

**Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)
Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000**

OREGON

*This profile was NOT completely verified by the staff of the Oregon Department of Education;
only the section on Title I was verified in June 2000.*

Index:

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.*

Although Oregon has used the **Oregon Statewide Assessments** since 1991, the tests have recently taken on greater importance. Beginning in 1999, students who meet 10th grade standards on the tests and certain classroom assignments will receive a Certificate of Initial Mastery. Beginning in 2000-01 in selected schools, students who achieve 12th grade standards will receive a Certificate of Advanced Mastery. The certificates signify that students have met high standards and are well prepared for their future.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:*

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s):* Oregon Statewide Assessments

- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*
Grade 3: Reading, Writing and Math (multiple choice) tests;
Grades 5, 8 and 10: Reading, Writing, Math (multiple choice and problem solving),
Science and Social Sciences tests.

- *Norm or Criterion Referenced:* Criterion

- *Matrix or Census Testing: Census*
- *Item Types (including proportions if available via Internet or interview) such as: traditional or enhanced multiple choice, performance tasks, open-ended questions, portfolios, essays, etc.*
All tests are multiple choice except the math and writing tests. The writing test requires students to write an essay and the math includes a problem-solving test which requires students to solve a complex multi-step math problem and show their work. Classroom work samples are also utilized. The science test may include work sampling, but the SBE has not yet decided.
- *Time of Testing (specific month(s) or testing window)*
Writing and math (problem solving) tests are administered during the later half of January and the first half of February. Reading and math (multiple choice), science and social studies tests are given at the end of March through about the third week in April. Each school district sets an exact date of testing.
- *High School Exit Exam (date of implementation and/or phase-in timeline)*
The **Certificate of Advanced Mastery** certifies student achievement of 12th grade academic and career-related learning standards. It represents the next level of achievement for high school students who have attained the **Certificate of Initial Mastery**. The Certificate of Advanced Mastery will be offered in all high schools beginning in the 2004-05 school year. All schools should begin developing Certificate of Advanced Mastery programs before that time.

To receive a **Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM)**, students must:

- Meet academic standards in English, math, science, the social sciences (history, civics, geography and economics), the arts and a second language;
- Meet career-related learning standards in communication, problem solving, teamwork, personal management, workplace systems career development and employment foundations; and
- Participate in a career pathway (called an endorsement area) and career-related learning experiences.

The **Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM)** will be awarded to students who achieve grade 10 academic standards in:

- English;
- Mathematics;
- Science;
- Social sciences (history, civics, geography and economics);
- Arts; and a
- Second language.

The Certificate of Initial Mastery was awarded in English and mathematics in 1998-99. Standards in the other four areas will be phased in over time. The Certificate of Initial

Mastery in all six areas will be awarded in the 2002-03 school year. Student progress toward the CIM is measured through state tests and classroom work samples.

- *Other Assessments*

The Oregon University System (OUS) has adopted new admission requirements for students to be admitted to Oregon's public universities. These new requirements will be phased in beginning with the fall term of 2001. To be admitted, students will need to demonstrate their knowledge and skill in six academic content areas: English, mathematics, science, second languages, visual and performing arts, and social science. The required knowledge and skills are defined in terms of proficiencies; the new system of admission is known as the **Proficiency-based Admission Standards System (PASS)**.

Beginning in 2001, applicants from Oregon public high schools will have the option of demonstrating proficiency in English and mathematics to be admitted to an Oregon public university. Students who apply in 2001 will still be required to meet subject area requirements in science, social science, and second languages, maintain a required GPA in those areas, and take the SAT I or ACT. Proficiency options in other areas will be phased in over a four-year period:

- science in 2002,
- the arts in 2003,
- second languages in 2004, and
- social science in 2005.

Beginning with the fall term 2005, applicants from Oregon public high schools will be expected to meet proficiency requirements in all six subject areas.

Students will demonstrate proficiency through activities in classes and by taking tests. Results from CIM tests and work samples can contribute to determining proficiency. Students will receive a score on each proficiency on a scale of 1 to 5, with a 3 meeting entrance requirements. Students must achieve a 3 for each proficiency to be considered proficient. Higher scores may result in college credit being awarded.

During the optional phase of PASS (through the high school class of 2005), the primary method of establishing proficiency will be teacher judgments of class-related assignments like tests, term papers, and presentations - evidence of proficiency accumulated over time by the student in classes. CIM tests and work samples, or national tests such as Advanced Placement or SAT-II, can also be used to demonstrate proficiency, if the student so chooses. The goal is for the student to be given every opportunity to demonstrate college readiness, either through teacher-verified judgments or external tests, whichever source shows the student meeting the standards.

Students who do not meet proficiency standards initially may resubmit work or retake tests without repeating an entire course to meet a particular proficiency, if school policies allow. Students who do not meet all proficiency levels may still be reviewed for admission on a case-by-case basis or may have other options available to them to demonstrate proficiency, particularly in cases where they lack proficiency only in one or two areas.

- *Transitional or Final Assessment System*: Final system

3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state? Probe on:*
Panels of Oregon teachers and department staff developed the state tests. There were and continue to be six panels with 36 teachers on each panel – one panel for each of the five subjects tested and one for bilingual assessments.

If a commercial test was used by the state, were modifications or additions made to the assessment to address state requirements or standards? If so, what did they include?
Not applicable – a commercial test was not used to design the state assessment.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments and their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

Local districts and schools are only required to administer the state assessments.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned? Probe on:*

- *Refining standards*
- *Revamping assessments*
- *Adding components to assessments*

What is the timeline for completion of the alignment?

The SDE asserts that the Oregon Statewide Assessment is a criterion-referenced assessment based on the Oregon Content Standards and is therefore already aligned.

