

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 2008-09

INDIANA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2009

PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2010

**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) 2008-09 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 2008-09 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 18, 2009. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 12, 2010. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2008-09, 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 2008-09 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 2008-09 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, 2008-09

Part II, 2008-09

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: 317-232-8004

e-mail: jzaring@doe.in.gov

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

Friday, March 12, 2010, 9:15:42 AM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2008-09



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 18, 2009
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The state board adopted new mathematics standards in in the spring of 2009. These standards are to be implemented by schools in the 2010-11 school year.

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.

The state assessments were moved from fall to spring during the 2008-09 school year. New cut scores were set and adopted by the State Board in July of 2009. The new assessment will undergo peer review in the spring of 2010.

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 4,000 characters.

The state assessments were moved from fall to spring during the 2008-09 school year. New cut scores were set and adopted by the State Board in July of 2009. The new assessment will undergo peer review in the spring of 2010.

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 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 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 ESEA. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities(IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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	561,051		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,451		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,048		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	68,905		>97%
Hispanic	37,308		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	422,168		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	89,555		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,778		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	221,885		>97%
Migratory students	556		>97%
Male	287,208		>97%
Female	273,278		>97%
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, 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(IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	30,255	34.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	51,852	59.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,980	5.7
Total	87,087	
Comments:		

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 reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	560,343		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,449		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	7,644		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	68,886		>97%
Hispanic	37,031		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	422,168		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	89,592		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	28,730		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	221,953		>97%
Migratory students	544		>97%
Male	286,838		>97%
Female	272,945		>97%
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 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 (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	29,785	34.3
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	51,987	59.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	4,988	5.8
Total	86,760	
Comments:		

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 science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	158,165		>97%
American Indian or Alaska Native	409		>97%
Asian or Pacific Islander	2,226		>97%
Black, non-Hispanic	19,120		>97%
Hispanic	10,540		>97%
White, non-Hispanic	119,211		>97%
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	24,031		>97%
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	8,269		>97%
Economically disadvantaged students	63,400		>97%
Migratory students	166		>97%
Male	80,743		>97%
Female	77,241		>97%
Comments:			

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

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 science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only 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	8,744	36.8
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	15,049	63.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	23,793	
Comments:		

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

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	79,586	55,687	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	210	137	65.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,277	1,000	78.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9,820	4,852	49.4
Hispanic	5,856	3,105	53.0
White, non-Hispanic	58,373	43,989	75.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,852	6,888	53.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,083	2,710	53.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,872	19,795	58.4
Migratory students	88	32	36.4
Male	40,739	28,857	70.8
Female	38,757	26,782	69.1
Comments: All students total is 79,586 students (210 American Indian; 1,277 Asian; 9,820 Black; 5,856 Hispanic; 58,373 White]. There are 4008 Multiracial and 42 unknown race.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 79586.			

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

	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
Grade 3			
All students	79,320	59,517	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	209	146	69.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,210	988	81.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,805	5,639	57.5
Hispanic	5,803	3,314	57.1
White, non-Hispanic	58,252	46,542	79.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,792	6,949	54.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,054	2,847	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	33,776	21,680	64.2
Migratory students	87	32	36.8
Male	40,534	29,132	71.9
Female	38,700	30,333	78.4
Comments: All students total is 79,320 students (209 American Indian; 1,210 Asian; 9,805 Black; 5,803 Hispanic; 58,252 White]. There are 3,999 Multiracial and 42 unknown race.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 79,320.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
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.

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,526	57,568	73.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	197	135	68.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,224	1,028	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,793	5,440	55.6
Hispanic	5,690	3,591	63.1
White, non-Hispanic	57,868	44,810	77.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,924	7,883	56.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,774	3,105	65.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33,218	20,968	63.1
Migratory students	82	41	50.0
Male	40,065	29,490	73.6
Female	38,357	28,029	73.1
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students. All students total is 78,526 students (197 American Indian; 1,224 Asian; 9,793 Black; 5,690 Hispanic; 57,868 White). There are 3,725 Multiracial and 29 unknown race.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing race is equal to 78,526.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,326	57,816	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	144	72.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,150	956	83.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9,789	5,481	56.0
Hispanic	5,621	3,328	59.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,819	45,265	78.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,900	6,988	50.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,741	2,782	58.7
Economically disadvantaged students	33,149	20,537	62.0
Migratory students	81	30	37.0
Male	39,941	27,591	69.1
Female	38,285	30,178	78.8
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students. All students total is 78,326 students (198 American Indian; 1,150 Asian; 9,789 Black; 5,621 Hispanic; 57,819 White). There are 3,719 Multiracial and 30 unknown race.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 78,326.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
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.

