

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 2007-08

INDIANA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009

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 (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

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

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 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.**

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

PART II

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

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

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, 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 2007-08 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 2007-08 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-HLPEDEN (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, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Indiana Department of Education

Address:
Room 225, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Jeffery P. Zaring

Telephone: 317-232-6622

Fax: 317-232-0744

e-mail: jzaring@doe.in.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Jeffery P. Zaring

Thursday, March 12, 2009, 2:11:04 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/>

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/>

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

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/>

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

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	644,023	633,016	98.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,745	1,701	97.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,430	8,295	98.4
Black, non-Hispanic	79,204	76,588	96.7
Hispanic	40,431	39,291	97.2
White, non-Hispanic	490,468	483,805	98.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	102,623	99,088	96.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,420	28,551	97.0
Economically disadvantaged students	242,110	235,732	97.4
Migratory students	738	738	100.0
Male	329,840	323,322	98.0
Female	313,412	308,923	98.6
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	32,356	32.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	61,092	61.7
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,640	5.7
Total	99,088	

Comments:

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

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	643,236	631,762	98.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,738	1,702	97.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,080	7,926	98.1
Black, non-Hispanic	79,206	76,552	96.6
Hispanic	40,041	38,809	96.9
White, non-Hispanic	490,446	483,456	98.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	102,668	98,726	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	29,184	28,257	96.8
Economically disadvantaged students	242,205	235,525	97.2
Migratory students	727	727	100.0
Male	329,440	322,262	97.8
Female	313,023	308,727	98.6
Comments:			

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

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	31,676	32.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	61,410	62.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,640	5.7
Total	98,726	
Comments:		

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

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	160,612	157,153	97.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	437	422	96.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,185	2,119	97.0
Black, non-Hispanic	19,822	19,121	96.5
Hispanic	10,437	10,028	96.1
White, non-Hispanic	121,392	119,277	98.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	25,943	24,028	92.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	7,846	7,505	95.7
Economically disadvantaged students	62,418	60,356	96.7
Migratory students	195	195	100.0
Male	82,089	79,945	97.4
Female	78,320	77,005	98.3
Comments: While Indiana offers the full range of accommodations for the science assessments, we do not yet have approved Alternate Assessments. Both Alternate Assessments for science(1% and 2%) are currently under development.			

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

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	8,692	36.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,336	63.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	0	0.0
Total	24,028	
Comments:		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

83I.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

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

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

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,206	55,067	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	124	62.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,166	940	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,797	5,040	51.4
Hispanic	5,567	3,039	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	57,746	43,539	75.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,092	6,998	53.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,650	2,565	55.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32,359	19,190	59.3
Migratory students	95	35	36.8
Male	40,013	28,453	71.1
Female	38,086	26,558	69.7

Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct. Total is listed as 78,206 that is composed of [200 American Indian + 1166 Asian, 9797 Black, 5567 Hispanic, 57746 White]. There are 3633 Multiracial and 97 unknown races in the overall total. Summing all five races plus the multiracial and missing races is equal to 78206.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,091	59,228	75.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	200	139	69.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,107	941	85.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,775	5,832	59.7
Hispanic	5,510	3,272	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	57,770	46,351	80.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,060	7,190	55.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,616	2,698	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	32,334	21,060	65.1
Migratory students	92	33	35.9
Male	39,917	29,089	72.9
Female	38,068	30,074	79.0

Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct. Total is listed as 78,091 which is composed of [200 American Indian + 1107 Asian, 9775 Black, 5510 Hispanic, 57770 White]. There are 3635 Multiracial and 94 unknown races in the overall total. Summing all five races plus the multiracial and missing races is equal to 78091.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Under Indiana's approved plan for No Child Left Behind, science is tested in Grades 5, 7, and Biology 1.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,891	58,666	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	160	76.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,113	962	86.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,470	5,476	57.8
Hispanic	5,334	3,434	64.4
White, non-Hispanic	58,228	46,123	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,800	8,139	59.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,376	2,881	65.8
Economically disadvantaged students	31,892	20,854	65.4
Migratory students	105	52	49.5
Male	39,643	30,272	76.4
Female	38,160	28,342	74.3
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,694	57,738	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	151	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,075	895	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9,452	5,466	57.8
Hispanic	5,280	2,963	56.1
White, non-Hispanic	58,141	45,722	78.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,764	7,015	51.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,354	2,377	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	31,870	19,995	62.7
Migratory students	104	38	36.5
Male	39,519	27,742	70.2
Female	38,088	29,951	78.6
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Under Indiana's approved plan for No Child Left Behind, science is tested in Grades 5, 7, and Biology 1.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,091	60,161	77.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	230	173	75.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,083	947	87.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,288	5,355	57.7
Hispanic	5,162	3,379	65.5
White, non-Hispanic	59,007	47,893	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,405	7,776	58.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,108	2,724	66.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,138	20,663	66.4
Migratory students	89	41	46.1
Male	39,535	30,642	77.5
Female	38,457	29,464	76.6
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,838	58,623	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	230	169	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,034	857	82.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9,267	5,462	58.9
Hispanic	5,096	3,058	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	58,892	46,653	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,362	6,265	46.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,072	2,360	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	31,076	19,779	63.6
Migratory students	88	37	42.0
Male	39,353	28,094	71.4
Female	38,388	30,467	79.4
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,432	50,410	65.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	229	146	63.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,075	797	74.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9,168	3,354	36.6
Hispanic	5,113	2,296	44.9
White, non-Hispanic	58,553	41,809	71.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,768	5,713	44.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,084	1,774	43.4
Economically disadvantaged students	30,784	15,295	49.7
Migratory students	89	24	27.0
Male	39,117	25,759	65.9
Female	38,214	24,609	64.4
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,777	64,189	80.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	157	74.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,030	919	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9,498	5,915	62.3
Hispanic	5,130	3,526	68.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,886	51,410	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,641	6,722	53.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,846	2,556	66.5
Economically disadvantaged students	30,761	21,513	69.9
Migratory students	91	49	53.8
Male	40,834	32,553	79.7
Female	38,871	31,591	81.3
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,650	57,478	72.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	134	64.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	982	805	82.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,470	4,818	50.9
Hispanic	5,082	2,735	53.8
White, non-Hispanic	60,888	46,904	77.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,597	4,873	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,804	1,820	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	30,729	17,913	58.3
Migratory students	91	31	34.1
Male	40,732	27,220	66.8
Female	38,845	30,221	77.8
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Under Indiana's approved plan for No Child Left Behind, science is tested in Grades 5, 7, and Biology 1.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,564	63,747	79.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	144	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,060	951	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	10,096	5,940	58.8
Hispanic	4,966	3,416	68.8
White, non-Hispanic	61,322	51,077	83.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,053	5,715	47.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,454	2,300	66.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30,030	20,383	67.9
Migratory students	107	50	46.7
Male	41,372	32,397	78.3
Female	39,090	31,294	80.1
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,327	56,896	70.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	131	66.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,007	806	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	10,061	5,061	50.3
Hispanic	4,902	2,661	54.3
White, non-Hispanic	61,242	46,266	75.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,961	3,884	32.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,409	1,635	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	29,962	16,865	56.3
Migratory students	107	34	31.8
Male	41,224	26,599	64.5
Female	39,001	30,250	77.6
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 7			
All students	79,721	45,666	57.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	103	53.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,044	728	69.7
Black, non-Hispanic	9,953	2,494	25.1
Hispanic	4,915	1,707	34.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,724	39,168	64.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,260	2,885	25.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,421	1,028	30.0
Economically disadvantaged students	29,572	11,289	38.2
Migratory students	106	14	13.2
Male	40,828	24,048	58.9
Female	38,791	21,588	55.7
Comments:			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,089	59,588	74.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	131	64.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	949	811	85.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9,914	4,708	47.5
Hispanic	4,759	2,798	58.8
White, non-Hispanic	61,693	49,312	79.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,848	4,858	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,134	1,740	55.5
Economically disadvantaged students	28,773	17,386	60.4
Migratory students	105	52	49.5
Male	41,024	30,448	74.2
Female	38,898	29,073	74.7
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,869	55,782	69.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	202	119	58.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	918	738	80.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,890	4,630	46.8
Hispanic	4,692	2,440	52.0
White, non-Hispanic	61,598	46,046	74.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,768	3,705	31.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,090	1,383	44.8
Economically disadvantaged students	28,692	15,660	54.6
Migratory students	105	31	29.5
Male	40,841	26,209	64.2
Female	38,859	29,505	75.9
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Under Indiana's approved plan for No Child Left Behind, science is tested in Grades 5, 7, and Biology 1.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	158,398	110,750	69.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	449	283	63.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,894	1,572	83.0
Black, non-Hispanic	18,525	7,517	40.6
Hispanic	8,373	4,575	54.6
White, non-Hispanic	124,923	94,120	75.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,249	7,631	34.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,983	2,481	49.8
Economically disadvantaged students	50,779	26,836	52.8
Migratory students	146	63	43.2
Male	80,901	56,728	70.1
Female	77,361	53,966	69.8
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory and LEP students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	158,293	108,702	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	454	284	62.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,803	1,386	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	18,637	7,995	42.9
Hispanic	8,247	4,005	48.6
White, non-Hispanic	124,925	92,324	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	22,214	5,819	26.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,912	1,805	36.7
Economically disadvantaged students	50,862	25,648	50.4
Migratory students	140	35	25.0
Male	80,676	50,963	63.2
Female	77,478	57,673	74.4
Comments: We expect we were better able to identify migratory and LEP students and that this number is correct.			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
Comments: Under Indiana's approved plan for No Child Left Behind, science is tested in Grades 5, 7, and Biology 1.			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	1,857	1,005	54.1
Districts	293	247	84.3
Comments:			

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

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	798	469	58.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	247	89	36.0
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	551	380	69.0
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
283	238	84.1
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	4
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	7
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	9
Comments: Note: 24 schools implemented corrective action in 2007-2008. The school that replaced staff members also replaced the principal.	

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

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	0
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
Comments:	

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

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other restructuring consisted of changing the role of principals and adding a governance structure in the form of additional staff to oversee the school, share leadership, and mentor principals. At 3 of the 5 schools, grade levels were reconfigured which also involved staffing changes.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan

- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA, in partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center (GLECC is in its third year of providing intensive technical assistance to districts in improvement and corrective action under NCLB. Assistance included:

1. Assistance in writing and revising District Improvement/ Action Plan and Curriculum Mapping and Aligning: Implementation Plan
2. Curriculum mapping coaches provide training in the critical components required by the SEA. Curriculum mapping coaches continue to be a critical liaison between the SEA and the district leadership team.
3. Dr. Heidi Hayes Jacobs workshops provided beginning and advanced levels of mapping and aligning the English language arts or math curriculum
4. Creation of policies and procedures regarding the written and taught curriculum within a district.
5. Fall Administrative Workshops provided districts with "Lessons Learned" from districts current mapping
6. Modeled, facilitated and created workbooks examining data and determining root causes analyses for districts to use in working with principals and school staff.