6. *What is the state's approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

The state assessments have been designed to be aligned with the Oregon Content Standards.

7. *How is the data included in the state assessment system used?*

- *Student Grade Promotion/Retention, Graduation, Diploma Certification*

Student progress toward the Certificate of Initial Mastery and Certificate of Advanced Mastery are measured using the state tests.

- *Teacher, School and/or District accountability*

The student performance indicator included in the **Overall School Performance Rating System** (*see school accountability*) is measured in part by using the state assessments.

Student performance on the state tests are also used to determine whether or not adequate yearly progress has been met. School improvement planning is also required and includes the use of achievement data as an indicator.

8. *Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

In June of 2000, the Oregon board of education approved several changes to the state's testing program, but put off at least until fall changes in the "certificate of initial mastery." The board moved the 3rd grade writing test to the fall of 4th grade and the 5th grade science test to the fall of 6th grade. The change will begin in the fall of 2001. The board also voted to allow students to earn a CIM at any point in grades 9-12, rather than making it a 10th grade goal, in part, because of high initial failure rates on the tests given in grade 10. Students in the class of 2001 will be the first class eligible to earn the certificates.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.*
The state is still in the process of fully implementing the new state assessment system.

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

1. *What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?*

For **special education students**, the IEP team, including the student's parent or guardian, makes the decision to have the student participate under standard test administration conditions, to modify the test administration conditions for the student, or to exempt the student from testing. For students in special education programs, information about modified testing or exemption from testing must be addressed on the student's Individual Education Program (IEP). For students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, such information could be included in the student's 504 plan.

All **ELL, NEP, ESL and/or bilingual students** also should be considered eligible to participate in the Oregon Statewide Assessment Program. A teacher and instructional team who know the individual student should make a decision, in consultation with the student's parent or guardian and/or the student, to have the student tested under standard conditions, to modify the test conditions for the student, or to exempt the student from test participation. It is important to note that exemption from one test, for example, mathematics, does not automatically exempt a student from tests in other subject areas. Each student must be considered individually for each assessment on the basis of proficiency in English, Spanish, or Russian, not on participation in a particular program nor identification as a bilingual or NEP student.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

Allowable Accommodations for Multiple Choice Test Administration include:

- Extended time

- Frequent breaks
- Divide testing over several sessions
- Administer at time of day most beneficial to student
- Read or reread directions to student
- Sign directions
- Translate directions orally
- Provide written version of oral directions
- Simplify language in directions
- Clarify directions
- Highlight words in directions
- Auditory amplification devices, hearing aids, noise buffers
- Large print version of the test
- Braille version of the test
- Read math, science, and social science (not reading/literature) items aloud to student
- Translate key words into language other than provided in the test
- Visual magnification devices
- Auditory amplification devices, noise buffers
- Tactile representation of charts, pictures, tables, graphs, etc.
- Administration of OSA side-by-side Spanish version of mathematics test
- Mark answers in test booklet if required by 3rd grader or student with disability; answers transcribed onto regular answer sheet by school staff
- Dictate multiple-choice responses to a scribe
- Point to multiple-choice responses for a scribe
- Test an individual student in a separate location
- Test a small group of students in a separate, but familiar location (e.g., Title 1 room)
- Minimize distractions (e.g., study carrel)
- Calculator and manipulatives
- Masks/markers to limit distractions

Sample Modifications for Multiple Choice Test Administration include:

- Schedule assessment for an individual student outside the official testing window
- Repeat directions between each reading selection or between questions
- Read the Reading/Literature passages and items aloud to the student
- Translate mathematics test into languages other than Spanish
- Administration of the Russian/English version of mathematics test
- Translations of reading/literature test into any language other than written English
- Electronic text-to-voice translation of passages and test items
- Signing the reading/literature passages and items to a student
- Electronic language translation device
- Electronic text-to-voice translation
- Student retells the reading passage in his or her own words for reading comprehension
- Administer test in student's home in the evening with parent as proctor
- Two students sit side-by-side and help each other with test

- Electronic translation device that scans words and reads them to student in native language
- Electronic text-to-voice translation

Sample modifications for the Writing Assessment include:

- Changes in timing: An assessment scheduled outside the testing window would be a modification.
- Changes in the test directions: Teachers verbally coaching the student through the writing process at each step.
- Changes in how the test questions are presented: Test administrator selects the prompt or mode the student will write to, or the translation of the writing prompts into a language other than English or Spanish.
- Changes in how the student responds: Responding to the writing prompts in a language other than English.
- Changes in test setting: An assessment scheduled outside of the school setting, in the student's home would be considered a modification.
- References and tools: Electronic spell checker, grammar checker or any other "help" feature on a
- word processor that identifies potential errors automatically may be used, as well as any electronic translation device.

Allowable Accommodations for the Writing and Mathematics Problem Solving Tests include:

- Extended time
- Frequent breaks
- Administer at time of day most beneficial to student
- Read or reread directions to student
- Sign directions
- Translate directions orally
- Provide written version of oral directions
- Simplify language in directions or clarify the directions
- Highlight words in directions
- Auditory amplification devices, hearing aids, noise buffers
- Large print version of prompts or math problems
- Braille version of prompts or math problems
- Read prompts or math problems aloud to student
- Sign writing prompts or math problems
- Visual magnification devices
- Auditory amplification devices, noise buffers
- Tactile representation of charts, pictures, tables, graphs, etc.
- Administration of side-by-side version of mathematics problem solving assessment
- Student responds to mathematics problem solving in English, Spanish or Russian
- Students whose IEPs require increased spacing, wider lines or margins should have additional room beyond what is in the writing folder to complete their response.
- Respond to writing or problem solving in Braille

- Students with disabilities (i.e. blindness, deafness, and orthopedic impairments) should be allowed any assistive device that serves as their primary communication mode if no other options are available to express their performance.
- Word processing or typewriting are not allowed under any other conditions.
- Test an individual student in a separate location
- Test a small group of students in a separate, but familiar location (e.g., Title 1 room)
- Minimize distractions (e.g., study carrel)
- Dictionary - English or English/other language
- Electronic spell reference without automated correction (e.g., Franklin Speller)
- Writing Handbook
- Use of masking device while copying from rough to final
- Thesaurus, Calculators and other manipulatives
- Highlighter, Scissors, tape
- Correction fluid (“white-out”); correction tape

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

The department provides districts with Spanish translations of the writing and mathematics multiple choice and problem solving tests and Russian translations of both mathematics tests.