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,244	60,347	77.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	150	77.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,132	968	85.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9,543	5,594	58.6
Hispanic	5,343	3,618	67.7
White, non-Hispanic	58,449	47,451	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,306	7,768	58.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,424	3,021	68.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32,548	21,923	67.4
Migratory students	86	47	54.6
Male	39,856	30,808	77.3
Female	38,290	29,471	77.0
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,971	58,508	75.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	144	73.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,080	901	83.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,518	5,526	58.1
Hispanic	5,278	3,168	60.0
White, non-Hispanic	58,320	46,189	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	13,227	6,245	47.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,403	2,556	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	32,458	20,629	63.6
Migratory students	85	37	43.5
Male	39,654	27,946	70.5
Female	38,219	30,501	79.8
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.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,383	49,638	64.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	124	63.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,125	822	73.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9,418	3,396	36.1
Hispanic	5,296	2,424	45.8
White, non-Hispanic	57,784	40,838	70.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,615	5,609	44.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,405	2,003	45.5
Economically disadvantaged students	32,113	15,886	49.5
Migratory students	86	35	40.7
Male	39,352	25,153	63.9
Female	37,933	24,434	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.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,516	62,591	79.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	166	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,101	928	84.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9,283	5,774	62.2
Hispanic	5,192	3,559	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	59,425	49,670	83.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,669	6,753	53.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,129	2,796	67.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,563	21,943	69.5
Migratory students	74	39	52.7
Male	39,782	31,488	79.2
Female	38,654	31,059	80.4
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.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78,464	56,517	72.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	146	67.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,039	832	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9,315	4,839	52.0
Hispanic	5,138	2,889	56.2
White, non-Hispanic	59,447	45,538	76.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	12,640	5,026	39.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,103	2,229	54.3
Economically disadvantaged students	31,628	18,506	58.5
Migratory students	71	28	39.4
Male	39,736	26,968	67.9
Female	38,650	29,509	76.4
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
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.

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,648	65,653	81.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	214	166	77.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,098	954	86.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9,604	6,098	63.5
Hispanic	5,223	3,737	71.6
White, non-Hispanic	61,463	52,334	85.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,936	6,127	51.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,838	2,713	70.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31,098	22,051	70.9
Migratory students	80	48	60.0
Male	41,358	33,120	80.1
Female	39,219	32,481	82.8
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students.			

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 collection tool.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,456	56,311	70.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	127	59.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,040	821	78.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9,599	4,685	48.8
Hispanic	5,165	2,762	53.5
White, non-Hispanic	61,393	45,893	74.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,894	3,853	32.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,828	1,890	49.4
Economically disadvantaged students	31,083	17,280	55.6
Migratory students	80	27	33.8
Male	41,219	26,437	64.1
Female	39,166	29,839	76.2
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79,824	45,550	57.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	102	48.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,087	734	67.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9,483	2,297	24.2
Hispanic	5,180	1,798	34.7
White, non-Hispanic	60,843	39,140	64.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,178	2,913	26.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,809	1,205	31.6
Economically disadvantaged students	30,678	11,800	38.5
Migratory students	80	16	20.0
Male	40,828	23,965	58.7
Female	38,923	21,561	55.4
Comments: New data collection system used to identify migrant students.			

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 C SPR collection tool.

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,154	60,166	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	132	68.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,086	914	84.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9,982	5,023	50.3
Hispanic	5,030	3,114	61.9
White, non-Hispanic	60,940	48,913	80.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,788	4,713	40.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,496	2,086	59.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29,829	18,398	61.7
Migratory students	88	45	51.1
Male	41,122	31,005	75.4
Female	38,968	29,126	74.7
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.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80,044	54,811	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	192	116	60.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,049	808	77.0
Black, non-Hispanic	10,004	4,741	47.4
Hispanic	4,975	2,591	52.1
White, non-Hispanic	60,910	44,626	73.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	11,766	3,420	29.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,493	1,611	46.1
Economically disadvantaged students	29,816	15,888	53.3
Migratory students	86	22	25.6
Male	41,036	25,727	62.7
Female	38,942	29,053	74.6
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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
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.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,511	52,609	67.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	199	129	64.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,018	768	75.4
Black, non-Hispanic	8,971	3,528	39.3
Hispanic	4,274	2,222	52.0
White, non-Hispanic	60,856	44,620	73.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,612	3,426	32.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,555	1,167	45.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,020	12,659	50.6
Migratory students	58	26	44.8
Male	39,656	27,054	68.2
Female	37,797	25,526	67.5
Comments: Drop was due to the elimination of grade 9 testing.			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & 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 collection tool.