Districts in corrective action must institute and implement a new curriculum based on State and local content and academic achievement standards that include appropriate scientifically research-based professional development for all relevant staff.

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

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	4
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: Please note that the response of "4" indicates districts in Year 3 Corrective Action in 07-08. Districts that remained in Corrective Action in 07-08 continued implementation of a new curriculum. Total continuing implementation = 15.	

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

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	1	1
Schools	49	21
Comments:		

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

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	02/22/08
---	----------

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

1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
 - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		90,010
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		31,763
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		35.3
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		30,558
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08		33.9
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	208	
Comments: Note: SY 2006-2007 are results from fall 2007 testing. Fall 2008 data to be provided when CSPR reopens. Per agreement with USDE on 3/3/09 -finalized fall 2008 data will be sent via email to the ED program officer. Per agreement with USDE on 3/3/09 -finalized fall 2008 data will be sent via email to the ED program officer.		

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

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	
Comments: Note: Response to 1.4.8.2 to be provided with fall 2008 data when CSPR reopens. Per agreement with USDE on 3/3/09 -finalized fall 2008 data will be sent via email to the ED program officer.	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.	Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status	Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		44				
2		66				
6 = Combo 1	Combo of #1 and #2	96				

Comments: Per agreement with USDE, Columns #4 -#7 will be completed when the CSPR I is reopened in spring of 2009. Per agreement with USDE on 3/3/09 -finalized fall 2008 data will be sent via email to the ED program officer.

Column 1 Response Options Box
<p>1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.</p> <p>4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.</p> <p>5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.</p> <p>6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p> <p>8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.</p>

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

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

1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

I. Fall 2008 Title I workshops included presentations from distinguished and high-performing schools. Workshops were conducted at three locations around the state and content from all workshops was also posted online.

II. In partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center, the SEA developed an Institute for School Leadership Team. The Institute is a two-year program for school leaders that are ready to

- Implement a team approach to instructional leadership;
- Use data to determine students' needs and plan appropriate teacher and student response;
- Utilize research-based practices from high-performing, high-poverty urban districts
- Receive support from current and recent successful urban principals; and
- Meet, work, and plan on a regular basis with a team of teachers, the principal, and a representative from the district.

The Institute began with on-site visits from the facilitator, who is a current or recent urban principal from a high performing, high poverty school. The facilitator works with the School Leadership Team (SLT) using data to identify the areas of focus for the year that will impact student achievement. The State held a 2008 summer academy based on the unique needs of each participating school. The summer academy provided whole group presentations, small group presentations and many opportunities for team work. Following the summer academy, the facilitators communicate with the SLT regularly through on-site visits and phone conferences. Additional one-day School-Year Sessions convene the school teams for group work in October, January and April. The second year of the Institute will be scheduled based on needs identified by the facilitators and SLTs over the course of year-one work.

III. Results from the 1003(g) evaluation will be shared with key stakeholders including LEAs and schools as well as with the general public.

IV. Instructional Coaches Training -Through continuous professional development of 10 workshops throughout the year with national presenters on instructional coaching and Indiana instructional coaches working in high poverty, high performing schools, assist instructional coaches to:

-gain new information and skills related to coaching teachers and paraprofessionals and literacy or math content through training

-share information and skills regarding data , curriculum, instruction and assessment with school staff using a variety of coaching processes. e.g., verbal explanation, modeling, co-teaching. and other forms of professional development.

-provide leadership and guidance in developing an effective school-wide literacy or mathematics program, including the development and the implementation of the school improvement plan.

-coach/teach school staff to understand and appropriately use diagnostic tools and formative assessments and other student data to determine appropriate instruction and to develop and implement differentiated instructional methods that correspond to specific students needs.

-collaborate with the principal to establish a climate and focus on the literacy or mathematics as a schoolwide program and to create a literacy or mathematics-focused professional development plan.

V. LEA Improvement -Through workshops with individual facilitators , assist and share with districts how to:

-Disaggregate student data.

-Develop patterns and findings from the data, especially for student groups.

-Determine root cause.

-Develop improvement plan to increase student achievement for those subgroups not meeting AYP

VI. LEA Corrective Action -Curriculum Audit, Development and Implementation -assist and share with districts how to:

-Evaluate the quality and the content of their current English/language arts curriculum.

-Implement the "curriculum mapping" process for district-wide improvement and/or development of a new E/LA curriculum.

-Involve all appropriate teachers in the mapping process.

-Establish corresponding formative assessments and instructional practices to align with the new curriculum map.

VII. School Support Teams -The IDOE, Office of Title I Academic Support has defined a three-step process for schools and their School

Support Teams with a goal of "increasing the opportunity for all students to meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards". Tools and support are provided to the teams.

As part of their work, the school support team works to review current improvement plans, instructional strategies and practices, and shares recommendations for improvement to ensure that strategies have a high likelihood of increasing student achievement when implemented consistently.

ms that began April 2008.

