.0
8	4365	2647	60.6
High School	1504	730	48.5
Total	69931	49580	70.9
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDfacts. The SEA submits the data in files N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584. In addition, the SEA submits the data in file N/X101 that includes data group 22.

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment & a Performance Level Reported	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	9702	6573	67.7
4	9729	6883	70.7
5	10141	6726	66.3
6	6967	4462	64.0
7	4646	3245	69.8
8	4444	2864	64.4
High School	1761	786	44.6
Total	47390	31539	66.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X075 that is data group 583. In addition, the SEA submits the data in file N/X101 that includes data group 22.

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

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment & a Performance Level Reported	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	9691	7924	81.8
4	9733	7761	79.7
5	10162	7219	71.0
6	6983	4852	69.5
7	4643	3269	70.4
8	4451	2720	61.1
High School	1768	980	55.4
Total	47431	34725	73.2
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in files N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584. In addition, the SEA submits the data in file N/X101 that includes data group 22.

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

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	20935
Limited English proficient students	32231
Students who are homeless	6550
Migratory students	5777
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X037 that is data group 538, category sets C-F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly section 2.1.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	4691
Asian or Pacific Islander	7027
Black, non-Hispanic	7921
Hispanic	41943
White, non-Hispanic	88318
Total	149900
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037, that is data group ID 548, category set B.

Note: This table was formerly section 2.1.3.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The total row is new for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2		51			51
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	29	1053	40	N<5	1126
K	3262	17257	81	1444	22044
1	3475	17827	127	1545	22974
2	3099	17653	102	1495	22349
3	2634	17703	111	1471	21919
4	2055	17302	101	1473	20931
5	1882	16663	74	1415	20034
6	981	7309	45	1053	9388
7	647	4430	45	1051	6173
8	567	4512	32	998	6109
9	806	1806	35	1293	3940
10	337	1624	53	702	2716
11	150	1648	61	648	2507
12	147	1477	71	637	2332
Ungraded	359	1854	51	69	2333
TOTALS	20430	130169	1029	15298	166926
Comments: Age 0-2, no participation in TAS, Private, Neglected.					

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037, that is data group ID 548, category set A.

Note: This table was formerly section 2.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The percent of total column has been deleted for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	3975
Reading/language arts	15965
Science	97
Social studies	53
Vocational/career	42
Other instructional services	100
Comments: Many of our students receive assistance in more than one or two of the instructional services.	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group ID 549, category set A.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.1.3.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	845
Supporting guidance/advocacy	1306
Other support services	292
Comments: Many of our students receive assistance in more than one or two of the support services.	

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group ID 549, category set B.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.1.3.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2002.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	249.1	
Paraprofessionals ¹	424.8	92.2
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	13.7	
Clerical support staff	8.4	
Administrators (non-clerical)	20.00	
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The following changes have been made to this table for the SY 2006-07 CSPR: Instructional Paraprofessionals has been relabeled to paraprofessionals, Non-instructional paraprofessionals has been relabeled to other paraprofessionals(translators, parental involvement, computer assistance), Support staff (clerical and non-clerical) has been relabeled to Clerical support staff, Other (specify) has been deleted, and percentage qualified has been added.

FAQs on staff information

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

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs (formerly 1.5.4.)

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

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals3	2809.00	96.8
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.5.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the paraprofessional FTE count has been added to this data collection.

3 Consistent with ESEA as amended by NCLB, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

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

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	7
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all required core services.
2. "Adults" include teen parents. The number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	316
2. Adults participating	341
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (LEP)	269
4. Participating children	455
a. Infants and toddlers (birth through 2 years)	206
b. Preschool age (age 3 through 5)	193
c. School age (age 6 through 8)	56
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: The participating children subcategories have been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of families at the time of enrollment for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project at any time during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	227
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	243
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level	160
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	193
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade	148
Comments:	

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

Note: For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, three new rows have been added: the number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level, the number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment, and the number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade data collections have been changed from percent to number.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families still participating, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2007). Report each family only once in lines 1-4. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	# Families
1. Number of families participating 3 months or less	67
2. Number of families participating more than 3 months and fewer than 6 months	70
3. Number of families participating more than 6 months and fewer than 12 months	91
4. Number of families participating 12 months or longer	88
5. Total families participating	316
Comments:	

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

Note: The additional calculation of total families participating is new for the SY 2006-07 CSPR. This data collection has been changed from collecting percent of families to collecting number of families for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

Describe your State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants. States should always provide an explanation if they are using measures that differ from what is specified.

Note regarding Table 2.2.1.2: An additional 6 children were served in Oregon Even Start programs that are not indicated in this table. Three of these children were over the age of 8 (they started in the program when under age 8) and the other 3 children did not have a DOB reported on their forms and the children have since exited the program.

Note: This is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests. Do not include LEP adults.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Do not use TABE
CASAS	16	13	Significant learning gain is defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours of ABE.
Other			
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number of adults pre-and post-tested has been added, but the number participating (cohort) has been deleted. This data collection requests the number of adults who showed significant gains. This is different from the SY 2005-06 CSPR, which requested the percentage of adults who showed significant gains.

2.2.2.2 LEP Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of LEP adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			Do not use TABE
CASAS	150	118	Significant learning gain is defined as a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum of 80 hours of ESL.
Other			
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number of adults pre-and post-tested has been added, but the number participating (cohort) has been deleted. This data collection requests the number of adults who showed significant gains. This is different from the SY 2005-06 CSPR,

which requested the percentage of adults who showed significant gains.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. "Cohort" includes only those adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED.

Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<5	N<5	
GED	N<5	N<5	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. This data collection is requesting the number of school age adults earning a diploma or GED, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage.

Non-School-Age Adults	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	N<5	N<5	
GED	28	11	
Other	0	0	
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. This data collection is requesting the number of non-school age adults earning a diploma or GED, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the collection of diploma or GED data has been split into two rows, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it was collected together.

2.2.2.4 Children Entering Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

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

The following terms apply to 2.2.2.4 through 2.2.2.7:

1. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points with a minimum 6 months between pre-and post-test.
2. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are expected to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
3. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of services in between.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	#Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	27	14	11		# Exempted is not available. 25% of the 14 tested kids scored 85 or higher. 6 of 13 tested kids met the goal on the TVIP assessment
Comments:					

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number age eligible, the number tested and the number exempted have been added, but the number participating (cohort) has been deleted. This data collection is requesting the number of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage.

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask.

The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	27	20	12.9	
Comments:				

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number age eligible, the number tested and the average number of letters (weighted average) have been added, but the number participating (cohort) has been deleted. This data collection is requesting the average number of letters children can identify, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

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

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	63	55	These numbers represent ALL of the Oregon Even Start school-aged children. In 200607 we did not request this data from programs. Sources: Unknown: 6 Report card: 56 Placement reading series: 1
1			
2			
3			
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. This data collection is requesting the number of school-age children reading on grade level, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage. The breakdown of grades K through 3rd is new for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			Not available
PEP Scale II			Not available
PEP Scale III			Not available
PEP Scale IV			Not available
Other			Not available
Comments:			

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. This data collection is requesting the number of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support, which is a change from the SY 2005-06 CSPR where it requested the percentage. The breakdown of PEP scales is new for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	696
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	19017
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1 Initially, the row "age birth through 2" is pre-populated by ED Facts 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.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	250
K	320
1	303
2	277
3	225
4	182
5	199
6	185
7	219
8	188
9	245
10	251
11	203
12	173
Ungraded	62
Out-of-school	0
Total	3282

Comments: Last year, Priority for Services (PFS) counts were generated without attributing the Oregon State Assessment's Reading and Math scores, because the scores were not available at the time of the report's due date; and last year Oregon included all children enrolled in kindergarten, first, and second grades as PFS because they did not take the State assessment. This year 2006-07 PFS criteria was changed to reflect the children whose education was interrupted during the regular school year and who did not meet the state benchmarks or who are at risk of failing.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X121 that is data group 634, category set B. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSRP.

FAQ on priority for services:

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

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	59
K	512
1	526
2	521
3	511
4	467
5	467
6	384
7	380
8	403
9	435
10	419
11	346
12	242
Ungraded	16
Out-of-school	6
Total	5694
Comments: Oregon's migrant population has decreased tremendously for school year 2006-07; therefore aggregate information for migrant children will show a substantial decrease. Many children who were eligible last year are no longer eligible this year.	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	16
1	23
2	32
3	38
4	38
5	45
6	39
7	34
8	42
9	53
10	43
11	26
12	15
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	444

Comments: Oregon's migrant population has decreased tremendously for school year 2006-07; therefore aggregate information for migrant children will show a substantial decrease. Many children who were eligible last year are no longer eligible this year. Data collection did not have the same breakdown as listed in this table.

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

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

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	351	269	72	N<5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	680	643	646	558
K	307	317	317	310
1	254	295	356	374
2	242	278	373	406
3	248	264	322	369
4	198	223	313	372
5	212	235	334	369
6	197	220	332	348
7	229	221	287	338
8	203	212	300	323
9	192	223	313	357
10	179	201	327	315
11	134	148	235	290
12	67	93	195	234
Ungraded	74	16	8	N<5
Out-of-school	745	283	295	371
Total	4512	4141	5025	5339
<p>Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.</p>				

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. New for this data collection for the SY 200607 CSPR is the column requesting data on students whose qualifying move occurred in the previous 37-48 months and the date of August 31 as the last day of the reporting period.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	609
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2152
K	1071
1	1097
2	1090
3	1029
4	917
5	970
6	912
7	894
8	863
9	888
10	851
11	657
12	462
Ungraded	82
Out-of-school	1335
Total	15879
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. New for this data collection for the SY 200607 CSPR is the date of August 31 as the last day of the reporting period.

2.3.2 Academic Status

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

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	0
8	0
9	N<5
10	14
11	6
12	10
Ungraded	0
Total	31

Comments: Although Oregon's Hispanic and Migrant student drop out is still high compared to the state and national standard, the decrease in the total number of migrant students who dropped out of school has more to do with the eligibility factors, their migrating patterns rather than with the success in Migrant student retention in the schools.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X032 that is data group 326, category set E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2006-07 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

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

Obtained a GED in your state	6
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

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

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	877	570
4	792	587
5	812	588
6	793	588
7	742	558
8	722	589
9	727	169
10	656	494
11	512	161
12	322	52
Ungraded	59	N<5
Total	7014	4358

Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for school year 2006-2007 because many of the migrant children's eligibility concluded during this school year. Many families fearing new immigration laws have opted to cease migrating. The state of Oregon has gone through many changes in their testing guidelines, test providers, and reporting guidelines. Due to the improved method of reporting the testing results, the students to be tested, and data storage and retrieval by the state of Oregon, the information reported for the year 2006-2007 seems to be more accurate and complete.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X081 that includes data group 589, category set F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	877	573
4	792	591
5	812	589
6	793	590
7	742	563
8	722	605
9	727	196
10	656	489
11	512	177
12	322	59
Ungraded	59	N<5
Total	7014	4434

Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for school year 2006-2007 because many of the migrant children's eligibility concluded during this school year. Many families fearing new immigration laws have opted to cease migrating.

