

# **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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date:  
10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2008-09 X 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, April 23, 2010, 11:44:14 AM

Signature Date

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

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

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

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

#### 2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	16,138	9,491	58.8
4	15,534	9,890	63.7
5	13,711	9,272	67.6
6	7,566	5,169	68.3
7	3,561	2,368	66.5
8	3,598	1,940	53.9
High School	311	102	32.8
Total	60,419	38,232	63.3
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	16,093	10,256	63.7
4	15,467	9,567	61.8
5	13,670	8,770	64.2
6	7,555	4,367	57.8
7	3,553	1,728	48.6
8	3,602	1,684	46.8
High School	309	139	45.0
Total	60,249	36,511	60.6
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	36,187	25,770	71.2
4	34,454	25,604	74.3
5	30,653	24,175	78.9
6	13,471	10,927	81.1
7	4,997	3,687	73.8
8	4,896	3,202	65.4
High School	1,695	669	39.5
Total	126,353	94,034	74.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	36,013	27,699	76.9
4	34,402	25,801	75.0
5	30,531	23,094	75.6
6	13,444	9,854	73.3
7	4,969	3,085	62.1
8	4,872	2,972	61.0
High School	1,705	840	49.3
Total	125,936	93,345	74.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation**

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	32,220
Limited English proficient students	13,842
Students who are homeless	3,275
Migratory students	329
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	452
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,535
Black, non-Hispanic	40,407
Hispanic	20,302
White, non-Hispanic	97,401
Total	160,097
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	557	2,073	N<10	N<10	2,635
K	11,673	16,039	334	13	28,059
1	13,137	16,070	397	24	29,628
2	11,765	16,115	351	39	28,270
3	9,055	15,110	312	39	24,516
4	7,329	14,556	322	57	22,264
5	6,160	12,793	230	66	19,249
6	2,390	7,216	146	128	9,880
7	1,081	2,871	109	188	4,249
8	862	2,826	100	265	4,053
9	1,000	463	12	356	1,831
10	270	113	30	347	760
11	181	72	N<10	201	460
12	77	52		82	211
Ungraded				N<10	N<10
TOTALS	65,537	106,369	2,351	1,812	176,069
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

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

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

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

	# Students Served
Mathematics	25,728
Reading/language arts	60,214
Science	2,671
Social studies	2,196
Vocational/career	N<10
Other instructional services	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	934
Supporting guidance/advocacy	6,013
Other support services	
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	986	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	1,284	100.0
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	85	
Clerical support staff	34	
Administrators (non-clerical)	74	
<b>Comments:</b>		

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2). <sup>2</sup> Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

### 2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

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

	<b>Paraprofessionals FTE</b>	<b>Percentage Qualified</b>
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	464.60	100.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

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

### 2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

In the tables below, please provide information requested for the reporting program year July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009.

#### 2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	8
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

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

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2008. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.
4. Do not use rounding rules to calculate children's ages .

The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	248
2. Adults participating	260
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	63
4. Participating children	362
a. Birth through 2 years	173
b. Ages 3 through 5	97
c. Ages 6 through 8	92
c. Above age 8	N<10
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and re-enrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	162
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	170
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	158
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	155
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	55
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2009). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	40
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days	32
3. Number of families enrolled 180 or more days but less than 365 days	32
4. Number of families enrolled 365 days or more	46
5. Total families enrolled	150
<b>Comments: The number of families reported in this section is lower than the number of families reported as having participated in Even Start because programs only report retention data on those families that met an attendance threshold of 75%. The criteria Indiana used are therefore more stringent than is mandated and will be realigned for next year to be consistent with the standard set by USDE.</b>	

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

## 2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators

### 2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. Only report data from the TABE reading test on the TABE line. Likewise, only report data from the CASAS reading test on the CASAS line. Data from the other TABE or CASAS tests or combination of both tests should be reported on the "other" line.

To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined at the State level either by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE), or as defined by your Even Start State Performance Indicators.

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2.