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

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

Comments:

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

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

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The State Education Agency (SEA) used the allowable reservation to identify schools to receive funds and to begin an outside evaluation. As agreed in the SEA's 1003(g) application to USDE, 1003(g) funds in Indiana are awarded through a competitive grant process. The SEA reservation included funds to obtain outside expertise to review and recommend applications for funding.

The second use of the SEA reservation was to begin funding an outside evaluation of 1003(g) funds. The purpose of the evaluation is to provide the SEA with the types of formative and summative feedback needed to inform program and policy decisions. The evaluation specifically addresses the following key questions:

How are 1003(g) funds being used, and are there specific practices and/or strategies being funded that appear to be more successful and effective than others in improving student achievement?

What are the primary obstacles and/or barriers to these school improvement efforts? In what ways can the program and/or its implementation be improved?

In what ways do 1003(g) funds appear to impact key expected outcomes such as improving student proficiency, increasing the number of schools that make adequate yearly progress, and using data to inform decisions and create a system of continuous feedback and improvement?

The evaluation will examine the implementation and effectiveness of strategies and approaches used to address the following program elements:

Classroom Assessments Research Based Instructional Strategies and Programs Strategies to Improve Student Achievement Instructional Materials Instructional Leadership Professional Development District-based Technical Assistance

Data collection methods include the following:

Literature review and background data collection Key stakeholder interviews Web-based surveys Site visits Extant data and other data collection methods

In addition to the formative feedback provided for program improvement, the ultimate purpose of the overall evaluation is to determine to the extent possible the impact and outcomes of 1003(g) funds through improved student proficiency, increased numbers of schools making adequate yearly progress, and the use of data to inform decisions and create a system of continuous feedback and improvement.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schoolwide Planning Support

Support consisted of ongoing professional development workshops, guided discussions, and samples/templates throughout the year to:

- establish schoolwide planning teams, clarify the vision for reform, identify data sources and analyze data to create the school profile.
- learn to identify research-based strategies.
- prioritize needs based on data and develop a comprehensive plan to address them.
- set measurable goals.
- learn how to evaluate the schoolwide plan.

Note: Schoolwide planning support included both schools identified for improvement and not identified for improvement.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

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

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	88,161
Applied to transfer	2,881
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,774

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

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	Yes
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	No
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,053,552
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	25
Comments:	

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

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school³ that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	35,742
Applied for supplemental educational services	9,675
Received supplemental educational services	7,954
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 11,641,716
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

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

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	269,618	260,157	96.5	9,461	3.5
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	39,340	37,840	96.2	1,500	3.8
Low-poverty schools	40,108	39,178	97.7	930	2.3
All elementary schools	158,101	153,760	97.3	4,341	2.7
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	27,738	26,230	94.6	1,508	5.4
Low-poverty schools	28,986	27,654	95.4	1,332	4.6
All secondary schools	111,517	106,397	95.4	5,120	4.6
Comments:					

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

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state uses a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, one for each subject taught.

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

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	98.8
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.5
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	97.9
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	0.5
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.6
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	50.7	20.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	
Secondary schools	36.2	15.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
2. Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
Yes	Transitional bilingual	Spanish
No	Developmental bilingual	
No	Heritage language	
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes "ESL" which differs from Pull-out ESL in that it is a scheduled course. ESL also differs from Content-based ESL in that language is taught not through content but rather through language in alignment with the Indiana English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards.

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

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	46,417
Comments: Count is based on the statewide data collection conducted at the beginning of the 2007-08 school year in October 2007.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	44,647
Comments:	

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

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	36,832
German (Amish)	1,478
Arabic	652
Mandarin	474
Punjabi	465

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Korean -451; Japanese -408; Vietnamese -394; Russian -371.

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

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	50,003
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	509
Total	50,512
Comments: 50,003 includes all students tested including LEP students and Level 5, fluent English proficient (FEP), students needing to attain a second Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year monitoring period per Indiana state policy. The State ELP assessment, LAS Links, is administered at the end of the 2007-08 school year in February/March 2008. This results in a higher number of students that was identified in 1.6.2.1. 509 represents students who actually attempted the State ELP assessment but that did not have a valid/complete score on the Spring 2008 administration of LAS Links.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	11,668
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	23.1
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 83I.

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	48,569
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	481
Total	49,050
Comments: 48,569 includes all Title III students tested including LEP students and Level 5, fluent English proficient (FEP), students needing to attain a second Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year monitoring period per Indiana state policy. The State ELP assessment, LAS Links, is administered at the end of the 2007-08 school year in February/March 2008. This results in a higher number of students that was identified in 1.6.2.2. 481 represents Title III students who actually attempted the State ELP assessment but that did not have a valid/complete score on the Spring 2008 administration of LAS Links.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

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

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	Results	
	#	%
Making progress	24,018	72.0
ELP attainment	8,989	27.0
Comments: Making progress and ELP attainment are calculated based on matched student records from the 2007 administration to the 2008 administration of LAS Links. The percentages represent 33,486 students that had matched records, not the total number of students tested which was 49,050. 479 students, or less than 1.5%, did not make progress. Clarification: In 1.6.3.2.1, Title III 48,569 LEP students were tested in Spring 2008. This number is higher than the number of all LEP students in the state, 46,417, reported in 1.6.2.1 because the LEP count occurred prior to the testing window. By the time testing occurred, more students had enrolled. Further, the number in 1.6.2.2 does not include the Level 5 students tested in 1.6.3.2.2. The number of students making progress and attaining proficiency is based on matched records of students with two data points.		