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77,487	54,520	70.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	203	143	70.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	957	694	72.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9,019	4,077	45.2
Hispanic	4,254	2,136	50.2
White, non-Hispanic	60,856	45,965	75.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	10,541	3,001	28.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,541	962	37.9
Economically disadvantaged students	25,079	13,418	53.5
Migratory students	54	12	22.2
Male	39,594	25,981	65.6
Female	37,832	28,505	75.4
Comments: Drop was due to the elimination of grade 9 testing.			

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 Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities (IDEA)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
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.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2008-09. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2008-09	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
Schools	1,843	923	50.1
Districts	292	243	83.2
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 2008-09 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 2008-09	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2008-09
All Title I schools	843	434	51.5
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	280	86	30.7
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	563	348	61.8
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 2008-09. 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 2008-09	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2008-09
331	242	73.1
Comments: There were more districts to qualify for Title I funding that had not been eligible in prior years. There was also an increase in new charter schools that qualified for Title I funding. Charters are counted as LEAs for the purpose of funding (e.g. Title I) but are not assessed for AYP as districts, just as schools.		

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 <> (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement ¹ Year 1, School Improvement ¹ 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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2008-09
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	
Comments: See attached document, per ED instructions.	

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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)	3
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Take over the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
Comments: Under Indiana's Differentiated Accountability Model, the labels did not change for restructuring actions until the 2009-2010 school year. Indiana is therefore able to report this data using the available permitted values for the actions taken in the 2008-2009 school year.	

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 appointing an outside expert and replacing the school principal. One of the six schools, in addition, added two new assistant principals, a new central office director, and increased district oversight through the accountability and compliance monitor.

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 2009-10 based on the data from SY 2008-09. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2009-10 (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.

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

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds 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.

Indiana Department of Education (SEA), has continued its partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center (GLECC) of providing intensive technical assistance to districts in improvement and corrective action under NCLB.

Assistance included:

- 1 Technical assistance and support in writing and revising District Improvement/ Action Plan and Curriculum Mapping and Aligning: Implementation Plan
- 2 Creation of policies and procedures regarding the written and taught curriculum within a district.
- 3 Fall Administrative Workshops provided districts with "Lessons Learned" from districts current mapping
- 4 Modeled, facilitated, and created workbooks examining data and determining root causes analyses for districts to use in working with principals and school staff.
- 5 Summer workshops during the Summer Learning Conference for LEA Curriculum Mapping with Susan Udelhofen.
- 6 Designation of a Title I Specialist to oversee and manage the efforts in this area.

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.

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 ESEA were implemented in SY 2008-09 (based on SY 2007-08 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 2008-09
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2007-08 and beginning of SY 2008-09 as a corrective action)	
Comments: See attached document, per ED instructions. Please note districts that remained in Corrective Action in 2008-2009 continued implementation of a new curriculum. Total continuing implementation = 14. Five (5) districts were in Year 3 Corrective Action in 2008-2009.	

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 SY 2008-09 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	87	27
Comments:		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2008-09 data was complete	04/10/09
---	----------

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 2008-09.

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 2008-09.

Instructions for States that during SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2008 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2008-09.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2008-09.
 - In SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2008-09.

States that in SY 2008-09 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2008 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the SY 2008-09 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2008-09 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2009.
 - In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2008-09 column.

Category	SY 2008-09	SY 2007-08
Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	27,723	
Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	16,189	
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	58.4	
Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003 (g) funds in SY 2008-09	27,639	
Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2008-09	15,259	
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 2008-09	55.2	
Comments: It appears as though Indiana didn't submit SY 07-08 data needed for 1.4.8.1 via CSPR last year. Instead, it submitted an excel spreadsheet. The data steward for Title I area no longer works for the Indiana Department of Education and the current staff are unable to determine what was submitted last year.		

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

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 2008-09 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 2008-09 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	28
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2008-09	3
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2008-09 that did	
not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2008-09	93
Comments:	

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

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2009. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2008-09.

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 based on testing after the schools received this assistance	Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, 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		23	3	7	A	
2		12	0	2	A	
5	Extended Learning Opportunities (e.g. summer school, extended day)	9	0	4	A	
6 = Combo 1	Combination of #1 and #2	24	0	5	A	
7 = Combo 2	Combination of #2 and #5	7	0	1	A	
8 = Combo 3	Combination of #1 and #5	14	0	1	A	
Comments: The information provided above applies to Indiana. All that apply have been entered above.						

Column 1 Response Options Box

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.

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.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. Title I Administrative 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. Continuing in partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center, the SEA developed an Institute for School Leadership Teams. This included continuing with cohort one (1) and beginning a new cohort 2 (two).

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 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 has been shared with key stakeholders including LEAs and schools as well as with the general public.