The state of Oregon has gone through many changes in their testing guidelines, test providers, and reporting guidelines. Due to the improved method of reporting the testing results, the students to be tested, and data storage and retrieval by the state of Oregon, the information reported for the year 2006-2007 seems to be more accurate and complete.

Source – Same as 2.3.3.1.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	25
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	506
K	662
1	717
2	704
3	641
4	618
5	602
6	623
7	677
8	621
9	651
10	626
11	498
12	322
Ungraded	15
Out-of-school	41
Total	8549
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X123 that includes data group 636, subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	215
K	154
1	196
2	150
3	126
4	117
5	115
6	122
7	180
8	141
9	175
10	185
11	147
12	101
Ungraded	11
Out-of-school	0
Total	2135
Comments: For the school year 2006-2007 the SEA redefined its definition for the Priority For Services. While in 2005-2006 all students who did not meet bench marks and those who did not take state standards testing were considered as PFS students, this year's new redefinition includes: ONLY children whose education was interrupted during the regular school year and who did not meet the state benchmarks or who are at risk of failing and all testing information for the year was acquired.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X123 that includes data group 636, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Oregon does not serve MEP children whose eligibility ended before September 1, 2006. MEP funds and services are targeted to those who are eligible for MEP as of September 1, 2006.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	381
K	529
1	561
2	547
3	514
4	478
5	441
6	439
7	552
8	493
9	561
10	547
11	416
12	285
Ungraded	10
Out-of-school	11
Total	6771
<p>Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students.</p>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	N<5	N<5	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	65	62	
K	325	194	
1	358	238	
2	329	211	
3	304	238	
4	308	250	
5	262	195	
6	201	181	
7	287	264	
8	253	208	
9	220	181	499
10	214	161	490
11	159	107	365
12	113	78	252
Ungraded	N<5	N<5	7
Out-of-school	6	5	11
Total	3408	2578	1624

Comments: EDEN used the total from 2005-06 MATH and is comparing it against 2006-2007 READING. EDEN used 2005-2006 Summer High School Credit Accrual totals (511) instead of 2486 as documented on the 2005-06 Regular school totals to compare against 2006-07 Regular High School Credit Accrual total of 1624. Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	25	5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	474	43
K	434	25
1	473	27
2	485	27
3	428	30
4	437	25
5	441	30
6	368	34
7	429	95
8	400	99
9	506	127
10	468	141
11	352	93
12	251	89
Ungraded	14	0
Out-of-school	39	10
Total	6024	900
<p>Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.</p>		

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	271
K	306
1	343
2	317
3	294
4	297
5	313
6	266
7	305
8	302
9	292
10	294
11	217
12	158
Ungraded	7
Out-of-school	32
Total	4032
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is EDFacts file N/X124 that includes data group 637.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	N<5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	440
K	478
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	0
Total	4317
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	93
K	121
1	115
2	104
3	101
4	70
5	58
6	64
7	73
8	40
9	36
10	36
11	27
12	16
Ungraded	41
Out-of-school	0
Total	995
<p>Comments: For the school year 2006-2007 the SEA redefined its definition for the Priority For Services. While in 2005-2006 all students who did not meet bench marks and those who did not take state standards testing were considered as PFS students, this year's new redefinition includes: ONLY children whose education was interrupted during the regular school year and who did not meet the state benchmarks or who are at risk of failing and all testing information for the year was acquired.</p>	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Oregon does not serve MEP children whose eligibility ended before September 1, 2006. MEP funds and services are targeted to those who are eligible for MEP as of September 1, 2006.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

FAQ on Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	N<5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	440
K	467
1	489
2	462
3	430
4	366
5	354
6	314
7	247
8	171
9	180
10	136
11	96
12	29
Ungraded	56
Out-of-school	0
Total	4239
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	0	0	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	262	222	
K	460	455	
1	482	484	
2	460	452	
3	426	425	
4	358	353	
5	348	341	
6	299	295	
7	207	196	
8	135	128	
9	102	54	179
10	75	32	129
11	54	23	92
12	9	N<5	26
Ungraded	19	18	44
Out-of-school	0	0	0
Total	3696	3482	470

Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	N<5	N<5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	408	27
K	434	14
1	474	16
2	437	36
3	402	10
4	353	12
5	333	9
6	268	N<5
7	218	14
8	148	12
9	153	35
10	127	40
11	86	23
12	29	N<5
Ungraded	55	0
Out-of-school	0	0
Total	3927	254
<p>Comments: Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.</p>		

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQs on Support Services:

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

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	N<5
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	147
K	133
1	166
2	136
3	129
4	138
5	118
6	83
7	72
8	60
9	43
10	44
11	26
12	N<5
Ungraded	N<5
Out-of-school	0
Total	1303
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	6
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	644
K	817
1	902
2	916
3	838
4	757
5	760
6	720
7	717
8	644
9	715
10	649
11	515
12	359
Ungraded	70
Out-of-school	0
Total	10029
Comments: The Oregon Migrant Education Service Center did not collect this data last year (2005-06) and are not aware of how the figure (75,975) is arrived at or where it came from.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X054 that includes data group 102, subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.4 School Data