Note: Do not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	96	55	
CASAS	N<10	N<10	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE			
CASAS	40	34	
BEST			
BEST Plus			
BEST Literacy			
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

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

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

<b>School-Age Adults</b>	<b># with goal</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
Diploma	11	10	
GED	21	11	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

<b>Non-School-Age Adults</b>	<b># with goal</b>	<b># Who Met Goal</b>	<b>Explanation (if applicable)</b>
Diploma			
GED	46	29	
Other			
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

### 2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

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

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	28	25	21	N<10	One student was exempted due to a severe disability.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
<b>Comments: One program failed to submit data regarding this measure due to discontinuation as an Even Start program.</b>					

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

#### 2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	28	25	20	N<10	One student was exempted due to a severe disability.
PPVT-IV					
TVIP					
<b>Comments: One program failed to submit data regarding this measure due to discontinuation as an Even Start program.</b>					

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

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

In the table below, provide the average number of letters children can identify as measure by PALS subtask.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who received Even Start services and who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2009 (or latest test within the reporting year).
3. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.
4. "Average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	31	27		17.9	The number of children tested is lower than the number age eligible due to the unenrollment of some students prior to completion of six months of the program.
<b>Comments:</b>					

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

**2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level**

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

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K			
1			
2			
3	10	N<10	Children in Third Grade previously served by Even Start that passed both the reading and math portions of ISTEP+, Indiana's statewide assessment.
<b>Comments: 60 out of 60 children in grades K-3 also demonstrated improvement in ability to read on grade level or reading readiness. This data is aggregate and cannot be provided by grade level at this time.</b>			

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

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

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

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

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I			
PEP Scale II			
PEP Scale III			
PEP Scale IV			
Other	620	586	This is an aggregate score measuring home based, formal setting, and interactive learning components. It represents four subscales with cohorts of 155 per subscale. Subscale I, formal setting, had a goal completion of 143. Subscales II and III, both related to home based learning, had goal successes of 151 and 146, respectfully. Subscale IV, focusing on interactive learning measures, had a goal completion of 146.
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

## 2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2008 through August 31, 2009. This section is composed of the following subsections:

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

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

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

### 2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

#### 2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

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

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	187
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	2,429
<b>Comments: Due to students' End of Eligibility and a lower number of new qualifying students, the overall number of eligible migrant students has continued to decrease for 2008-09.</b>	

### 2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<p><b>Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Since manual tracking of PFS status in COEStar is not accurate, the following data are re-submitted for PFS (due to time constraints, these data are being submitted as comments but a data file will be sent next week.) Age 3 -5: N&lt;10 K: 23 1: 28 2: 32 3: 31 4: 32 5: 25 6: 36 7: 38 8: 33 9: 55 10: 58 11: 48 12: 42 UG: N&lt;10 OSY: N&lt;10 Total: 481</b></p>	

#### FAQ on priority for services:

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

### 2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP)</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	149
K	89
1	16
2	30
3	38
4	60
5	67
6	71
7	65
8	52
9	85
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	737
<b>Comments: The revised LEP counts reflect accurate matching from the IDOE Student Test Number (STN) data system which is used by K-12 schools to submit LEP data for all enrolled students. Because out of school youth are not enrolled in school, there is no English proficiency assessment conducted to determine LEP status thus no data on LEP status is submitted to IDOE for OSY students.</b>	

### 2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

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

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	N<10
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	23
K	14
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	12
8	N<10
9	10
10	
11	N<10
12	
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	
Total	98

**Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and no edits are needed. Matches were identified in the IDOE Student Test Number (STN) data system. Due to improved data matching between the migrant database and IDOE student level data, a higher number of students were matched for 2008-09.**

### 2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	123	59	N<10	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	106	96	39	32
K	33	29	19	11
1	40	33	14	23
2	45	26	17	21
3	44	26	13	20
4	46	29	11	15
5	36	27	15	21
6	52	25	N<10	16
7	55	31	11	16
8	47	29	14	18
9	78	31	11	17
10	58	27	N<10	14
11	68	20	14	15
12	60	26	13	10
Ungraded			N<10	
Out-of-school	285	179	59	41
Total	1,176	693	270	290
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are accurate and no edits are needed. Due to the overall decrease in the number of eligible migrant students, the totals in most categories are less than last year.</b>				

### 2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31, 2008. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Move During Regular School Year</b>
Age birth through 2	44
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	80
K	32
1	28
2	32
3	33
4	36
5	26
6	25
7	25
8	25
9	26
10	20
11	19
12	19
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	154
Total	625
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and do not need to be edited. Due to the overall decrease in eligible migrant students, the number of students with a qualifying move during the school year has also decreased.</b>	

### 2.3.2 Academic Status

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

#### 2.3.2.1 Dropouts

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

Grade	Dropped Out
7	
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Total	N<10
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and do not need to be edited. Due to the overall decrease in the number of eligible migrant students since last year, the number of dropouts has also decreased.</b>	

#### FAQ on Dropouts:

*How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."*

### 2.3.2.2 GED

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

<b>Obtained a GED in your state</b>	N<10
<b>Comments:</b> 4.21.10 Note: Based on data matching through the IDOE Student Test Number (STN) system, one migrant student was identified as obtaining a GED.	