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

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

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

Language(s)
Comments:

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

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

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

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
2,808	1,729	4,537
Comments:		

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

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,517	4,015	88.9	502
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,512	3,830	84.9	682
Comments:			

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

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
1,106	806	72.9	300
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	96
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	62
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	96
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	95
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	62
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	3
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	3
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	3
Comments: Three LEAs did not meet AMAOs (AMAO III: AYP)two years consecutively. The Title I LEA Improvement Plans for these LEAs are reviewed to determine if Title III LEP issues are sufficiently addressed. If not, a separate Title III improvement plan is established. Indiana AMAOs have been calculated AMAOs for SY 2007-08 based on the Fall 2007 administration of ISTEP+ and the Spring 2008 administration of LAS Links. Per the USDE guidance on December 15, 2008, this method is permissible.	

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

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
Comments: The SEA did not meet AMAO III: AYP	

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

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments:	

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

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
11,763	3,729	6

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,400
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1,000

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	139	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	126	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	89	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	76	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	96	
Other (Explain in comment box)	43	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	126	8,815
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	98	819
PD provided to principals	118	901
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	110	473
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	110	1,547
PD provided to community based organization personnel	30	859
Total		13,414

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/10/07	08/22/07	31
Comments: The distribution timeline of 31 business days for the 2007-08 school year is a significant improvement from last school year in which the distribution took 44 business days.		

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

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA has an internal processing timeline of two business weeks for each LEA grant application from the date it is submitted to the SEA for review. The initial distribution of funds to LEAs occurs upon grant approval. The SEA can further shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to LEAs by encouraging LEAs to submit their grant application on, or before, the due date. Also, the SEA can shorten the process by maximizing the number of SEA staff reviewing LEA grant applications.

Clarification: The SEA reviews and approves grant applications within two weeks of receipt; however, it may take a total of 31 business days for the funds to be distributed. Once the Title III SEA staff approve the application, it is forwarded to School Finance for the electronic distribution to be made. This process of making the distribution can take a few weeks. This lengthens the overall process of distributing funds to 31 business days.

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

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	87.1
Black, non-Hispanic	57.0
Hispanic	64.3
White, non-Hispanic	79.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	52.6
Limited English proficient	58.8
Economically disadvantaged	58.6
Migratory students	55.1
Male	72.7
Female	80.4
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	4.3
White, non-Hispanic	2.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	3.2
Limited English proficient	4.3
Economically disadvantaged	4.1
Migratory students	2.1
Male	3.0
Female	2.3
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	312	312
LEAs with subgrants	20	20
Total	332	332
Comments:		

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

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	401
K	284	494
1	340	613
2	282	633
3	266	586
4	290	535
5	224	507
6	214	367
7	225	339
8	225	312
9	196	239
10	152	186
11	140	150
12	133	147
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2,971	5,509
Comments:		

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

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	819	679
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	1,970	4,135
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	45	159
Hotels/Motels	122	150
Total	2,956	5,123
Comments: The number of homeless children when examined by grade and type differs due to the inclusion of preschool children in the grade set. They were not included in the housing type set.		

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

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	401
K	494
1	613
2	633
3	586
4	535
5	507
6	367
7	339
8	312
9	239
10	186
11	150
12	147
Ungraded	0
Total	5,509
Comments: The numbers reported for EDEN were for the whole state (grantees and non-grantees). The numbers on the right are just numbers served by subgrantees.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	163
Migratory children/youth	151
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	923
Limited English proficient students	435
Comments: The numbers reported for EDEN represent homeless students across the entire state. The numbers reported here represent sub-grantee districts only.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	16
Expedited evaluations	14
Staff professional development and awareness	16
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	17
Transportation	16
Early childhood programs	14
Assistance with participation in school programs	16
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	16
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	16
Coordination between schools and agencies	16
Counseling	11
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	14
Clothing to meet a school requirement	14
School supplies	16
Referral to other programs and services	16
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	15
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other 1: Field Trip Fees Other 2: Teen Pregnancy/Parenting Other 3: Employment Assistance/College Tours

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

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	7
School Selection	6
Transportation	5
School records	5
Immunizations	5
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	523	279
4	464	251
5	451	260
6	331	160
7	286	125
8	265	97
High School	319	127
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	527	263
4	465	257
5	452	268
6	338	205
7	289	169
8	271	132
High School	325	118
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	320
K	137
1	151
2	155
3	143
4	137
5	148
6	143
7	145
8	167
9	170
10	171
11	133
12	155
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	815
Total	3,091
<p>Comments: Decline in count due to fewer families migrating to Indiana. Concerns about immigration resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. The high cost of gasoline made it unreasonable for many families to travel the long distances from home based states to Indiana. Additionally, Indiana experienced floods, tornadoes and drought conditions that limited agricultural productivity throughout the state.</p>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 seems to be the result of a combination of factors. There are tremendous concerns regarding immigration and the impact on migrant families. This concern resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. Discussions with farmworkers confirmed the fears that exist among all those who engage in farm labor. These fears exist regardless of an individual's legal status. There were numerous cases of crops that needed to be harvested, yet there were no workers to do the harvesting. Initially it was believed that the immigration concerns would have a minor impact on the number of eligible migrant students identified; however, it has become exceedingly clear that immigration concerns had a MAJOR impact. This concern related to immigration laws and enforcement practices frequently kept families from migrating. This resulted in single male farmworkers coming to Indiana and leaving children and spouses at home. Additionally, Indiana experienced floods, tornadoes and drought conditions that limited agricultural productivity throughout the state. Initial reports indicated that there was over an \$840 million loss to the agricultural economy due to these factors. Also, the high cost of gasoline made it unreasonable for many families to travel long distances from home based states to Indiana. Other factors that contributed to the decrease in students are the hiring practices of growers and agricultural conditions that lowered the need for migrant farmworkers.