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

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	Number
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	672
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	10685
Comments: Oregon's migrant population has decreased tremendously for school year 2006-07; therefore aggregate information for migrant children will show a substantial decrease. Many children who were eligible last year are no longer eligible this year.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X102 that includes data group 110. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. This data collection has been changed to include public schools only.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	Number
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	5
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	10685
Comments: Oregon's MEP projects are discouraged from combining or commingling MEP funds in schools that are schoolwide. This is why the decrease from 27 schools for 2005-06 to five schools for school year 2006-07.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X102 that includes data groups 110 and 514. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
1. Regular school year – school day only	83	3598
2. Regular school year – school day/extended day	0	0
3. Summer/intersession only	0	0
4. Year round	112	13264
<p>Comments: Last year's information accounted for the number of MEP regions which provided School Day Only services. Eight out of Oregon's 18 MEP regional programs provided services in 2005-2006. For 2006-2007 we counted all districts within the 18 regional MEP regional programs. There are 83 districts providing MEP services within the 18 regional programs. Oregon's migrant student enrollment population decreased considerably for the school year 2006-2007 due to the change in state policy regarding the qualification of migrant students. Because of these constant and frequent changes in state policy encouraged by proposed changes to the NRGs, the recruiters, especially trained veteran recruiters, lost confidence in their ability to properly identify migrant children, students and families. Although the state, through its service provider; the Oregon Migrant Education Service Center, began to issue clarification notices, bulletins, and additional trainings, many recruiters' workload and learning curves pertaining to the new forms, documentation, and COEs, were steep and they would often refrain from recruiting families.</p>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number of MEP funded staff in the regular school year, the number of MEP funded staff in summer term/intersession and the FTE amount of time in summer term/intersession have been deleted.

FAQs on the MEP State director

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

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	55	19.7	257	226.6
Counselors	0	0.00	0	0.00
All paraprofessionals	125	84.9	240	199.3
Recruiters	75	47.5	39	34.8
Records transfer staff	19	12.2	9	5.6

Comments: Oregon has consolidated many of its smaller I-C regional programs into fewer large programs during 2006-2007; and many of these larger programs are being run through regional Education Service Districts rather than school districts. Many of Oregon's MEP regional programs are funding more migrant staff teachers than the previous year to provide services to the new PFS designated students. Oregon has consolidated many of its smaller I-C regional programs into fewer large programs during 2006-2007; and many of these larger programs are being run through regional Education Service Districts rather than school districts. Several of these larger I-C regional programs have chosen to fund additional paraprofessionals in the districts/schools within their region. During 2006-2007, the State I-C office has been working with the regional programs on an increased emphasis on identification and recruitment of migrant students, especially during the summer. Oregon has consolidated many of its smaller I-C regional programs into fewer large programs during 2006-2007; and many of these larger programs are being run through regional Education Service Districts rather than school districts thus requiring fewer records transfer staff.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X065 that includes data groups 515 and 625, category A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 - To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 - Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)).*

Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground

- e. Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	113	78.2	180	154.3
Comments:				

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.3.1.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

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

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

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
1. Neglected programs	47	48
2. Juvenile detention		
3. Juvenile corrections	9	122
4. Adult corrections		
5. Other		
Total	56	170

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: Juvenile detention does not access Title I-D funds. ODE does not have information for Adult corrections and there is no information for "Other".	

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.4.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The unduplicated count of Neglected and Delinquent students has been moved for the SY 2006-07 CSPR. The additional calculation of total number of programs/facilities is new for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

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

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
1. Neglected Programs	47
2. Juvenile Detention	
3. Juvenile Corrections	9
4. Adult Corrections	
5. Other	
Total	56
Comments: Juvenile detention does not access Title I-D funds. ODE does not have information for Adult corrections and there is no information for "Other".	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	1644		1394		
Long Term Students Served	1644		913		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	73		57		
Asian or Pacific Islander	14		24		
Black, non-Hispanic	121		143		
Hispanic	172		202		
White, non-Hispanic	1246		953		
Total	1626		1379		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1017		1240		
Female	627		154		
Total	1644		1394		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	28		0		
6	40		0		
7	58		0		
8	70		0		
9	83		0		
10	83		0		
11	86		0		
12	111		0		
13	135		0		
14	194		14		
15	239		62		
16	250		139		
17	191		219		
18	61		338		
19	8		270		
20	N<5		151		
21	N<5		77		
Total	1644		1270		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain.

Comments: In the above tables, "Other" and "Declined to Report" are not options. For Race/Ethnicity, Neglected had 18 in Other/Declined to report and Juvenile Corrections has 15 in Other/Declined to report, therefore affecting the totals in the 3

Age vs Unduplicated: Our current data reporting requirements and collection method impairs our ability to capture good data here. However, we have amended our contracts to require our contractors to utilize the Title I Part D facility level tool provided by NDTAC to address this issue for the 2008-09 data collections.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X119 that is data group 656, category sets A, B, and C. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the age groupings that were present in the SY 2005-06 CSPR have been changed to collect data by each age year.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

Note: In the remaining tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)	29	9		
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)	6	9		
3. Awarded GED(s)	N<5	N<5		
Comments:				