IV. A summer conference, "Supporting Student Learning", sponsored by the Indiana Department of Education offered national, state, and local presenters that provided professional development on instructional strategies and techniques for classroom teachers to use with students in special populations; special education, English language learners and children of poverty.

V. Instructional Coaches Training

-Through continuous professional development on using state assessment tools, 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.

VI. LEA Improvement -Through workshops, 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

VII. 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.

VIII. School Support Teams -The IDOE, Office of Title I Academic Support contracted with School Support Teams to assist in achieving a continuous 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 teams work 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.

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

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2008 (SY 2008-09) 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.

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

For SY 2008-09 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools -CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

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 2008-09.

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 were 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 was 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 examined the implementation and effectiveness of strategies and approaches used to address the following program elements:

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

Data were collected to assess progress and fidelity of the implementation of the 1003(g) initiatives. Data collection methods included 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 was 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.

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 2008-09 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.

I. Schoolwide Planning Support-A team of Specialists from the Indiana Department of Education, Office of Title I Academic Support, provides a year-long schoolwide training process for schools interested in becoming schoolwide programs. A series of one or two webcast calls and four or five centralized meetings are offered to help schools revise PL 221 school improvement plans that address all mandatory components as stated in NCLB. The process will include:

? Determining areas of need by reviewing ISTEP+ performance data as well as other data sources

? Identifying instructional strategies that target the needs of struggling students

? Providing opportunities to strengthen teachers' knowledge and repertoire of best practices that will increase the achievement of all students

? Offering experiences for parents to participate in meaningful, educationally-oriented activities that will support the academic development of their children

? Maximizing daily instructional time and adding extended-time programming to help support struggling students

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.

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	96,459
Applied to transfer	2,172
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,123

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 3,229,600

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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	23

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.
- In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.
- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

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	46,801
Applied for supplemental educational services	13,205
Received supplemental educational services	11,835
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	\$ 13,714,066
Comments:	

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number 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 classes	284,879	278,234	97.7	6,645	2.3
All elementary classes	166,432	163,883	98.5	2,549	1.5
All secondary classes	118,447	114,351	96.5	4,096	3.5

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain 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.
--

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 is 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 the reporting period? The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.*

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

In the tables 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	16.4
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	38.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	44.8
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	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)	21.5
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	26.6
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	51.9
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	38,114	37,170	97.5
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	37,949	37,618	99.1
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	31,681	29,807	94.1
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	33,610	32,931	98.0

1.5.4 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	54.0	22.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	
Secondary schools	39.0	17.0
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.**
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
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
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	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	45,449
Comments:	

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 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.	44,773
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; Castilian	36,199
German	1,403
Burmese	1,050
Arabic	676
Chinese	594

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the 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	52,147
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	530
Total	52,677
Comments: "Not tested" is based on students that did not have a complete annual ELP assessment score. The number tested includes not only LEP students but also first time FEP, Level 5, students that must receive a second consecutive Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year Title III monitoring period.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	10,578
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	20.3
Comments: The number tested includes not only LEP students but also first time FEP, Level 5, students that must receive a second consecutive Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year Title III monitoring period.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	51,300
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	508
Total	51,808
Comments: The number tested includes not only LEP students but also first time FEP, Level 5, students that must receive a second consecutive Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year Title III monitoring period.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III Students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/making progress(# and % making progress).	
	#
Number of Title III LEP with one data point whose progress can not be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1.	14,237

1.6.3.2.2

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) = State targets for the percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.**
2. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students that met the definition of Making Progress as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students that meet the State defined English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
4. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of Making Progress and the number and percent that met the State definition of Attainment of English language proficiency.**

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	23,892	46.6	14,825	40.00
ELP attainment	8,733	17.0	2,416	8.00

Comments: Results: The results are based on matched student records from Spring 2008 to Spring 2009 LAS Links and do not reflect the total number of students tested. The result for Making Progress is 23,892 or 64% and the result for Attainment Part A is 4,422 or 64% and Part B is 4,311 or 14%. Targets: For the ELP attainment target, Indiana uses a Part A and Part B. Part A is that 50% or 3,431 students will maintain a Level 5 score from the prior year and Part B is that 8% or 2,416 students will attain a Level 5 score from a Level 1-4 the prior year.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 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
3,704	2,978	6,682
Comments:		

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,073	5,425	89.3	648
Comments:			

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

In the table below, report the number of 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 1.6.3.6.3 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
6,072	5,301	87.3	771
Comments:			

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP 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 total 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
1,695	1,166	68.8	529
Comments:			

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	100
# -Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	70
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	99
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	99
# -Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	71
# -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 2007-08 and 2008-09)	5
# -Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2008-09 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	5
# -Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09)	1
Comments: Consortia members are included as part of one sub-grantee (i.e., a consortium of 20 LEAs is counted as 1 sub-grantee).	