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

### 2.3.2.3 Participation in State Assessments

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

#### 2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

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

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	87	87
4	81	81
5	85	85
6	71	71
7	80	80
8	86	86
9		
10	54	54
11		
12		
Total	544	544

**Comments:** 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and do not need to be edited. Due to the overall decrease in eligible migrant students, the number of students participating in the English/language arts and Math academic assessments is lower than last year.

### 2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	88	88
4	82	82
5	86	86
6	74	74
7	80	80
8	88	88
9		
10	58	58
11		
12		
Total	556	556

**Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and do not need to be edited. Due to the overall decrease in eligible migrant students, the number of students participating in the English/language arts and Math academic assessments is lower than last year.**

### 2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

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

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

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

Do not include:

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

#### 2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

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

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

### 2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During Regular School Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	104
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	239
K	72
1	92
2	100
3	79
4	79
5	80
6	80
7	78
8	86
9	78
10	77
11	70
12	54
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	320
Total	1,689
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and do not need to be updated.</b>	

**2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year**

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

**Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Since manual tracking of PFS status in COEStar is not accurate, the following data are re-submitted for PFS (due to time constraints, these data are being submitted as comments but a data file will be sent next week.)**

**Age 3 -5:**  
**K: 50**  
**1: 64**  
**2: 70**  
**3: 55**  
**4: 55**  
**5: 56**  
**6: 56**  
**7: 55**  
**8: 60**  
**9: 55**  
**10: 54**  
**11: 49**  
**12: 38**  
**UG:**  
**OSY:**  
**Total: 717**

### 2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<p><b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: Based on data reporting, this section is correct and does not need to be updated. Based on local analysis of students' needs, the number of students served under Continuation of Services has decreased from last year.</b></p>	

### 2.3.3.1.4 Services

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

**2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	97
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	234
K	72
1	91
2	100
3	78
4	79
5	80
6	80
7	78
8	85
9	78
10	77
11	70
12	54
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	33
Total	1,386

**Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct. The students mentioned below served by SEA intermittent tutors and recruiters were not provided by certified teachers or instructional assistants. These data represent K-12 migrant students served by funded LEA migrant projects. These data do not include 1) students served by the SEA Intermittent Tutors that may have provided instruction once the regular school year started (i.e. to finish PASS courses) and 2) Out of School Youth that may have received instructional materials during the ID&R process.**

### 2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	97	97	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	233	229	
K	72	72	
1	91	91	
2	100	100	
3	78	78	
4	79	79	
5	80	80	
6	80	80	
7	77	77	
8	85	85	
9	77	77	
10	77	77	
11	70	70	
12	54	53	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	33	32	
Total	1,383	1,377	

**Comments: 4.22.10 Note: For high school credit accrual, the following migrant students participated through the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) program administered by funded LEA migrant projects:**

**Grade, # of Students**  
**grade 9, N<10 students**  
**grade 10, N<10 students**  
**grade 11, N<10 students**  
**grade 12, N<10 student**  
**Total = 25 students**

**Due to time constraints, this data is being submitted as a comment but a data file will be sent next week.**

#### **FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	104	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	237	
K	72	N<10
1	92	N<10
2	100	14
3	79	N<10
4	79	N<10
5	80	14
6	80	10
7	78	12
8	86	12
9	78	14
10	76	12
11	70	N<10
12	54	N<10
Ungraded	N<10	
Out-of-school	320	
Total	1,686	128
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and have been verified through COEStar.</b>		

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

**2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

**Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds, consisted mostly of preschool through TMC or a school-based program; content area remediation for standardized academic assessment; post-secondary awareness opportunities, and adult ESL/ABE.**

**Age/Grade, # of students**  
**Age birth -2, 10 students**  
**Age 3-5, 11 students**  
**K, N<10 students**  
**1, N<10 students**  
**2,**  
**3, N<10 students**  
**4,**  
**5,**  
**6, N<10 students**  
**7, N<10 students**  
**8, N<10 students**  
**9, 11 students**  
**10, 13 students**  
**11, N<10 students**  
**12, N<10 students**  
**UG,**  
**OSY, 12 students**  
**Total = 91 students**

### 2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section with one difference. The questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year.