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

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
1. Earned high school course credits	724	732		
2. Enrolled in a GED program	10	20		
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
1. Enrolled in their local district school	438	24		
2. Earned a GED	10	56		
3. Obtained high school diploma	24	13		
4. Were accepted into postsecondary education	8			
5. Enrolled in post-secondary education	8			
Comments: Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities -#4 and #5: Though we do not have a specific number of students available at this time, post-secondary studies is an option for students who have obtained a HS Diploma. Data tools to capture this information for the future are being put in place.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs	31	173		
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
1. Enrolled in external job training education	N<5	0		
2. Obtained employment	16	0		
Comments: Juvenile Corrections/Detention Facilities: Though we do not have a specific number of students available at this time, post-secondary studies is an option for students who have obtained a HS Diploma. Data tools to capture this information for the future are being put in place.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2006, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories (rows 3 through 7). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
1. Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	726	461		
2. Long-term students who have complete pre- and post-test results (data)	475	327		

Of the students reported in row 2 above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3. Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	24	126		
4. No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	60	42		
5. Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	124	19		
6. Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	136	27		
7. Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	88	113		
Comments: Our current data reporting requirements and collection method impairs our ability to capture good data here. However, we have amended our contracts to require our contractors to utilize the Title I Part D facility level tool provided by NDTAC to address this issue for 2008-09 data collections.				

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X113 that is data group 628, category sets A and B. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
1. Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	726	677		
2. Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	475	347		

Of the students reported in row 2 above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3. Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	24	107		
4. No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	60	84		
5. Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	124	44		
6. Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	136	17		
7. Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	88	95		

Comments: Our current data reporting requirements and collection method impairs our ability to capture good data here. However, we have amended our contracts to require our contractors to utilize the Title I Part D facility level tool provided by NDTAC to address this issue for 2008-09 data collections.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X113 that is data group 628, category sets A and B. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
1. At-risk programs	13	0
2. Neglected programs	12	108
3. Juvenile detention		
4. Juvenile corrections	19	49
5. Other	1	30
Total	45	187

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
Comments: At-risk programs data submitted does not calculate an Average Length of Stay in Days. Juvenile "detention" and "corrections" not collected separately.	

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.4.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the unduplicated count of neglected and delinquent children has been moved. The category At-risk or Other has been split into two separate categories for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQ on average length of stay:

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

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
1. At-risk programs	13
2. Neglected programs	12
3. Juvenile detention	
4. Juvenile corrections	18
5. Other	1
Total	44
Comments: Collection did not separate Juvenile detention and Juvenile corrections.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	2152	1051		1205	0
Total Long Term Students Served		327		370	0

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	70	48		78	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	28	10		16	0
Black, non-Hispanic	40	40		40	0
Hispanic	483	117		143	0
White, non-Hispanic	1453	803		906	0
Total	2074	1018		1183	0

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	1023	661		915	0
Female	1129	390		290	0
Total	2152	1051		1205	0

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					0
6					0
7					0
8					0
9					0
10	0	112		12	0
11					0
12					0
13					0
14					0
15	271	400		429	0
16					0
17					0
18	1497	503		749	0
19					0
20					0
21	384	36		15	0
Total	2152	1051		1205	0

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. Comments: At-Risk -survey did not collect Long-Term Student information.

Other -none reported.

Race/Ethnicity: Did not report -At Risk -78, Neglected -33, Juvenile Corrections -22.

Age: LEA survey collected by groups -5-10, 11-15, 16-18, 19 & older; no collection for under 5.

No "Other" to report.

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

Note: For this data collection, the age groupings that were present in the SY 2005-06 CSPR have been changed to collect data by each age year. In addition, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

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

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.

Note: In the remaining tables, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

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

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/Corrections	Other Programs
1. Awarded high school course credit(s)		10	19	
2. Awarded high school diploma(s)		N<5	7	
3. Awarded GED(s)		N<5	N<5	
Comments: Did not collect data for At-Risk or Other.				

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

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. In addition, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention	Other Programs
1. Earned high school course credits		514	498	
2. Enrolled in a GED program		63	84	
Comments: Did not collect data for At-Risk or Other.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention	Other Programs
1. Enrolled in their local district school		228	481	
2. Earned a GED		12	52	
3. Obtained high school diploma		22	25	
4. Were accepted into post-secondary education		5	6	
5. Enrolled in post-secondary education		N<5	N<5	
Comments: Did not collect data for At Risk or Other.				

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

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. In addition, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention	Other Programs
1. Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		178	93	
Comments: Did not collect data for At Risk or Other.				

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

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/Detention	Other Programs
1. Enrolled in external job training education		11	13	
2. Obtained employment		80	37	
Comments: Did not collect data for At Risk or Other.				

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

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2006, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories (rows 3 through 7). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
1. Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		183	155	
2. Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		205	132	

Of the students reported in row 2 above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
3. Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		N<5	13	
4. No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		30	29	
5. Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		33	32	
6. Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		68	17	
7. Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		70	41	
Comments: Did not collect data for At Risk or Other.				

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X125 that is data group 629, category sets A and B. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2006, through June 30, 2007.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
1. Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		201	173	
2. Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		213	130	

Of the students reported in row 2 above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
3. Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		6	19	
4. No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		32	32	
5. Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		37	29	
6. Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		69	23	
7. Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		69	27	
Comments: Did not collect data to At Risk or Other.				

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X125 that is data group 629, category sets A and B. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This was formerly part of section 2.4.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the column At-risk and Other was split into two separate columns.

2.5 COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM (CSR) (TITLE I, PART F)

This section collects information on Comprehensive School Reform.

2.5.1 CSR Grantee Schools Making AYP

In the table below, provide the percentage of CSR schools that have/had a CSR grant and that made AYP in reading/language arts and mathematics during SY 2006-07.

	Percentage
Reading/language	34.5
Mathematics	36.2
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: Mathematics was formerly part of section 2.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.5.2 CSR Grantees

In the table below, provide the number of schools that have/had a CSR grant since 1998.