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

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	289
K	125
1	129
2	127
3	118
4	122
5	108
6	123
7	115
8	144
9	150
10	136
11	118
12	124
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	700
Total	2,628
<p>Comments: Decline in count due to fewer families migrating to Indiana. Concerns about immigration resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. The high cost of gasoline made it unreasonable for many families to travel the long distances from home based states to Indiana. Additionally, Indiana experienced floods, tornadoes and drought conditions that limited agricultural productivity throughout the state.</p>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 seems to be the result of a combination of factors. There are tremendous concerns regarding immigration and the impact on migrant families. This concern resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. Discussions with farmworkers confirmed the fears that exist among all those who engage in farm labor. These fears exist regardless of an individual's legal status. There were numerous cases of crops that needed to be harvested, yet there were no workers to do the harvesting. Initially it was believed that the immigration concerns would have a minor impact on the number of eligible migrant students identified; however, it has become exceedingly clear that immigration concerns had a MAJOR impact. This concern related to immigration laws and enforcement practices frequently kept families from migrating. This resulted in single male farmworkers coming to Indiana and leaving children and spouses at home. Additionally, Indiana experienced floods, tornadoes and drought conditions that limited agricultural productivity throughout the state. Initial reports indicated that there was over an \$840 million loss to the agricultural economy due to these factors. Also, the high cost of gasoline made it unreasonable for many families to travel long distances from home based states to Indiana. Other factors that contributed to the decrease in students are the hiring practices of growers and agricultural

conditions that lowered the need for migrant farmworkers.

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

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEStar was the system used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for 2007-08 and for previous reporting periods. It is the intent to continue using COEStar for future reporting.

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

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana collects Family, Student, and Eligibility data based on the "Sample Certificate of Eligibility" suggested by OME. The family/student data collected includes: name, birth date, birthplace, gender, race, parents and/or guardian names, unique ID number, current residence and home base information. The eligibility data collected includes: QAD, residency date, qualifying activity, from and to move, and who moved (child on own, with parent, or guardian). In addition, Indiana collects data regarding school and program enrollment that includes the school term, school year, enrollment and withdrawal dates, and instructional as well as supportive services.

Recruiters interview families and individuals in person or in rare instances via telephone to gather the information needed to complete a COE and determine eligibility. In addition, work questionnaires are distributed to all schools for families to complete in order to gather preliminary information. Recruiters then contact the family to determine eligibility. The toll free number for the Migrant Education Hotline is actively promoted. Families call our field office, located in Kokomo, where information is gathered to determine eligibility. Recruitment takes place throughout the year

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

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

count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Recruiters input the COE data on laptop computers using the COEStar system. The electronic COE is then transmitted via modem to the Kokomo field office for review. Once the data are verified it is then sent to the Indianapolis Office. The Data Entry Specialist enrolls each identified migrant child (whether or not they are receiving educational services) in regular (R) and/or summer (S) term according to residency dates and current school calendar year. The Records Administrator and the Data Entry Specialist update records according to information provided by recruiters and/or by school personnel. COEStar Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) scans COEStar databases, locates eligible COEs for the federal reporting period, extracts and tabulates the data into reports for child count purposes.

Families homebased in Indiana are contacted at least once per reporting period. A new COE is generated to reflect any new move, to update student information or to document that the children were residents of Indiana for at least one day of the reporting period. In addition, LEA staff updates student information as needed throughout the year. The data are organized through the COEStar system.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data for both category 1 and category 2 were collected and maintained using the COEStar system.

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

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

If any of the following dates are within the current reporting, the child is considered a resident and eligible to be counted. Age is tested as a primary criterion, as is the test of the three years from the last qualifying move and residency in the state. They must pass those tests before any others are considered.

1. Qualifying Arrival Date
2. Residency Date
3. Enrollment Date
4. Instructional/Supportive Service Program Start Date Since COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system.

Since COEStar keeps a copy of the actual COE, calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) continue to be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

All children counted for services may not be counted for funding since 0-2 years old can be counted for services. This is actually a single calculation and each child's record is marked to indicate their age and age category (0-2, 3-21, >21) when selected.

By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

COEStar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track, but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

COEs are tested to ensure that the Current Residence State is in our state (Indiana). In order for a child to qualify, he/she must reside in our state regardless of the destination noted in the eligibility section of the COE indicating moving from one location to another. In addition, residency is verified through home visits, and/or telephone interviews, and/or program attendance records, and/or other agencies with which we coordinate services.

Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) selects all COEs from the COE database that show eligibility for part or all of the performance report period. According to the current law, COEs with a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) on or after September 1, 2004 and on or before August 31, 2008 are selected. A COE with a QAD of September 1, 2004 is eligible for one day during this period. All eligible children associated with those COEs are selected.