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 State did not meet AMAO III: AYP.	

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:	

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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
10,505	2,094	7

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 under 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) û The term æLanguage instruction educational program' means an instruction course û (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.	1,358
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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. Total = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	91	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	86	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	73	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	63	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	68	
Other (Explain in comment box)	39	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	87	11,523
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	83	871
PD provided to principals	77	1,935
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	70	600
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	72	2,484
PD provided to community based organization personnel	28	891
Total		18,304

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Individual Learning Plan usage, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), Continuing education, Indiana Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL), school-wide planning through the Indiana Student Achievement Institute, Indiana K-12 ESL Conference, Literacy Collaborative training, Cultural competency, TransAct training, cultural & educational diversity, LAS Links Administrative workshops, LEP accommodations and modifications, Response to Intervention (RtI), Parent Involvement, use of technology in ELL instruction, Project Alianza partnership, and Indiana Student Learning Conference.

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 2008-09 funds July 1, 2008, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2008, for SY 2008-09 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/07/08	08/18/08	30
Comments: The date that the grant application was released to LEAs was July 18, 2008. The grant application was not due until September 5, 2008; however LEAs could submit early. It typically takes about two weeks for SEA staff to review the content of the grant application and approve the application. 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 30 business days.		

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. Funds are distributed to LEAs upon grant approval using a cash request form process for monthly distributions. The SEA can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to LEAs by encouraging LEAs to submit their grant applications on, or before, the due date and by submitting their cash request forms on a timely basis. Further, the SEA can shorten the process by maximizing the number of SEA staff reviewing LEA grant applications.

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.

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	
Comments: Indiana does not have any persistently dangerous schools.	

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 2007-08). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	77.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	67.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.9
Black, non-Hispanic	59.5
Hispanic	65.4
White, non-Hispanic	81.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	53.2
Limited English proficient	58.8
Economically disadvantaged	61.0
Migratory students	59.1
Male	74.1
Female	81.7
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 2007-08). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.7
Black, non-Hispanic	2.7
Hispanic	2.4
White, non-Hispanic	1.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2.3
Limited English proficient	2.8
Economically disadvantaged	2.4
Migratory students	2.8
Male	2.0
Female	1.4
Comments: Dropout for Asian or Pacific Islander students is correct.	

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	321	321
LEAs with subgrants	20	20
Total	341	341
Comments:		

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)		582
K	433	461
1	579	567
2	528	571
3	499	576
4	401	526
5	390	487
6	317	409
7	295	386
8	281	314
9	228	305
10	215	221
11	179	182
12	211	221
Ungraded		
Total	4,556	5,808
<p>Comments: Students identified by more than one LEA but with a consistent grade, the students are counted once. For example, if LEA A and LEA B both report a student as homeless and in the first grade, the student will be counted once. If however, two different LEAs report a student as homeless and two different grades, the student will be included in this count for both grades. The difference in methodology for disaggregation by type of housing vs. grade results in totals that do not match for the two data sets.</p>		

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	863	1,113
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	3,387	4,511
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	75	38
Hotels/Motels	247	151
Total	4,572	5,813
Comments: When a student is identified by multiple LEAs they are included multiple times. If one LEA reports a student as homeless multiple times, they are included in this count one time. The difference in methodology for disaggregation by type of housing vs. grade results in totals that do not match for the two data sets.		

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)	582
K	461
1	567
2	571
3	576
4	526
5	487
6	409
7	386
8	314
9	305
10	221
11	182
12	221
Ungraded	
Total	5,808
Comments: We have no students in the ungraded category.	

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

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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	160
Migratory children/youth	31
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,005
Limited English proficient students	491
Comments:	

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	12
Expedited evaluations	11
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	12
Transportation	11
Early childhood programs	10
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	12
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	12
Coordination between schools and agencies	12
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	12
Clothing to meet a school requirement	11
School supplies	12
Referral to other programs and services	12
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
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.

Support groups, mentoring, college visits, and pregnant/parenting services were all also reported by one program each in the 'other' category.

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	4
School Selection	3
Transportation	3
School records	3
Immunizations	2
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Transportation to school of origin after permanent housing has been obtained.

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 ESEA 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 ESEA.