#### 2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	159
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	248
K	68
1	91
2	71
3	69
4	72
5	61
6	79
7	88
8	75
9	108
10	80
11	88
12	79
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	416
Total	1,852

**Comments:** These data include only K-12 migrant students served by a funded LEA migrant summer project. These data do not include students served by SEA Intermittent Tutors during the summer. 2008-09 MEP Evaluation Report data indicate that an additional 146 K-12 students and 155 Out of School Youth students were served by SEA Intermittent Tutors during summer 2009. Note 4.22.10:

In addition to the 1,852 reported, the following provides a grade level breakdown of students served by the intermittent SEA Tutors:

Kindergarten  
 First 16  
 Second 13  
 Third 21  
 Fourth 14  
 Fifth 15  
 Sixth 13  
 Seventh 21  
 Eighth 12  
 Ninth N<10  
 Tenth N<10  
 Eleventh N<10  
 Twelfth N<10  
 Total 146

### 2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	N<10
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	N<10
Total	13

Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Since manual tracking of PFS status in COEStar is not accurate, the following data are re-submitted for PFS (due to time constraints, these data are being submitted as comments but a data file will be sent next week.)

Age 3 -5:

K: 61

1: 82

2: 64

3: 48

4: 50

5: 43

6: 55

7: 62

8: 52

9: 76

10: 56

11: 62

12: 55

UG:

OSY:

Total: 767

### 2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

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

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	
<p><b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: This data has been verified through the COEStar system. Due to the overall decrease in eligible migrant students and locally determined student needs, the number of summer continuation of service students is lower than last year.</b></p>	

### 2.3.3.2.4 Services

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

#### FAQ on Services:

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

**2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children Receiving an Instructional Service</b>
Age birth through 2	102
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	210
K	68
1	91
2	71
3	69
4	70
5	61
6	79
7	87
8	75
9	106
10	79
11	87
12	77
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	31
Total	1,363
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct and reflect services provided by a teacher or paraprofessional.</b>	

### 2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

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

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	102	102	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	210	206	
K	68	68	
1	91	91	
2	71	71	
3	69	69	
4	70	70	
5	61	61	
6	79	79	
7	87	85	
8	75	75	
9	106	106	
10	79	79	
11	87	87	
12	77	77	
Ungraded			
Out-of-school	31	29	
Total	1,363	1,355	

**Comments: 4.22.10 Note: For high school credit accrual, the following migrant students participated through the Portable Assisted Study Sequence (PASS) program administered by funded LEA migrant projects in the summer:**

**Grade, # of Students**

**grade 9, N<10**

**students grade 10, N<10**

**students grade 11, N<10**

**students grade 12, N<10**

**student Total = N<10 students**

**Due to time constraints, this data is being submitted as a comment but a data file will be sent next week.**

#### **FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

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

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	159	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	247	
K	67	
1	91	N<10
2	71	
3	67	
4	69	
5	61	
6	78	
7	86	N<10
8	74	
9	105	
10	80	
11	87	
12	77	
Ungraded		
Out-of-school	409	
Total	1,828	N<10
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: These data are correct.</b>		

#### FAQs on Support Services:

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

**2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referred Service</b>
Age birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	
K	
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	

**Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Participating migrant children who, during the summer, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds, consisted mostly of preschool through TMC; post-secondary awareness opportunities, and adult ESL/ABE.**

**Age/Grade, # of students**  
**Age birth -2, 18 students**  
**Age 3-5, 155 students**  
**K, 12 students**  
**1, 14 students**  
**2,**  
**3,**  
**4,**  
**5,**  
**6,**  
**7,**  
**8,**  
**9, 22 students**  
**10, 15 students**  
**11, N<10 students**  
**12, 10 students**  
**UG,**  
**OSY, 155 students**  
**Total = 409**

### 2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Program Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	170
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	274
K	85
1	112
2	105
3	95
4	95
5	91
6	95
7	107
8	100
9	124
10	103
11	102
12	98
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	494
Total	2,251