Selected COEs are sorted to obtain an unduplicated list of participants between the ages of 3 and 21 years inclusive. This process uses the COEStar Student ID number as well as the Migrant Student Directory (MSD) ID number. Therefore, if a student is identified in more than one location, but assigned the same MSD number, (s)he will not be counted twice. Normally, since Indiana recruiters use COEStar, students identified in more than one school district will be individually identified. There are a limited number of cases where mobile students move around the state and are assigned different numbers (less than 1%). In those cases SEA staff locates these and either consolidates the records or consolidates the MSD number for the child. We also have several reports to aid in the location of possible duplicates, but the personal nature of the Indiana program with the population served is extremely effective by itself.

The unique list of students is tabulated to produce the Counts of Migrant Children Eligible for Funding Purposes for the Performance Report. If a child's record has one or more records with an educational encounter or enrollment marked as an Intersession or Summer participant, they are counted one time in the Summer/Intersession Count or Participants Eligible for Funding Purposes and one time in the Twelve Month Count of Students Eligible for Funding Purposes. If there is no enrollment type noted on the record or the type is anything other than an Intersession or Summer Program indicator, the participant is counted one time in the Twelve Month Count of Students Eligible for Funding Purposes.

To ensure that students are counted only once, recruiters, the Migrant Field Coordinator and Migrant Field Clerk cross check each child on

a COE with the COEStar database. As COEs are generated, recruiters search the database for an existing COEStar Student ID. If the child is already in the database the existing ID is used, otherwise COEStar generates a new ID. During the COE review process the Migrant Field Coordinator and Migrant Field Clerk again cross check the COEStar database. If a new ID is generated for a child who is already in COEStar, then the new ID is deleted and the existing is used for the new COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count was generated using the same system as the category 1 count. Records with a summer (S) term according to residency dates and current school year calendar are selected. In addition, summer enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the three-year eligibility period when services began. COEStar Performance Reporter basic rule is that any child counted must be between 3 and 21 years old inclusive in all cases. 1) This is based on date of birth calculation during the basic data selection. 2) Indiana, as a procedure, does not enter children in summer school until the regular school term has ended.

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

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All recruiters participate in an intensive two week initial training. The recruiter locates and interviews migrant families. After conducting the interview and determining eligibility, the information is inputted and/or updated and saved into the laptop using the COEStar system. At the end of the work day the recruiter recalls all COEs done that day and reviews them for completeness and accuracy. COEs are then transmitted via modem to the Kokomo field office.

The Migrant Field Coordinator reviews each COE against the existing database. If a COE already exists for a particular child, the previous COE is compared with the latest COE to prevent duplication. Each COE can be marked as verified and locked; and invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes. Duplicate COEs are marked as deleted at this time; thus, disqualifying the duplicate COE.

The Migrant Field Coordinator examines and researches all COEs for completeness and accuracy. If there is a question or doubt, the recruiter who completed that COE is contacted for clarification. On occasion a second visit or telephone call is made to verify information with the family.

After review/verification, COEs are sent to the Records Administrator at our main office (Indianapolis) via modem. The Records Administrator reviews and verifies the information for each child. The Records Administrator and the Migrant Field Coordinator communicate daily regarding any discrepancies on the COE. Once the Records Administrator has reviewed the COE, students are enrolled by the Data Entry Specialist as eligible migrant students with a regular (R) or a summer (S) term code.

The effectiveness of recruitment procedures and efforts is revised yearly. Field staff completes a "Field Staff Evaluation Form" at the end of each season. With this toll we measure the effectiveness of all aspects of recruitment. These forms are reviewed and suggestions are taken into account when planning the next season. All LEA staff with responsibilities for student record keeping are trained. Materials and procedures are provided at the beginning of each session. The recruiters are closely supervised and participate in weekly meetings to resolve any recruitment concerns that might exist. All of the built in check points ensure accuracy of eligibility determinations.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) implemented the re-interview process during June of 2007 for program year 2005-06. The sampling plan provides for a random sample of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) to be pulled from a universe consisting of 100% of the COEs corresponding to 100% of the students listed as qualified for the IMEP during the 2005-06 program year. In order to ensure geographic equity within the sample, the universe of COEs was divided into three subgroups made up of the northern, central, and southern counties of Indiana. A computerized list of 100% of the COEs that were created during the 2005-06 program year, in alphabetical order according to the last name of the eligible student, was created for each geographical region. From each of these lists, every tenth COE was selected for re-interview, resulting in an initial list of re-interview candidates consisting of 212 COEs from the northern counties, 52 from the central counties and 86 from the southern counties. As a result of the fact that most COEs contain information on multiple eligible students, each time a name was selected from the list, and the corresponding COE pulled, all of the students on that COE were counted towards the original sampling. Additionally, every student listed on a COE for which a re-interview was successfully conducted was towards the goal of a final sample size of 369 students that was suggested by the Office of Migrant Education. With a goal of 123 re-interviews per geographic region, the original samplings pulled for each region contained an ample number of students to account for the possibility that some migrant families would not be available for re-interview. In the case that a family was not available for re-interview the reviewers noted the reason for the failure to re-interview and proceeded to the subsequent COE in the sampling for their region. The final sampling of successful re-interviews consisted of 64 COEs, representing 161 students, from the northern counties; and 37 COEs, representing 110 students, from the central counties; and 38 COEs, representing 110 students, from the southern counties. These 381 students represent 64, 37, and 38 families respectively, that were available for re-interview. The remainder of the original list of possible candidates were not re-interviewed for one of two reasons: 1) they were not available for re-interview, or 2) the targeted number of re-interviews (369) provided by the Office of Migrant Education was met before a re-interview was attempted. There were a total of 381 students samples of which eight students were determined to be ineligible. These eight students represent three families. Each of the three families was found, upon re-interview, to have never worked, or moved with the intent to work, in a qualifying activity. The eight students found to be ineligible upon re-interview were immediately removed from the list of students eligible for the IMEP. Those eight names were subsequently added to the list of students identified as ineligible. With the sample of 381 students and eight found to be