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	527	304
4	482	255
5	450	238
6	364	194
7	348	159
8	282	114
High School	188	88
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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 ESEA 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	530	269
4	489	272
5	455	250
6	364	238
7	349	212
8	280	130
High School	185	71
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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 under 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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	273
K	92
1	110
2	109
3	103
4	101
5	99
6	98
7	113
8	108
9	137
10	108
11	117
12	109
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	564
Total	2,242
Comments: The Category 1 child count for 2008-09 is about 30% lower than 2007-08. This decrease is attributed to students' end of eligibility; decreased numbers of migrant workers in Indiana to planting and harvesting delays caused by rain and other weather issues; and changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work activities.	

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 Category 1 child count for 2008-09 is about 30% lower than 2007-08. This decrease is attributed to students' end of eligibility; decreased numbers of migrant workers in Indiana to planting and harvesting delays caused by rain and other weather issues; and changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work activities.

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, 2008 through August 31, 2009. 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)	233
K	67
1	91
2	70
3	69
4	71
5	61
6	79
7	88
8	75
9	107
10	79
11	86
12	77
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	413
Total	1,666
Comments:	

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 Category 2 summer child count for 2008-09 (1,666) is about 40% lower than in 2007-08 (2,879). This decrease is attributed to students' end of eligibility; decreased numbers of migrant workers in Indiana due to planting and harvesting delays caused by rain and other weather issues; decreased numbers of families with children as employers hire more singles without children; and changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work activities.

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 data system used for 2008-09 category 1 and 2 Child Counts. COEStar has been used for 10+ years. Indiana is implementing a new, SEA-based migrant data management system which will replace COEStar by November 2010.

The new Indiana Migrant Information & Data Access System (MIDAS) is being developed in order to improve compatibility of the migrant student data system with other IDOE data systems; improve the reporting functionality within the migrant data system for SEA users; and improve the ability to aggregate and disaggregate state-level migrant student data (i.e., academic assessment participation).

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.

Category 1 and 2 Child Counts were provided to the SEA by the COEStar vendor, TROMIK. Data were collected for 9.1.08 through 8.31.09 based on eligible students within COEStar. The CSPR 1.10 Migrant Child Count data reporting requirements were provided to TROMIK and the data was collected according to the reporting requirements.

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.

Category 1 and 2 Child Counts were provided to the SEA by the COEStar vendor, TROMIK. Data were collected for 9.1.08 through 8.31.09 based on eligible students within COEStar. The CSPR 1.10 Migrant Child Count data reporting requirements were provided to TROMIK and the data was collected according to the reporting requirements.

Edit submitted 3.9.10: In order to ensure that Indiana effectively locates and recruits all eligible migrant students, Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) duties are carried out at the SEA level. The Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP), employs four full-time, permanent Migrant Education Specialist staff responsible for ID&R and associated data quality control and record keeping. Due to the volume of ID&R conducted over the summer, IMEP also employs intermittent Field Recruiters from the end of May through the end of October to conduct ID&R duties in various parts of the state. ID&R is conducted through a face-to-face family interview or may be conducted over the phone in some cases. The intermittent Field Recruiters must be bilingual in English and Spanish and report directly to and are supervised by the Migrant Education Specialists. Intermittent Field Recruiters participate in a comprehensive training to ensure their understanding of program eligibility requirements. The SEA has developed comprehensive guidance and training materials, including an IMEP Handbook, related to migrant student eligibility and quality control. As outlined in the State's Service Delivery Plan (SDP), all identification and recruitment and eligibility decisions are made by full-time, permanent IMEP staff or by well trained intermittent IMEP staff. For Summer 2009, the following measures were planned to be implemented to ensure that all intermittent staff members are accountable for their daily time and effort:

- 1 Field Recruiters will upload Certificate of Eligibility (C.O.E.) and Ineligible Form documents to the migrant database, COEStar, on a daily basis based on the family interviews conducted each day.
- 2 Field Recruiters will call the office to check-in and report activities daily.
- 3 Field Recruiters will receive observations visits conducted by a Migrant Education Specialist to ensure the reliability of green sheets and daily activity logs.
- 4 All intermittent staff will complete a daily attendance sheet (green sheet) to document their mileage, hours, and activities which can be compared to C.O.E./Ineligible Forms and/or tutorial sign-in sheets. These sheets will also be compared against pay vouchers (A4) and Enterprise Rent-A-Car odometer readings.
- 5 All intermittent staff will participate in staff meetings twice a month to provide updates on activities, receive information about newly arrived families, and receive support and guidance from supervisors.

The data collected during the ID&R process includes all National COE reporting requirements and also addresses the social service needs of each family with referrals to migrant service provider agencies.
This information has been reported on CSPR previously and the process has not changed.

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.

The process for the category 2 count is the same as category 1.