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

Students are allowed to take assessments at a lower grade level (i.e. 5th grade students participate in 3rd grade test).

5. *Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?*

All students with disabilities are eligible to participate in the Oregon Statewide Assessment Program. Each student must be considered individually and not on the basis of the category of his/her disability. Strategies for inclusion include extensive accommodations and the policy that all students be accounted for, even those exempted or absent.

6. *Are changes planned in the for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

An alternative assessment program is also being developed that would be based on daily classroom work, similar to a portfolio program. Three teachers who know the student well and an external judge would be involved. Student work would need to represent the subjects tested in the state assessment program.

Performance Standards

1. *How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?*

On the Oregon Statewide Assessments, the following *satisfactory* performance scores have been developed for student testing results:

- GRADE 3 : Score of 201 out of about 300 on reading test
 Score of 202 out of about 300 on math (multiple choice) test
- GRADE 5: Score of 215 out of about 300 on reading test
 Score of 215 out of about 300 on math (multiple choice) test
 Score of 40 out of 60 on writing test
- GRADE 8: Score of 32 out of 46 on math (problem solving) test
 Score of 231 out of about 300 on reading test
 Score of 231 out of about 300 on math (multiple choice) test
 Score of 40 out of 60 on writing test
- GRADE 10: Score of 32 out of 46 on math (problem solving) test
 Score of 239 out of about 300 on reading test
 Score of 239 out of about 300 on math (multiple choice) test
 Score of 40 out of 60 on writing test
 Score of 32 out of 46 on math (problem solving) test

Science performance levels were approved for the 1999-2000 school year, and include the following:

- GRADE 5: Meet the Standard with a score of 223
 Exceed the Standard with a score of 239
- GRADE 8: Meet the Standard with a score of 233
 Exceed the Standard with a score of 247
- CIM: Meet the Standard with a score of 239
 Exceed the Standard with a score of 252

Performance standards for the social sciences test will be set in 2000. School districts will set their own performance standards for the arts and second languages. Students will not be held accountable for meeting standards on these tests until after the standards are set.

Work Samples (possible scores from 1 to 6 with 1 as the lowest and 6 as the highest)

- GRADE 3: 90% reading accuracy and a score of 4 in reading and literature
 Score of 3 in each discipline section in writing
 Score of 3 in each discipline section in speaking
 Accuracy plus score of 4 in each section
 Number meeting standards needed: 1-speaking and 2 each-writing/math
- GRADE 5: Score of 4 in each section reading and literature
 Score of 4 in each discipline section in writing
 Score of 4 in each discipline section in speaking
 Accuracy plus score of 4 in each section
 Number meeting standards needed: 2 each-speaking/math and 3-writing
- GRADE 8: Score of 4 in each section reading and literature
 Score of 4 in each discipline section in writing
 Score of 4 in each discipline section in speaking
 Accuracy plus score of 4 in each section

Number meeting standards needed: 2 each-speaking/math and 3-writing
GRADE 10: Score of 4 in each section reading and literature
Score of 4 in each discipline section in writing
Score of 4 in each discipline section in speaking
Accuracy plus score of 4 in each section
Number meeting standards needed: 2-math and 3 each-writing, speaking

The state reports via the **Oregon Statewide Assessment Results** on the percentage of students in each school who:

- Met (M) the performance standard
- Exceeded (E) the standard
- Did not yet meet (D) the standard.

2. *Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures (e.g. 70% of students in Maryland pass the MSPAP)?*

Schools will be rated on a five-point system, from acceptable to unacceptable with final criteria and performance measures left up to the SBE. Schools with low or unacceptable grades must write school improvement plans. Schools will be rated on several measures: student performance, student behavior, and school characteristics (all described below) – these measures will be combined to yield an Overall School Performance Rating of:

1. exceptional,
2. strong,
3. satisfactory,
4. low, or
5. unacceptable.

As one criterion for Title I districts (see Title I), an adequate yearly progress baseline is established for each district by the results of the 1997 OSA multiple choice scores in Reading and Mathematics. The goal is to have all students meet or exceed standard by the year 2010. To get a yearly target, the percentage of scores not yet meeting standards in 1997 is divided by 13 (the number of years between 1997 and 2010). In order to demonstrate AYP, a district must increase the percentage of scores meeting or exceeding standards by its yearly target when compared to the previous year.

3. *How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?*

Performance Scores: To calculate the annual performance component, the school's total scores in reading/literature multiple choice, writing, mathematics multiple choice, and mathematics problem solving (weighted at 80%) and attendance/dropout (weighted at 20%) will be combined (*see accountability section*).

4. *Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?*

All students are to be included in the assessments and the calculations.

5. *Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

No significant changes are planned at this time.

6. *What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?*

The state identified 45 districts and 70 schools as eligible for CSRD grant funding due to their rating as either unacceptable, low, or in Title I program improvement status (*see accountability and Title I sections*).

