Division 22 Standards Reporting Highlights:
Going Above and Beyond

Providing Evidence of Compliance

We'd like to recognize the efforts of district leaders who shared Division 22 compliance reports that go beyond the minimum requirements with their boards and communities. **The following districts' 2023-24 community reports are exemplary:**

- **Astoria**
- **David Douglas**
- **Eugene 4j**
- **Gervais**
- **Gresham-Barlow**

- **Medford**
- **Morrow County**
- **Phoenix-Talent**
- **South Umpqua**
- **West Linn-Wilsonville**

Kudos to the following districts for including evidence and explanations for compliance on all or most of the standards:

- Bethel
- Coos Bay
- Coquille
- Crook County
- Culver
- Days Creek

- Falls City
- Fern Ridge
- Glendale
- Jefferson
- La Grande
- McKenzie

- Newberg
- North Marion
- Oakridge
- Pleasant Hill
- Riddle
- St. Paul

Building Understanding

Providing context for the report by posting the slides from the board presentation is another step in the right direction to build the district community's understanding of what the standards are and why they are important. Some districts also post the video of the board presentation. A dedicated Division 22 Standards landing page makes the report easy to find and many districts archive reports from the last few years there, as well.

Each district's report is linked from the ODE Division 22 Standards webpage, which also houses a video explaining what the Division 22 Standards are, how the Assurance process works, and how to interpret the reports.

Including Speakers of Other Languages

Sixty districts provided reports to their communities in languages other than English; that is 31% of all districts in the state. A special shout out to:

- **Beaverton SD** for posting a copy of their report in ten different languages;
- **David Douglas** for posting their report in six additional languages;
- **Centennial SD, North Clackamas SD**, and **Woodburn SD** for posting their reports in at least 2 languages in addition to English.

Division 22 Standards Assurances Data

In January, ODE posted an overview of Division 22 Standards compliance data for the most recent reporting year, which also includes historical comparison data. This report shows the number of districts reporting out of compliance and the number of rules with one or more districts reporting out of compliance. It also includes an out of compliance count by rule for the current reporting year, with comparison numbers from the previous year and the 2018-19 school year (pre-pandemic numbers).

The graph included below shows selected rules that had the highest number of non-compliance reports during the last four years.

Division 22 Standards: Assurances Summary

Number Of Districts Reporting Out Of Compliance With Each Division 22 Standard
Selected rules with highest recent non-compliance, as reported to ODE by the 196 districts required to do so; districts reported on a total of 56 standards for the 2023-24 SY[1]

Legend: 2020-21, 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24

Assessment of Essential Skills - Local Performance Assessment (-2115)[2]: 6, 3, 13

Comprehensive School Counseling (-2060): 5, 9, 6, 9

Human Sexuality Education (-2050): 9, 15, 7, 8

Substance Use Prevention and Intervention Plan (-2045)[3]: 7, 6, 6, 5

Instructional Time (-2320): 15, 7, 4, 2

Media Programs (-2340): 9, 8, 7, 1

PE Requirements (-2263): 25 (K-5), 46 (K-8), 30 (K-8), 23 (K-8)

Rules Related to Instructional Materials (-2350, -2355, -2360): 34, 27, 18, 17

Menstrual Dignity for Students (-2515)[4]: 18

Rules Related to TAG Students (-2325, -2330, -2500): 8, 16, 10, 5

Administration of State Assessments (-2100, -2110): 35, 3, 2, 1