	#
Schools that have/had a CSR grant since 1998?	63
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This was formerly part of section 2.5.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data. The first four columns (e.g., Performance Indicators, Instruments/Data Sources, Frequency of Collection/Baselines, and Targets) will be pre-populated from your State's SY 2005-06 CSPR submission.

Note: The information in the first four columns is provided for reference purposes only.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 1.1	2004-05 .7
			2005-06 1	2005-06 .6
			2006-07 .9	2006-07 1
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 .5	Baseline: 1.2
			2008-09 .5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who carried a gun on school property in the past 30 days	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 .3	2004-05 1
			2005-06 .2	2005-06 .5
			2006-07 .1	2006-07 1.2
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 .05	Baseline: .5
			2008-09 .5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who engaged in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 14.5	2004-05 17.3
			2005-06 14	2005-06 15.9
			2006-07 13.5	2006-07 15.8
		Year of most recent	2007-08 13	Baseline: 15.9

		collection: 2007	2008-09 13	Year Established: 2002-03
--	--	------------------	------------	---------------------------

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who engaged in a physical fight on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 5	2004-05 8
			2005-06 5	2005-06 7.3
			2006-07 5	2006-07 8.5
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 5	Baseline: 7.4
			2008-09 5	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 10	2004-05 13.1
			2005-06 10	2005-06 13.6
			2006-07 10	2006-07 14.1
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 10	Baseline: 13.1
			2008-09 10	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 24.5	2004-05 24
			2005-06 24	2005-06 23.7
			2006-07 23.5	2006-07 23.8
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 22	Baseline: 25.1
			2008-09 22	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	---------	-----------------------

% of 8th grade students who used illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 15.5	2004-05 15.3
			2005-06 14.5	2005-06 15.7
			2006-07 14	2006-07 15.9
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 13.5	Baseline: 15.9
			2008-09 13.5	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who used illicit drugs in the past month (includes marijuana, inhalants, prescription drugs, stimulants, cocaine, heroin, Ecstasy and/or LSD)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 24	2004-05 24
			2005-06 23	2005-06 21.8
			2006-07 22	2006-07 25
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 20	Baseline: 24.3
			2008-09 20	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 23.5	2004-05 30.1
			2005-06 23	2005-06 31.9
			2006-07 22.5	2006-07 30.9
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 22	Baseline: 24.7
			2008-09 22	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who report using alcohol in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 35	2004-05 47
			2005-06 35	2005-06 43.9
			2006-07 35	2006-07 48.7
		Year of most recent	2007-08 35	Baseline: 43.4

		collection: 2007	2008-09 35	Year Established: 2002-03
--	--	------------------	------------	---------------------------

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
		Frequency: Annual	2004-05 13.5	2004-05 13.8
			2005-06 13	2005-06 10.7
			2006-07 12.5	2006-07 15.6
			2007-08 12	Baseline: 14.6

% of 8th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Year of most recent collection: 2007	2008-09 8	Year Established: 2004-05
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
		Frequency: Annual	2004-05 11.5	2004-05 12
			2005-06 11	2005-06 11.9
			2006-07 10.5	2006-07 13.7
			2007-08 10	Baseline: 12.5
% of 11th grade students who seriously considered attempting suicide during the past 12 months	Oregon Healthy Teen Surey (YRBS)	Year of most recent collection: 2007	2008-09 9.5	Year Established: 2004-05

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
		Frequency: Annual	2004-05 47.5	2004-05 47.3
			2005-06 47	2005-06 38.8
			2006-07 46.5	2006-07 42.8
			2007-08 46	Baseline: 48.1
% of 8th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Year of most recent collection: 2007	2008-09 38	Year Established: 2004-05

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who have felt harassed at school during the past 30 days (or on the way to or from school, was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 35	2004-05 35
			2005-06 30	2005-06 31.1
			2006-07 25	2006-07 30.7
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 20	Baseline: 41.2
			2008-09 20	Year Established: 2004-05
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 5.5	2004-05 5.7
			2005-06 5	2005-06 6.2
			2006-07 4.5	2006-07 5.8
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 4	Baseline: 6.7
			2008-09 3.5	Year Established: 2004-05
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who did not feel safe at school or on the way to or from school during the past month (did not go to school was added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 3	2004-05 3
			2005-06 3	2005-06 5.3
			2006-07 3	2006-07 4.6
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 3	Baseline: 4.7
			2008-09 2.5	Year Established: 2004-05
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 12	2004-05 10.7
			2005-06 11.5	2005-06 9.9

			2006-07 11	2006-07 8.9
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 10.5	Baseline: 12.7
			2008-09 8	Year Established: 2004-05
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who report using marijuana in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 15	2004-05 20
			2005-06 15	2005-06 18.7
			2006-07 15	2006-07 18.6
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 15	Baseline: 23.4
			2008-09 14.5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 8	2004-05 9.8
			2005-06 8	2005-06 8.2
			2006-07 8	2006-07 10.7
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 8	Baseline: 10.5
			2008-09 7.5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who report using tobacco products in the previous month	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 15	2004-05 17
			2005-06 15	2005-06 15.4
			2006-07 15	2006-07 20.4
		Year of most recent	2007-08 15	Baseline: 18.7

		collection: 2007	2008-09 14.5	Year Established: 2002-03
--	--	------------------	--------------	---------------------------