Edit submitted 3.9.10: In order to ensure that Indiana effectively locates and recruits all eligible migrant students, Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) duties are carried out at the SEA level. The Indiana Department of Education, Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP), employs four full-time, permanent Migrant Education Specialist staff responsible for ID&R and associated data quality control and record keeping. Due to the volume of ID&R conducted over the summer, IMEP also employs intermittent Field Recruiters from the end of May through the end of October to conduct ID&R duties in various parts of the state. ID&R is conducted through a face-to-face family interview or may be conducted over the phone in some cases. The intermittent Field Recruiters must be bilingual in English and Spanish and report directly to and are supervised by the Migrant Education Specialists. Intermittent Field Recruiters participate in a comprehensive training to ensure their understanding of program eligibility requirements. The SEA has developed comprehensive guidance and training materials, including an IMEP Handbook, related to migrant student eligibility and quality control. As outlined in the State's Service Delivery Plan (SDP), all identification and recruitment and eligibility decisions are made by full-time, permanent IMEP staff or by well trained intermittent IMEP staff.

For Summer 2009, the following measures were planned to be implemented to ensure that all intermittent staff members are accountable for their daily time and effort:

- 1 Field Recruiters will upload Certificate of Eligibility (C.O.E.) and Ineligible Form documents to the migrant database, COEStar, on a daily basis based on the family interviews conducted each day.
- 2 Field Recruiters will call the office to check-in and report activities daily.
- 3 Field Recruiters will receive observations visits conducted by a Migrant Education Specialist to ensure the reliability of green sheets and daily activity logs.
- 4 All intermittent staff will complete a daily attendance sheet (green sheet) to document their mileage, hours, and activities which can be compared to C.O.E./Ineligible Forms and/or tutorial sign-in sheets. These sheets will also be compared against pay vouchers (A4) and Enterprise Rent-A-Car odometer readings.
- 5 All intermittent staff will participate in staff meetings twice a month to provide updates on activities, receive information about newly arrived families, and receive support and guidance from supervisors.

The data collected during the ID&R process includes all National COE reporting requirements and also addresses the social service needs of each family with referrals to migrant service provider agencies.
This information has been reported on CSPR previously and the process has not changed.

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.

The Indiana MEP child counts are calculated as follows:

children who were between age 3 through 21;

Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system from another source. 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. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can be counted for funding

children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);

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; the residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and 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.

children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);

TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, Residency dates, Enrollment dates, Withdrawal dates, Departure dates, LEP, Needs Assessment and Graduation / Termination dates, Special Services dates, and Health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if Departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began.

children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;

Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer / intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer / intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began.

children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The Performance Reporter ranks the grades from 0-2, 3-5 (age), k-12, UG and OSY then determines the highest of those grades that the child attended during the year, as well as the highest regular term grade and summer term grade. Any child in the 3-5 age group who has a grade of K is given the grade of K. The grade ranking is the same as they appear on the CSPR. The Performance Reporter builds a profile that contains one record for each child for this and other unique annual data.

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.

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.

To determine and verify student eligibility, the Indiana MEP has taken steps ranging from (1) making all ID&R determinations at the State level to (2) providing high quality training to intermittent ID&R staff to (3) implementing a quality control data review process for each Certificate of Eligibility.

Currently, there are four permanent IMEP staff whose primary responsibilities are identification and recruitment. All four positions require the interviewing of families to determine eligibility in the IMEP. Of the four Migrant Education Specialists, one is responsible for reviewing every COE and serves as the Data Quality Control Specialist. The remaining three Migrant Education Specialists oversee the intermittent recruitment staff assigned to their respective counties.

When recruiters interview families they input the data into COEstar using laptop computers and transmit the electronic COE, via e-mail. The Migrant Education/Data Quality Control Specialist, review each COE for accuracy. During the review process the Migrant Education Specialist/Data Quality Control Specialist will screen for:

Missing information,

Accuracy of dates such as Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and school district arrival date (residency),

Qualifying move information,

Birth dates for eligibility, Qualifying activity,

School identification code,

Mis-spelling

The Migrant Education/Data Quality Specialist will also review any previous migratory history that exists for that family and, if needed, she will contact the family on the COE to confirm the correctness of the information. As necessary, she will also crosscheck with the Migrant Education Program in the family's home base and/or sending state.

In the event that the Migrant Education/Data Quality Specialist is uncertain regarding an eligibility determination, she will confer with the other Migrant Specialists and with the Coordinator. In turn, Coordinator and the Migrant Education Specialists will refer to the Policy Guidance on Eligibility provided by the U.S. Department of Education, and confer with OME official. The approved COE is marked as verified or if necessary, deleted from the system.