Reporting Performance Data

1. *Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience).*

In 1999, the legislature passed a measure that requires the state to produce report cards on *each school and district*. Schools will be rated on a five-point system, from acceptable to unacceptable with final criteria and performance measures left up to the SBE. Schools with low or unacceptable grades must write school improvement plans. (*Quality Counts 2000*)

- Student reports:

For each subject area tested (5 areas), students receive a report of their achievement with respect to the state performance standards. The reports also include a profile on the student's strengths and weaknesses. This is sent to the district testing coordinator for distribution.

- School reports

Oregon School Report Cards: Oregon law (SB 1329) mandates that the Oregon Department of Education produce annual performance report cards for *schools and districts* beginning in the year 2000. Educational performance and improvement are the focus of the Oregon School Report Card rating system. For the first School Report Card, the Overall School Performance rating will be based on the following criteria:

1. Student Performance, reflecting student scores on Oregon state assessments;
2. Student Behavior, based on the attendance rate (for all schools) and the dropout rate (for schools that include grade 12);
3. School Characteristics, reflecting the percentage of eligible students who took the tests.

These criteria may change in the future as more data become available. These measures will be combined to yield an **Overall School Performance Rating** of:

1. exceptional,
2. strong,

3. satisfactory,
4. low, or
5. unacceptable.

School Report Cards are one component in the **Oregon Performance Accountability System**. All public schools in Oregon will be included in the system. Small schools returning less than forty student answer sheets in reading and mathematics multiple choice will receive a report card but will not receive a Student Performance rating or an Overall School Performance rating.

The Oregon School Report Cards include the following:

1. Overall School Performance Rating
2. Student Performance Rating
3. Improvement Over Time (from 1996-99): 1) improved over time, 2) stayed about the same over time, 3) declined over time, or 4) unable to determine improvement over time.
4. Percent of students meeting standards, by grade, subject against comparison group and state scores
5. Student Behavior Rating
6. Attendance
7. Dropout Rate
8. School Characteristics Rating
9. Percent of students taking the state tests
10. Additional school information from the state
11. SAT scores
12. Education and experience of instructional staff
13. Local information provided by the school

- District reports

The Oregon District Report Cards include the following:

1. Student Performance by subject and grades tested as compared to the state average
2. Percent of students meeting standards by ethnicity
3. Student Ethnicity (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, Multi-Ethnic, White, Non-Declared)
4. Student behavior – attendance
5. District Characteristics – percentage of students taking the state tests
6. Other Information - Professional experience of teachers and administrators in the district
7. School Performance Rating for the schools in the district
8. Local information provided by the district

- State reports

The Oregon Report Card summarizes state level statistics, including the state assessment results. Other information in the 1998-99 report includes state status on:

- School Funding
- Demographics of students and school staff
- Student Services
- Early Childhood Education, and

- Special Education.

Narrative portions of the reports also describe state reform initiatives.

- Title I reports

The report of Adequate Yearly Progress includes recommendations about the district and school(s) status for program improvement identification. On this report, when a district has failed to meet adequate yearly progress for 1995-96 and 1996-97 for TAS, SWPs or both, ODE recommends that the district be identified for program improvement. ODE has a further responsibility to support any district identified for program improvement in the revising of its district plan, by providing technical or other assistance, and by working with schools needing improvement upon that district's request.

District reports of Adequate Yearly Progress are posted on the department's web site. In addition, districts are required to annually review the progress of each school and submit to the Oregon Department of Education the final AYP decision for each Title I funded school. Final school-level AYP decisions are added to the state's AYP report for each district and made public.

The state provides reports on AYP for the state, each district and school. For the state and district reports, each criterion (Interim, 1 and 2) are reported as:

- Interim Criterion: Exceeds, Meets, Not Yet
- Criterion 1: Exceeds, Meets, Progress 1, 2, or 3
- Criterion 2: Target vs. Actual and % meeting or exceeding the standard

(see **criteria under Title I**). At the district and school levels, progress is also reported for each grade and subject, and then for each grade as combined with the scores from both subjects tested and included in AYP (reading and math). Total scores and the number of students who were exempted or participated in modified assessments are also listed.

2. *How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?*

The first school report cards were scheduled to be issued on February 1, 2000 and will be issued annually thereafter. The first round of report cards included over 1,000 schools. Remaining schools will receive a delayed report card by February 29, 2000. On March 31, 2000, district offices must send their school and district report cards to all parents of students enrolled in the district.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported (see Internet sites for state, district and school level report cards)? Check on the following categories required by federal regulation:*

- Gender
- Race
- LEP status
- Migrant Status
- SWD
- SES

Data is disaggregated by all but the category of socio-economic status; socio-economic status is, however, included in comparative analyses conducted by the state. Racial statistics include the following categories: American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black, Hispanic, Multi-Ethnic, White, and Non-Declared.

4. *Does trend data exist from the state assessments (example: Texas State Assessment data is available from “1996-97 on”)?*

In calculating the school’s Improvement Score, the first two years (averaged together) of an accountability period will be used as a baseline score. The total scores (averaged together) for the third and fourth years of an accountability period will produce the Improvement Score. For example, the School Report Card issued in February 2000 used data from 1995-96 and 1996-97 (averaged together) compared to data from 1997-98 and 1998-99 (averaged together). The use of multiple years’ data helps to produce more reliable Improvement Scores.

5. *How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?*

Students tested under standard conditions have their scores aggregated as a whole. The state also disaggregates by special education and LEP status.

6. *What are the state’s requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?*

The Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) available in each district includes descriptions of basic learning opportunities planned for each school in the district as well as results of current Oregon Statewide Assessments and school dropout data.