**Comments: 4.21.10 Note: Based on COEStar limitations, grades may not match the number of students identified in a few grades. The data reports generated by TROMIK are based on the highest grade that the student attained during the reporting period. In a few cases, the grade changed resulting in a discrepancy.**

### 2.3.4 School Data

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

#### 2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

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

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments: 4.22.10 Note: Based on data matching from COEStar to the IDOE Student Test Number (STN) system, 254 schools were identified as enrolling migrant students. The number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools was 1,111.</b>	

#### 2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

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

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments: 4.22.10 Note: The number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a SWP was one school; the number of eligible migrant students enrolled in that school was 42.</b>	

### 2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

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

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

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

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	18	655
Regular school year – school day/extended day	1	15
Summer/intersession only	9	257
Year round	0	0
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: Based on students' end of eligibility and a decline of newly enrolled students, the number of students in each project type has decreased since last year.</b>		

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

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

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

### 2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

#### 2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

##### 2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

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

<b>State Director FTE</b>	1.00
<b>Comments:</b> 4.21.10 Note: This count is accurate.	

#### FAQs on the MEP State director

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

##### 2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

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

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	21	12.00	50	41.00
Counselors	1	0.00	2	2.00
All paraprofessionals	71	37.00	99	71.00
Recruiters	4	4.00	9	9.00
Records transfer staff	6	4.00	3	2.00
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: The continuing decrease in the number of eligible migrant students has resulted in staffing reductions compared to last year. Due to the overall decrease in the number of eligible migrant children, staffing at the LEA and SEA level has been reduced. Please note that the Recruiter positions are hired at the SEA, not LEA, level.</b>				

**Note: The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number** submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

## FAQs on MEP staff:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

### 2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

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

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	71	37.00	99	71.00
<b>Comments: 4.21.10 Note: Based on the continued decrease of eligible migrant students, the number of paraprofessionals has decreased. Regular school year: headcount -71, FTE -37; Summer: headcount -99, FTE -71.</b>				

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

#### FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
  1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

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

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

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
  - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
  - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

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

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

### 2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

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

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	6	142
Juvenile corrections	0	0
Adult corrections	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	6	142

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

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

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	0
<b>Comments: In last year's reporting, Indiana reported for two institutions: 9105 Soldiers and Sailors and 9100 Indiana Department of Corrections. Information for 9105 (SOS) was mistakenly reported in the 9100 (IDOC) section (identifying the counts for the wrong type of program) and vice versa for 9100 in the 9105 section. IDOC (9100) is actually a state institution for Juvenile Detention facilities. It is being reported as such in this submission of CSPR II. The other issue is that 9105 Soldiers and Sailors is no longer in operation. With the institution being closed, there are no contacts available for Indiana to obtain information for the 2008-2009 school year. Counts for 9105 are therefore not included in this collection.</b>	

#### FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1:

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

#### 2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

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

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>State Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	6
Juvenile Corrections	0
Adult Corrections	0
Other	0
Total	6
<b>Comments: In last year's reporting, Indiana reported for two institutions: 9105 Soldiers and Sailors and 9100 Indiana</b>	

IDOC (9100) is actually a state institution for Juvenile Detention facilities. It is being reported as such in this submission of CSPR II.

The other issue is that 9105 Soldiers and Sailors is no longer in operation. With the institution being closed, there are no contacts available for Indiana to obtain information for the 2008-2009 school year. Counts for 9105 are therefore not included in this collection.

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

### 2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

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

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served		2,228			
Long Term Students Served		2,228			

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native		N<10			
Asian or Pacific Islander		11			
Black, non-Hispanic		838			
Hispanic		88			
White, non-Hispanic		1,217			
Total		2,161			

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male		1,909			
Female		319			
Total		2,228			

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12		16			
13		47			
14		179			
15		446			
16		692			
17		747			
18		95			
19		N<10			
20					
21					
Total		2,228			

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments: Comments: Not included in these counts is the Race/Ethnic group Multi-racial. These numbers could not be reported in the Race/Ethnicity Total due to the five permitted values. However, the students in this ethnic group have been accounted for in the other totals for gender and age.**

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.*

**2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1**

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

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	6	0	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	6	0	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	6	0	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

**2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1**

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

**2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility**

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		1,110		
Enrolled in a GED program		272		
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		1,252		
Earned a GED		260		
Obtained high school diploma		N<10		
Were accepted into post-secondary education		70		
Enrolled in post-secondary education		70		
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