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to smoke one or more cigarette packs a day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 93	2004-05 96
			2005-06 93	2005-06 84.2
			2006-07 93	2006-07 76.5
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 93	Baseline: 95.1
			2008-09 95	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using tobacco (high changed to great and using changed to smoke one or more cigarette packs a day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 93	2004-05 93
			2005-06 93	2005-06 90.8
			2006-07 93	2006-07 82.4
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 93	Baseline: 95.3
			2008-09 95	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
			2004-05 92	2004-05 94.1
			2005-06 95	2005-06 84.1
			2006-07 95	2006-07 74.5

% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04, high changed to great '05) Comments:	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 95	2006-07 74.5	2007-08 95	Baseline: 85.5	2008-09 95	Year Established: 2002-03

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using marijuana (regularly '04, high changed to great '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 85	2004-05 88
			2005-06 90	2005-06 79.3
			2006-07 90	2006-07 67.7
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 90	Baseline: 78.4
			2008-09 90	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk (someone your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 98.5	2004-05 98.4
			2005-06 99	2005-06 99.1
			2006-07 99	2006-07 98.5
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 99	Baseline: 98.3
			2008-09 99	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive using illegal drugs as a risk (someone your age added and as a risk changed to is wrong '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 98	2004-05 98
			2005-06 98	2005-06 98.5
			2006-07 98	2006-07 97.9
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 98	Baseline: 97.4
			2008-09 99	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 90	2004-05 94

regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	(YRBS)		2005-06 92	2005-06 61.8
			2006-07 94	2006-07 55.1
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 95	Baseline: 88.4
			2008-09 95	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive a moderate to high risk in using alcohol regularly. (high changed to great and regularly changed to nearly every day '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 90	2004-05 88
			2005-06 95	2005-06 67.2
			2006-07 95	2006-07 60.3
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 95	Baseline: 86.8
			2008-09 95	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of tobacco use (for them to smoke cigarettes added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 97	2004-05 99
			2005-06 98	2005-06 99
			2006-07 99	2006-07 98.6
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 99	Baseline: 95.9
			2008-09 99	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
		Frequency: Annual	2004-05 95	2004-05 98
			2005-06 95	2005-06 98.6
			2006-07 95	2006-07 98.4
			2007-08 95	Baseline: 91.3

% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of tobacco use (for them to smoke cigarettes added '05)

Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)

Year of most recent collection: 2007

2008-09 99

Year Established: 2002-03

Comments:

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

--	--	--

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 96	2004-05 98
			2005-06 97	2005-06 98
			2006-07 98	2006-07 97.7
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 99	Baseline: 94.1
			2008-09 99	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of alcohol use (their and regularly added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 90	2004-05 N/A
			2005-06 95	2005-06 97
			2006-07 95	2006-07 95.5
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 95	Baseline: 88.8
			2008-09 97	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments: N/A -information is not available.

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04; their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 97	2004-05 98.8
			2005-06 98	2005-06 97.6
			2006-07 99	2006-07 98.3
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 99	Baseline: 96.3
			2008-09 99	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 11th grade students who perceive parental disapproval of other drug use (only marijuana listed '04; their added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS)	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 95	2004-05 97
			2005-06 95	2005-06 98.1
			2006-07 95	2006-07 97.1
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 95	Baseline: 94.8
			2008-09 98.5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
% of 8th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 4	2004-05 6.7
			2005-06 3.5	2005-06 6.4
			2006-07 3	2006-07 8.4
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 2.5	Baseline: 4.8
			2008-09 2.5	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
-----------------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	---------	-----------------------

% of 11th grade students who felt threatened with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property? (during past 12 months added '05)	Oregon Healthy Teen Survey (YRBS) Q.69b	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 4.5	2004-05 4.5
			2005-06 4	2005-06 4.8
			2006-07 3.5	2006-07 5.8
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 3	Baseline: 5.2
			2008-09 3	Year Established: 2002-03
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 17500	2004-05 NA
			2005-06 17000	2005-06 17295
			2006-07 16500	2006-07 17597
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 16000	Baseline: 17804
			2008-09 16000	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
* # of youth and referrals for juvenile non-criminal offenses for the 2004 reporting year	Juvenile Justice Information System	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 6300	2004-05 NA
			2005-06 6200	2005-06 6578
			2006	
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 6000	Baseline: 6462
			2008-09 6000	Year Established: 2003-04
Comments:				

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Targets	Actual Performance
# of persistently dangerous schools	ODE Disciplinary Collection	Frequency: Annual	2004-05 0	2004-05 0

			2005-06 0	2005-06 1
			2006-07 0	2006-07 1
		Year of most recent collection: 2007	2007-08 0	Baseline: 1
			2008-09 0	Year Established: 2002-03

Comments: *The unique number of youth processed by the juvenile justice system in the reporting year. Youth and referrals statewide report criminal and non-criminal offenses committed by juveniles for each reporting year. Each statistic is available grouped by the youth's sex, age at the time of disposition and race. The full report is available with county specific data on the following website: <http://www.oya.state.or.us/jjisdata.htm>
NOTE: The student behaviour data is derived from the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey. Oregon Healthy Teens is a combined survey of the "Youth Risk Behaviour Survey" and the "Communities that Care Survey". Oregon surveys 8th and 11th graders in a randomly selected sample every year. Oregon Department of Education requires that school districts report expulsion data annually. The number of "Persistently Dangerous/Unsafe School Choice" schools are determined from a subset of the collected expulsion data.