7. *Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?*

Significant changes are not planned at this time for the February 2001 reports.

8. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.*

The state gave the SDE only a very short period between June of 1999 when the reporting legislation was passed and February 1, 2000 to get the reporting system implemented.

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.*

The **Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century**, passed by the state legislature in 1991, calls on schools to hold students accountable for higher academic standards. Students are to demonstrate what they know and can do through complex assignments and periodic tests. Students who achieve the high standards will receive certificates certifying their abilities.

The state has turned over the work of developing an accountability system to a new seven-member “education leadership team” whose members include the Governor, leading state legislators, the state superintendent, and the chancellor of the state board of higher education. The group was asked to make recommendations with the help of 14 non-voting members, including parents, educators and students (*Quality Counts 2000*).

2. *What are the characteristics of the state accountability system? Organize the response into the following subsections:*

- *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

The **Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM)** will be awarded to students who achieve grade 10 academic standards in:

- English;
- Mathematics;
- Science;
- Social sciences (history, civics, geography and economics);
- Arts; and a
- Second language.

The Certificate of Initial Mastery was awarded in English and mathematics in 1998-99. Standards in the other four areas will be phased in over time. The Certificate of Initial Mastery in all six areas will be awarded in the 2002-03 school year.

To earn a Certificate of Initial Mastery, students must meet all of the standards—on all required state tests and work samples. However, students who meet the standards on some but not all of the tests will receive a **Certificate of Achievement** showing which standards they did achieve.

Students who were sophomores in 1998-99 are expected to meet the English and mathematics standards for the Certificate of Initial Mastery. Some may do so in their sophomore year. Others may do so in their junior or senior years. The phase-in schedule continues as follows:

- Students who were sophomores in 1999-2000 are expected to meet the English, mathematics and science standards for the Certificate of Initial Mastery, regardless of the year in which they meet these standards.
- Students who are sophomores in 2000-01 are expected to meet the English, mathematics, science and social sciences standards, regardless of the year in which they do so.
- Students who are sophomores in 2001-02 are expected to meet the English, mathematics, science, social sciences and arts standards for the Certificate of Initial Mastery, regardless of the year in which they do so.
- Students who are sophomores in 2002-03 and later are expected to meet all of the standards for the CIM—English, mathematics, science, social sciences, arts and a second language, regardless of the year in which they do so.

School districts may use performance on the state tests as one criterion to determine whether a student should be promoted to the next grade or retained. Districts will decide whether and how much weight to give state tests in making these decisions.

The **Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM)** will be awarded to students who:

- Achieve grade 12 academic standards in English, mathematics, science, the social sciences (history, civics, geography and economics), the arts and second languages;
- Achieve grade 12 career-related learning standards in personal management, problem solving, teamwork, communication, workplace systems, career development and employment foundations;
- Participate in a career area of interest such as arts and communications, business and management, industrial and engineering systems, natural resource systems, human resources or health services; and
- Participate in career-related learning experiences.

The Certificate of Advanced Mastery will be phased in selected schools. It will be awarded in all schools to students in the 2004-05 school year.

Students may substitute work samples in writing and mathematics problem solving for state test scores that fall below the standard if:

- The student scores a total of 35 to 39 on the state writing test; or
- The student scores a total of 29 to 31 on the state problem solving test; and
- All work samples to be substituted meet the work sample standards.

Student Accountability Sanctions

If a child does not meet the standards, districts may offer before school, after school, weekend or summer activities to help students. As more students receive the new curriculum linked to these standards, more students will meet the standards. Unless a school district decides otherwise, meeting the performance standards currently is not required for graduation.

- **School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions**

Schools will be rated on a five-point system, from exceptional to unacceptable with final criteria and performance measures left up to the SBE. Schools with low or unacceptable grades must write school improvement plans. Schools are on several measures: student performance, student behavior, and school characteristics (all described below) – these measures will be combined to yield an Overall School Performance Rating of:

- exceptional,
- strong,
- satisfactory,
- low, or
- unacceptable.

The state **Overall School Performance Rating System** will reflect how well the school performed in the most recent year (1999) on:

- student test
- attendance
- dropout (if school includes grade 12)

how much the school improved on:

- student tests over the past several years (1996 through 1999 for the school report card issued in the year 2000)
- attendance over the past several years (1996-1999)
- dropout over the prior two years (1997 and 1998, if school includes grade 12)

and how many of the eligible students participated in the state tests. Although the Overall School Performance Rating uses the same data elements as the previous three ratings, the data elements are combined differently. The Overall School Performance Rating is not the "average" of the three ratings for School Characteristics, Student Behavior, and Student Performance.

Rating	Total Score
Exceptional	125.0 or above
Strong	100.0 – 124.9
Satisfactory	60.0 – 99.9
Low	40.0 – 59.9
Unacceptable	less than 40.0

Student Performance: The principal measure of student performance will be results from the annual state assessments. This will count for 80 percent of the Overall School Performance rating. The performance levels (e.g., "Meets the Standard," "Nearly Meets the Standard") used to report assessment results for each student will be converted to an index, or numerical score, using a point system. The performance level indexes for all students for each test will be averaged to yield a school's performance score for reading/literature multiple choice, writing, mathematics multiple choice and mathematics problem solving. The school's index scores for each subject area will be weighted (reading, 35 percent; mathematics multiple choice, 35 percent; writing, 20 percent; and mathematics problem solving, 10 percent). The school's performance on the most recent year's tests will be combined with its improvement over the previous three years on the reading and mathematics multiple choice tests, to produce the Student Performance Rating.

The Student Performance Rating considers student performance on the state's benchmark tests for the most recent year and improvement in scores over the past years.