ineligible the defect rate of 2% resulted. Re-interviews were conducted face-to-face in person in nearly all cases. There were only three that were done via the telephone after making home visits and finding adults not at home at the time. Information card tags were left on the doors to let the families know that the Indiana Migrant Education Program had visited and would be returning or telephoning. The format of the interviews was based on the standard COE and done independently of the original interviews. The original COE was checked after the re-interview was completed to confirm information. Those conducting the re-interviews were well trained in eligibility and were assigned to areas of the state that they had not previously worked. This eliminated the possibility of those conducting re-interviewers encountering families they had previously interviewed. At the annual Identification and Recruitment Forum held in Atlanta in October 2008 it was clarified that the calculation of the defect rate was to be per COE rather than the total number children on an individual COE. This information would result in a recalculation of the Indiana defect rate based on three ineligible findings (rather than eight) and lower the rate to .78%. This compares very favorably with the national defect rate of over 10%.

The previously described process is followed throughout the year. In addition, reports are generated periodically by the Migrant Field Consultant and the Records Administrator to ensure accuracy. Local projects submit a "Weekly Enrollment List." That information is compared with the COE and with reports generated by the Records Administrator. The Migrant Field Consultant supervises all identification and recruitment activities. There are three Migrant Field Coordinators in the Kokomo office and one in the Indianapolis office. The Consultant and the four Coordinators recruit as needed. In addition each field Coordinator focuses on specific areas. One Coordinator processes and reviews all COEs, the other three focus on recruitment and perform recruitment support activities, including computer information updates, and researching recruitment leads and overseeing the work of the intermittent recruitment staff.

COEStar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEStar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEStar is included in the overall quality control process. Additional data, like enrollment and services data, are thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEStar was the system used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for 2007-08 and for previous reporting periods. It is the intent to continue using COEStar for future reporting.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The previously described process is followed throughout the year. In addition, reports are generated periodically by the Migrant Field Consultant and the Records Administrator to ensure accuracy. Local projects submit a "Weekly Enrollment List." That information is compared with the COE and with reports generated by the Records Administrator. The Migrant Field Consultant supervises all identification and recruitment activities. There are three Migrant Field Coordinators in the Kokomo office and one in the Indianapolis office. The Consultant and the four Coordinators recruit as needed. In addition each field Coordinator focuses on specific areas. One Coordinator processes and reviews all COEs, the other three focus on recruitment and perform recruitment support activities, including computer information updates, and researching recruitment leads and overseeing the work of the intermittent recruitment staff.

COEStar data collection is an integrated process and requires no additional steps beyond those normally used in the collection of data. Since all COEStar data originates with the collection of the COE, COEStar is included in the overall quality control process. Additional data, like enrollment and services data, are thoroughly edited by the system upon entry to be sure it is accurate.

COEStar was the system used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for 2007-08 and for previous reporting periods. It is the intent to continue using COEStar for future reporting.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEStar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable; however, all numbers are double and triple checked against other sources which include LEA applications, LEA "End of Project Report", LEA "pre-site Visit Information Sheet", and ongoing communication with LEAs through inservices, informal visits, site visits, as well as information shared and gathered from interagency coordination, including sharing reports and pertinent information, multi-agency projects (Consolidated Outreach Project), conferences and meetings. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

Additionally, during the month of October the Migrant Field Consultant, the Migrant Field Coordinators and the intermittent staff will review every COE once again. Staff will screen for missing information, correctness of dates such as Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and school district arrival date (residency), qualifying move information, birth dates for eligibility, qualifying activity and school identification code. In November, the data are analyzed once more to identify any remaining duplications that might exist. Then corrections or deletions are made as the individual case merits. The State Director and SEA staff then review the data, comparing it to the previous year, expectations for the current year, and other sources in order to assess the reasonableness of the count.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The average defect rate in eligibility determinations for State administered Migrant Education Programs across the US is approximately. The IMEP, as a result of the re-interview process, found a 2% defect rate and a recalculated rate of less than 1%. This relatively low defect rate is believed to be a result of high quality training and supervision provided to the individuals who are responsible for identifying and recruiting for the IMEP. Among the COEs of the eight students, representing three families, there were not commonalities, that is to say that there was evidence of a gap in the training or supervision provided to those who conducted the original interviews, nor was there any evidence that the eligibility determinations were falsified. The eight students who were determined to be ineligible upon re-interview were immediately removed from the IMEP list of eligible migrant students. The IMEP will continue to implement its intensive identification and recruitment training and maintain the high level of quality control. The results of the re-interview process will be discussed as part of the two week intensive training in order to emphasize the tremendous importance of

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. There is a concern regarding the significant decline in the number of eligible migrant students in Indiana. Much research and inquiry of other programs serving the migrant population has resulted in the conclusion that there are several factors contributing to this decline. This concern was addressed in sections 1.10.1.1 and 1.10.2.1 of this report.

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