Once the COE has been verified, the Migrant Education/Data Quality Specialist enrolls each student on the COE in regular (R) term and/or summer (S) term according to the current school year calendar. As Student Withdrawal forms are received, the Migrant Education /Data Quality Control Specialist verifies the information and updates COEstar to reflect the withdrawal date, days enrolled, days present, health data, special education data and instructional and supportive services provided.

During the month of October the Migrant Education Specialists 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. If any errors are discovered, the Migrant Education Specialists will follow the same process noted in the previous paragraph.

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.

A re-interview process occurred in 2009 to test the accuracy of MEP eligibility determinations and to assess the eligibility of meat processing as 'temporary' employment. Industrial surveys were conducted at the major meat processing plants in February 2009. Based on the results of those surveys, IMEP has concluded that the majority of jobs are not temporary. IMEP conducted a re-interview specifically for meat processing in March 2009. This re-interview was based on COEs with meat processing as the qualifying activity generated from August 28, 2008 through February 16, 2009 statewide. This re-interview included 84 COEs representing 170 children. The results of the re-interview were as follows:

o Of the 84 COEs, 26 COEs could not be reached; 43 COEs were found to be ineligible; and 15 COEs were found to be eligible.

o Of the 170 children, 52 children could not be reached and 118 children were reached. Of the 118 children included in the re-interview: 89

children were found to be ineligible (75%); and 29 children were found to be eligible (25%).

Based on the results of this re-interview and guidance from OME, the following steps were taken:

o students identified as eligible through February 2009 when the re-interview was conducted will continue to be eligible.

o no new COEs will be generated for meat processing without verifying the temporary nature of the work through a statement from the employee or employer.

o COEs will specify the type of job being performed (i.e., turkey slaughtering or chicken de-beaking instead of meat processing).

o COEs will explain in the comments section if the work is temporary or if the worker stated that he/she planned to stay for a limited time in compliance with National COE implementation.

In August/September 2009, a re-interview was done based on a random selection of COEs created from July 1 -31, 2009 across the state including every qualifying activity during that time period. This re-interview included 31 COEs representing 31 children. The results of the re-interview were as follows:

o Of the 31 COEs, 19 COEs could not be reached; zero COEs were found to be ineligible; and 12 COEs were found to be eligible.

o Of the 31 children, 16 children could not be reached; 3 parents declined the re-interview and 12 children were reached and were included in the re-interview. Of the 12 children included in the re-interview: no children were found to be ineligible (0%); and 12 children were found to be eligible (100%).

Edit submitted 3.9.10: In August/September 2009, a second half of the re-interview was done based on a random selection of COEs created from August 1 -31, 2009 which included a total of 63 COEs for July and August. For the re-interview process a non-response or "could not be reached" occurred when the family had moved from the last known address and could not be located. The meat processing re-interview was of a sufficient sample size because it was based on ALL COEs with meat processing as the qualifying activity generated from August 28, 2008 through February 16, 2009 statewide. The summer 2009 re-interview was based on a random sample (63 COEs) which was selected based on prior OME policy of 50 COEs as a representative sample. The re-interview was conducted by IMEP staff that did not complete the original COE (i.e., COEs from the southern part of the state were re-interviewed by the staff person assigned to the northern part of the state). IMEP staff are well trained on eligibility requirements. A standard Re-Interview Form was developed by IMEP for use during the re-interview.

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.

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

COEstar does not merge data. All data kept by COEstar databases is relational based on internal keys and all information for a child is related. The system does support data synchronization between multiple stand-alone systems using a very accurate and proprietary technology developed by TROMIK Technology Corporation. This method relies on record stamping using keys and data signatures to determine how data is exchanged and consolidated. The process is similar to other database synchronization methods but is much more refined and precise. COEstar documentation provides more information about data partners and the synchronization process.

As part of the synchronization process, data is examined by TROMIK personnel for any anomalies, potential duplications, or other potential errors. These findings, if any, are then submitted to the Migrant Education/Data Quality staff in Indianapolis for further review, verification, and/or correction.

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.

The State MEP staff review the child count data provided by TROMIK to identify trends and impacts to program administration. Data files are then sent to the State EDEN/CSPR coordinator for review and submission to ED.

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 following improvements will be made by the SEA to ensure the accuracy of MEP eligibility determinations in light of the re-interviewing results:

- o no new COEs will be generated for meat processing without verifying the temporary nature of the work through a statement from the employee or employer.
- o COEs will specify the type of job being performed (i.e., turkey slaughtering or chicken de-beaking instead of meat processing).
- o COEs will explain in the comments section if the work is temporary or if the worker stated that he/she planned to stay for a limited time in compliance with National COE implementation.
- o training materials will be updated for Summer 2010 to ensure compliance with OME regulations

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.

IMEP has no concerns about the underlying eligibility determinations.