Rating	Student Performance Index
Exceptional	115.0 or higher
Strong	90.0 – 114.9
Satisfactory	60.0 – 89.9
Low	40.0 – 59.9
Unacceptable	less than 40.0

Student Behavior: The Student Behavior rating will be based on attendance rates (for all schools) and dropout rates (for schools with grade 12). Attendance rates reflect the average percentage of students enrolled who were at school each day during the school year. Dropout rates are based on the Department's definition of a student enrolled in a public school, who does not enroll the next year, and who has not graduated, enrolled in another educational

program, or moved to another state. Each rate will be converted to an index. The Student Behavior rating for schools that include grade 12 will be based on an average of the attendance index and the dropout index. The rating for schools that do not include grade 12 will be based solely on the attendance index.

The Student Behavior Rating considers attendance for elementary and middle schools, and attendance and dropout for schools that include grade 12. The latter schools include traditional high schools (grades 9-12) and also other grade organizations, such as 7-12 and K-12. Both most recent performance in attendance and/or dropout, as well as improvement are considered.

Rating	Student Behavior Index
Exceptional	100.0 or higher
Strong	80.0 – 99.9
Satisfactory	60.0 – 79.9
Low	40.0 – 59.9
Unacceptable	less than 40.0

School Characteristics: The School Characteristics rating reflects the proportion of students eligible to take the state tests who actually received scores – that is, the number of students who attempted the test under regular conditions divided by the number of students who attempted the test under regular conditions plus the number of students who did not take the test because they were absent. This factor is important because high participation rates in the state assessments help to ensure sound comparisons over time; it is a key element in the validity of the system. A participation rate of 85 percent or above earns a "satisfactory" School Characteristics rating and less than 85 percent earns an "unacceptable" School Characteristics rating.

The School Characteristics rating is a key determinant of the Overall School Performance rating. Schools with an "unacceptable" School Characteristics rating will be classified as "Low" in the Overall School Performance rating unless their index scores would have resulted in "Low" or "Unacceptable" overall ratings; in those cases, the school will be classified as "Unacceptable." In addition, schools will earn additional points based on a participation rate of over 85 percent.

A school's performance score will be calculated annually, using the index scores for the Student Performance and Student Behavior Ratings. The Overall School Performance rating (an accountability measure) will be reported annually; it represents both performance for the most recent year and growth data aggregated over several years. The first Overall School Performance ratings will be reported on February 1, 2000 using data from years 1995-96 through 1998-99.

The School Characteristics Rating is based upon one indicator, the percent of eligible students who take the state benchmark assessments. A school with a participation rate equal to or greater than 85% will receive a rating of "Satisfactory." Schools with a participation

rate lower than 85% will receive a rating of "Unacceptable." Only these two School Characteristics ratings will be given in the school report cards issued in the year 2000.

<u>Rating</u>	<u>Total Score</u>
Satisfactory	85% or above
Unacceptable	less than 85%

The Characteristics Index reflects the participation of eligible students on the state test above a minimum percentage of 85%.

- Characteristics Index = Participation Rate - 85
- Minimum index = 0

Performance Scores: To calculate the annual performance component, the school's total scores in reading/literature multiple choice, writing, mathematics multiple choice, and mathematics problem solving (weighted at 80%) and attendance/dropout (weighted at 20%) will be combined.

Improvement Scores: In calculating the school's Improvement Score, the first two years (averaged together) of an accountability period will be used as a baseline score. The total scores (averaged together) for the third and fourth years of an accountability period will produce the Improvement Score. For example, the School Report Card issued in February 1, 2000 will use data from 1995-96 and 1996-97 (averaged together) compared to data from 1997-98 and 1998-99 (averaged together). The use of multiple years' data helps to produce more reliable Improvement Scores. (Note: Because a different definition of "dropout" was used prior to 1997, improvement in dropout rate for the high schools will be based on dropout rates in 1996-97 compared to 1997-98. For reports issued this year, 1997-98 dropout data are the most recent available.) Improvement over time will be weighted at two times the gain in order to recognize improvement in schools that have made gains in student achievement. Attendance and dropout rates will be weighted at two times the gain and averaged. The student achievement gain not only takes into account the gain in percent of students meeting the standards, but also takes into account the overall gain in all levels of student performance (e.g., "Nearly Meets the Standard, Low, Very Low").

The average baseline score will be subtracted from the average improvement score to determine the amount of growth a school has made over four years. The Overall School Performance rating will be calculated by using the school's performance for the latest year of an accountability period plus growth. In this way, the system gives credit to schools that improve their scores over time. The system also makes it possible for lower-performing schools to achieve higher ratings than they would if absolute performance were the only consideration.

The Improvement Rating reflects improvement on state tests in reading and mathematics (multiple choice) over four years. The improvement score is the sum of the change in the reading index and the change in the math index over time.

Rating	Total Score
Improving	3.33 and above
About the same	-3.32 to 3.32
Declining	-3.33 and below

- District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions

Accountability is based at the school level and does not have rewards or sanctions for districts outside of reporting.

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*
The state rating system sets absolute targets for student achievement scores and includes measures of growth in its performance rating.
4. *Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded (probe on inclusion of SWD and LEP students)?*
All students tested under regular conditions or accommodations are included in the calculations. Students exempted are, of course, not included; this would account for approximately 2% of the student population.
5. *How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?*
The Title I system of AYP and the state system of performance ranking are separate for 1999-2000, although both systems include the Oregon statewide assessments as a primary indicator for evaluating school performance. If, however, the USDOE approves the state's school rating system as the new process for Title I, the two systems will be in alignment.
6. *Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?*
Although subgroup performance is disaggregated in the district report cards, they are not included as an indicator in school ratings.
7. *Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?*
The four approved charter schools in the state are a part of the state accountability system. Non-public schools may voluntarily be included in the state assessment system, but not reporting or accountability
8. *Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*
No changes are planned at this time. However, a task force is looking at how modified scores or the number of exempted students can be included in the reporting system.
9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.*
Designing the ratings system in the state has been the biggest challenge, deciding between a letter grading system and other options.