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

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	581-021-0055 Standards of Conduct (1) Students shall comply with the written rules of the school district board, pursue the prescribed course of study, submit to the lawful authority of teachers and school officials, and conduct themselves in an orderly fashion. (2) Students shall be liable to discipline, suspension, or expulsion for misconduct, including but not limited to: (a) Theft; (b) Disruption of the school; (c) Damage or destruction of school property; (d) Damage or destruction of private property on school premises or during a school activity; (e) Assault or threats of harm; (f) Unauthorized use of weapons or dangerous instruments; (g) Unlawful use of drugs, narcotics, or alcoholic beverages; (h) Persistent failure to comply with rules of the lawful directions of teachers or school officials.
Illicit drug related	(2) Students shall be liable to discipline, suspension, or expulsion for misconduct, including but not limited to: (a) Theft; (b) Disruption of the school; (c) Damage or destruction of school property; (d) Damage or destruction of private property on school premises or during a school activity; (e) Assault or threats of harm; (f) Unauthorized use of weapons or dangerous instruments; (g) Unlawful use of drugs, narcotics, or alcoholic beverages; (h) Persistent failure to comply with rules of the lawful directions of teachers or school officials.

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

Source – Initially, pre-populated with definition from the SY 2005-06 CSPR. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This was formerly part of sections 2.7.2.3, 2.7.2.4, and 2.7.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the State definition of physical fighting data collection has been removed, however the data collection for

violent incident without physical injury and violent incident with physical injury have been added.

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2814	115
6 through 8	8715	144
9 through 12	12710	160
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from EDFacts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: The tables in this section and 2.7.2.3 replace section 2.7.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR, which collected data on physical fighting.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	23	14
6 through 8	176	41
9 through 12	403	60
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from EDFacts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: The tables in this section and 2.7.2.3 replace section 2.7.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR, which collected data on physical fighting.

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	2674	109
6 through 8	5986	126
9 through 12	4615	139
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from EDFacts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: The tables in this section and 2.7.2.2 replace section 2.7.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR, which collected data on physical fighting.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	17	12
6 through 8	169	40
9 through 12	318	54
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from EDFacts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: The tables in this section and 2.7.2.2 replace section 2.7.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR, which collected data on physical fighting.

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	121	31
6 through 8	174	42
9 through 12	172	48
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	37	21
6 through 8	153	43
9 through 12	198	53
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	5	2
6 through 8	212	44
9 through 12	827	88
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	0	0
6 through 8	34	18
9 through 12	155	34
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	19	14
6 through 8	306	69
9 through 12	1306	100
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	8	5
6 through 8	102	32
9 through 12	381	61
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated from ED Facts file N/X030 for data group 523. If necessary, it is updated by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.7.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. The data collection requirement to report by elementary, middle and high school has changed to the grades K through 5, 6 through 8, and 9 through 12 for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This data collection has been changed from a manual text entry to a check box format for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of ESEA, as amended, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

Note: This data collection was formerly section 2.8.8 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	193	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	193	
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 2.8.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the number of LEAs and percentage of LEAs that completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments is a new data collection.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 19-20, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23
24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities		
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	942125	
Comments: Did not collect data for Title V-A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities.		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 2.8.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs is a new data collection.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

- 1 That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
- 2 That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
- 3 For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
1. Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	192	181
2. Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
3. Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	192	181
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly section 2.8.11 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection for States to report not knowing whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds is a new data collection.

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	82
Comments:	

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
1. Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	1
2. Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	6
3. Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	7
4. Parental involvement activities	0
5. Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	3
6. Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	6
7. Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	3
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly section 2.9.2.1 of the SY 2005-06

CSPR.

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Oregon's goal for Rural Low Income Schools (RLIS) is to ensure that the students have opportunities to meet state standards and graduate secondary school. The RLIS objectives are to achieve targets for AYP and graduation. Oregon measures both the goals and objectives through District Improvement Status and Graduation rate status.

Process for meeting Goals/Objectives

Oregon has a process of Continuous Improvement Planning (CIP) for all districts including the RLIS districts. In the CIP, districts analyze data on 10 Oregon Education Performance standards (two of the standards are AYP and Graduation). After the data analysis, districts then prioritize their resources to effectively meet the standards through using research-based practices. ODE has provided districts regional professional development and technical assistance on how to create, enhance and update the LEA CIP plans. In addition, districts were involved in a peer review process which helped build capacity in districts and to provide feedback to other districts on their CIP plan. The districts are continuously updating their CIP's and turned in revised versions in the Fall of 2007

In Fall 2007, ODE provided professional development and technical assistance training on NCLB issues, accountability and compliance. RLIS districts participated in this training. These trainings helped support districts in assessing where they were on meeting the standards and effectively utilizing their Federal resources. After analyzing their data the RLIS districts have determined that the following activities will continue to help them meet AYP and graduation targets: by focusing on academic achievement of subgroups especially ELL; education technology -specifically distance learning opportunities for students (helps students continue on until graduation by better meeting their needs) and; teacher retention and mentoring.

Outcomes

Of the thirteen RLIS districts in Oregon (2006-07), twelve districts continued to meet AYP targets and only one LEA was in District Improvement year 2 holding status (which means they met AYP for 1 year). All RLIS districts met the graduation targets.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly section 2.9.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2006-07?	No
Comments:	

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

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

Number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	38
Comments:	

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

2.10.2.1 Use of Funds

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds to and from each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred to and from each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	4	19738.5
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	105509.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	3	40016.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	22	1302267.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	14	441434.5

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.10.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	29	1757235.5
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	4	22338.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	15	125853.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	3	3538.5
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: This table was formerly part of section 2.10.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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