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

1. *How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?*

Using the **Overall School Performance Rating** system, schools are categorized as a low or unsatisfactory school, using the criteria outlined above:

- student performance,
- student behavior and
- school characteristics.

2. *Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?*

The state has developed the rating system, and the district has not been involved.

3. *What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?*

- *Evaluation and Planning*

The Oregon Department of Education has a responsibility to support any district identified for improvement under AYP in the revising of its district plan by providing technical or other assistance, and upon that district's request by working with schools needing improvement.

- *Financial*

Grants in the amount of \$10,000 are available for low or unacceptable schools through an application process.

- *Expert Assistance*

The state provides technical assistance to districts and schools at the district's request.

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

The assistance of school support team members can be arranged through the Oregon Department of Education's regional Title I Distinguished Educator. In the general sense, the staff of the Curriculum Instruction and Field Services in the Oregon Department of Education are responsible for providing technical assistance and offering the grant.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

Additional support in the form of Title I Distinguished Educations and other resources are available to Title I schools (*see Title I section*).

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

Schools are rated as satisfactory or unacceptable; unacceptable schools must simply improve to the satisfactory level to no longer be considered low performing.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

The Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) available in each district includes descriptions of basic learning opportunities planned for each school in the district as well as results of current Oregon Statewide Assessments and school dropout data.

A Title I district must write or revise its Comprehensive District Improvement Plan (CDIP) to identify and address the causes for low achievement and submit its plan to the SEA. A Title I school identified as not making adequate yearly progress must work with parents and a regional school support team member to develop or revise the schoolwide program plan or school improvement plan to improve *the performance of children served by Title I*. The plan must include a two-year professional development component designed by the school staff to improve the skills of its staff. An amount equivalent to at least 10 percent of the school's Title I Part A annual allocation must be dedicated to this purpose or otherwise demonstrate that the school is effectively carrying out required professional development activities. The plan must also address specific elements of student performance problems and specify school and district responsibilities in carrying out the plan. The plan must be submitted to the district for approval and be implemented in accordance to its timeline.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

No significant changes are planned at this time.

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. *What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?*

Adequate Yearly Progress for the district has been determined by the academic performance of all students tested under normal testing conditions in schools that receive Title I Part A funds. Districts with five or fewer students reported in the group tested have no display of data in order to protect the confidentiality of students. The Oregon Department of Education works with these districts individually to determine appropriate measures for determining Adequate Yearly Progress.

Oregon has applied three criteria by which a district may demonstrate that it meets adequate yearly progress. Satisfying any *single criterion in a year* means that a district has met adequate yearly progress for that year:

Criterion 1: The percentage of scores from Title I funded schools in each OSA proficiency category (exceeds standards, meets standards, and not yet meeting standards) on multiple choice reading and mathematics tests is examined for two successive years. If the change in percentages indicates overall movement into higher categories, the district's Title I program has shown AYP. For the purposes of this criterion the range of scores within the "Not Yet

Meeting Standards" category is divided into three parts referred to as "Progress Categories" so that movement may be measured within this wide range of scores.

Criteria 2: An AYP baseline is established for each district by the results of the 1997 OSA multiple choice scores in Reading and Mathematics. The goal is to have all students meet or exceed standard by the year 2010. To get a yearly target, the percentage of scores not yet meeting standards in 1997 is divided by 13 (the number of years between 1997 and 2010). In order to demonstrate AYP, a district must increase the percentage of scores meeting or exceeding standards by its yearly target when compared to the previous year.

Interim Criterion: The percentage of scores meeting or exceeding proficiency from Title I funded schools in each district is compared to the percentage meeting or exceeding proficiency of all Oregon Title I funded schools. If the local program percentage is equal to or greater than the state percentage, the program has met AYP.

The Oregon Department of Education is required to evaluate the progress of each district to determine whether schools receiving Title I funds are making adequate progress. For that purpose, the preliminary district report of Adequate Yearly Progress includes AYP recommendations about each Title I funded school. These recommendations are derived by evaluating each Title I school's performance on Oregon Statewide Assessment (OSA) with the same three criteria used for the district AYP evaluation. Districts have the option of adding local assessment information to make final decisions about the adequate yearly progress of schools. These school-level final decisions must be submitted to the SDE.

2. *What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress for the following:*

- *Title I schools and non-Title I schools*

Districts are required to annually review the progress (AYP) of each school and submit to the Oregon Department of Education the final AYP decision for each Title I funded school. IASA, Section 1116(c) requires the district to determine whether its Title I funded school(s) have met or failed to meet adequate yearly progress, and subsequently identify for program improvement any Title I school that has failed to make AYP for two consecutive years. To assist in this requirement and to fulfill its responsibilities, the Oregon Department of Education included in the district's preliminary report of AYP an analysis of each Title I school's performance on Oregon Statewide Assessment **using the same criteria applied for the district's AYP evaluation**. School level information is provided where the number of students included in the analysis was six or greater. Schools with five or fewer students reported in the group tested have no display of data in order to protect the confidentiality of students.

Using the state's analysis and local school-level assessment information where appropriate, the district determines whether each Title I funded school has met or failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress and reports that decision to the Oregon Department of Education.

- *Districts*

Oregon has applied three criteria (Criteria 1, Criteria 2, Interim Criteria: see above) by which a district may demonstrate that it meets adequate yearly progress. Satisfying any *single criterion in a year* means that a district has met adequate yearly progress for that year.

Are these transitional or final definitions? If transitional, when will the final definitions be in place and what criteria and processes will they include?

The definition of adequate yearly progress is transitional in Oregon until statewide district effectiveness criteria for all schools and districts are in place. The state's final standards, assessments and accountability amendments were submitted to the USDOE, and would merge the systems of state accountability and Title I accountability (*see changes below*).

3. *What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts plays a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?*
The district is required to review the preliminary Adequate Yearly Progress report when it is issued. If the district believes that identification for improvement is in error due to statistical or other substantive reasons, the district may provide corroborating evidence of that error to the Office of Student Services, Oregon Department of Education. Once identified for program improvement the district is under obligation to work with the Oregon Department of Education in carrying out appropriate corrective actions through the revision of its plan and, where appropriate, support of specific schools in carrying out school improvement activities.
4. *What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools?*

Any **school or district** that fails to meet AYP for two consecutive years is automatically identified for program improvement. Schools identified for program improvement are to be given the opportunity to review school-level data and provide evidence to the district if the school believes the identification of program improvement is in error.

Requirements for a Title I funded school that has been identified for program improvement:

- In consultation with parents, the district and a regional school support team member the school must develop or revise the schoolwide program plan or school improvement plan to improve the performance of children served by Title I. (Contact with a school support team member is arranged through the Oregon Department of Education's regional Title I Distinguished Educator.)
- The plan must include a two-year professional development component designed by the school staff to improve the skills of its staff. An amount equivalent to at least 10 percent of the school's Title I Part A annual allocation must be dedicated to this purpose or otherwise demonstrate that the school is effectively carrying out required professional development activities. Funds from sources other than Title I may be used to meet his requirement.
- The plan must address specific elements of student performance problems and specify school and district responsibilities in carrying out the plan.

- The plan must be submitted to the district for approval.
- The approved plan must be implemented in accordance to its timeline.

Similarly, any **district** that has failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress for two consecutive years falls into Program Improvement. To get out of program improvement, schools and districts must make AYP for two out of three years after being identified.

5. *What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?*
To assist districts in the support of schools that have failed to meet Adequate Yearly Progress or have been placed in Program Improvement status, the Office of Student Services offers technical assistance in a variety of ways. As a means of helping to support districts in achieving school improvement, Regional School Support Teams have been formed to assist schools particularly those using the schoolwide planning process. Competitive grants for school improvement are also available through CSRD funds and the state's FY 2000 appropriation for school improvement.

6. *Who provides the assistance?*

- The district is responsible for providing support to schools;
- Regional School Support Teams have been formed to help in the planning process;
- Five regional Title I Distinguished Educators (DEs) are available to assist the 37 current program improvement schools; and
- The Office of Student Services (SDE) offers technical assistance and resources (i.e. research and information) to address issues, often through the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory's Comprehensive Center.

Title I Distinguished Educators are local educators and administrators who are on job rotation from their districts and provide full time support to districts and schools regionally for two to three years. They provide technical assistance and help in improvement planning.

The **Regional School Support Teams** work with DEs to provide expertise. Support Team members are generally members of the higher education community or school districts with specific expertise in areas such as curriculum design or bilingual education. DEs will recruit these people to work with a school on a specific issue for a very short time (i.e. a few days or twice a year). They also come together in the spring of each year to read schoolwide plans with the DEs and give feedback to the schools.

7. *Have waivers played a role in this process?*

No, waivers have not played a role.

8. *Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

During the 1999-2000 school year, Oregon developed a statewide accountability system for all schools and districts and that system includes the issue of an annual district and school

report card. Within a new proposal provided for review to the USDOE, Oregon is amending the definition of Adequate Yearly Progress contained within the current, 1996 approved Consolidated State Plan. Specifically:

Proposed Adequate Yearly Progress Definition:

- A district meets Adequate Yearly Progress when 90% or more of its Title IA funded schools receive a satisfactory or higher rating on their annual report cards.
- A Title I funded school meets adequate yearly progress when it receives a satisfactory or higher overall rating on its report card.

The report card developed by the state was written in response to Oregon legislation and provides an evaluation for all schools, not just Title I schools. After the first report card was issued and the Committee of Practitioners were consulted, the Oregon Department of Education decided to forward for approval the use the report card to provide Title I evaluation for the 1999-2000 school year.

Essentially, the state submitted for approval to the USDOE the state's reporting and school ratings system as the new system for determining adequate yearly progress and schools in need of improvement. Districts would be identified as making AYP if 90% of the schools in the districts were rated at the satisfactory level or higher. Schools and districts not making AYP for two consecutive years would then be in need of improvement. To get out of program improvement, schools and districts would need to make AYP for two out of three years after being identified.

If approved, Title I would be aligned and implemented in 2000-2001 using the assessment results from 1999-2000.

9. *Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?*

Although the Title I system of AYP and the state system of performance ranking were separate for 1998-99 school year, if the USDOE approves the state's school rating system as the new process for Title I, the two systems will be in alignment, beginning with the 2001 report cards for the 1999-2000 school year.

10. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.*

One issue in the state has been moving into alignment with the general state system. The other has been the lack of any increase in funding since the reauthorization of Title I, despite increases in the number of ESL students and students in poverty in the state.

Contact Information

Assessment

Phyllis Rock
Assessment Coordinator
Office of Assessment and Evaluation
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol St NE, Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-5585
phyllis.rock@state.or.us

Accountability

Steve Slater
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol St NE, Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-5585, ext. 265
steve.slater@state.or.us

Title I

Marty McCall
Oregon Department of Education
255 Capitol St NE, Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-3310, ext. 488
marty.mccall@state.or.us