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

#### 2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		168		
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education				
Obtained employment		N<10		
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

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

#### 2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,273		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		1,357		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		364		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		101		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		154		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		167		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		571		
<b>Comments:</b>				

#### FAQ on long-term students:

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.*

### 2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry		1,206		
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)		1,351		

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

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams		324		
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		105		
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		153		
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		149		
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams		620		
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

#### 2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

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

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	0	0
Neglected programs	0	0
Juvenile detention	0	0
Juvenile corrections	44	94
Other	0	0
Total	44	94

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

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

	<b>#</b>
<b>Programs in a multiple purpose facility</b>	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

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

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

<b>LEA Program/Facility Type</b>	<b># Reporting Data</b>
At-risk programs	0
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	33
Other	0
Total	33
<b>Comments: The difference between 33 and 44: There are 33 reporting LEAs with Subpart 2 programs. One LEA has 3 facilities, Four LEAs have 2 facilities, and One LEA reports for 6 facilities.</b>	

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

### 2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

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

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served				10,189	
Total Long Term Students Served				1,555	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native				21	
Asian or Pacific Islander				23	
Black, non-Hispanic				3,168	
Hispanic				936	
White, non-Hispanic				5,798	
Total				9,946	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male				7,431	
Female				2,758	
Total				10,189	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5					
6				N<10	
7				N<10	
8				18	
9				33	
10				50	
11				99	
12				211	
13				636	
14				1,198	
15				2,009	
16				2,512	
17				2,891	
18				424	
19				95	
20				N<10	
21				N<10	
Total				10,189	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments: Comments: Not included in these counts is the Race/Ethnic group Multi-racial. These numbers could not be reported in the Race/Ethnicity Total due to the five permitted values. However, the students in this ethnic group have been accounted for in the other totals for gender and age.**

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

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

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009.*

**2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2**

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

<b>LEA Programs That</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention/ Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	0	23	0
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	0	16	0
Awarded GED(s)	0	0	23	0
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

**2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2**

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

**2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility**

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits			2,839	
Enrolled in a GED program			670	
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school			5,916	
Earned a GED			147	
Obtained high school diploma			155	
Were accepted into post-secondary education			29	
Enrolled in post-secondary education			27	
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

#### 2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

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

##### 2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs			22	
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

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

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

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education			16	
Obtained employment			292	
<b>Comments:</b>				

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

### 2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

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

#### 2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2008, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			1,051	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)			710	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams			100	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			72	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			379	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			179	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			263	
<b>Comments: Comments: Many LEAs did not have information available to report due to problems with computer assessment systems and lack of data from subpart II institutions.</b>				

#### **FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2008, through June 30, 2009.*

### 2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry			1,065	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)			704	

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

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections/ Detention</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams			100	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			56	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			360	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			133	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams			265	
<b>Comments: Comments: Many LEAs did not have information available to report due to problems with computer assessment systems and lack of data from subpart II institutions.</b>				

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

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

**2.7.1 Performance Measures**

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state.	DOE EX/SU Report	Annual	SY 08-09	2006-07: 0	2006-07: 0	0	2003
				2007-08: 0			
				2008-09: 0			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the number of expulsions for possession of deadly weapons.	DOE EX/SU Report	Annual	SY08-09	2006-07: 1,149	2006-07: 278	1,246	2003
				2007-08: 315			
				2008-09: 299			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions for the use/possession of alcohol and tobacco.	DOE EX/SU Report	Annual	SY08-09	2006-07: 16,710	2006-07: 5,022	18,115	2003
				2007-08: 4,754			
				2008-09: 4,502			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Year of	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Established
				Targets			
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 21.3%	2006-07: 19.9%	24.3%	2003
				2007-08: 18.8%			
				2008-09: 17.5%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 10.7%	2006-07: 10.8%	14.0%	2003
				2007-08: 9.7%			
				2008-09: 9.9%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 8.7%	2006-07: 8.3%	10.6%	2003
				2007-08: 7.1%			
				2008-09: 7.8%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	---	---------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------------

				2006-07: 31.1%	2006-07: 31.1%		
				2007			
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	08: 30.1%	08: 28.4%	36.9%	2003
				2008-09: 27.3%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 17.0%	2006-07: 19.3%	22.2%	2003
				2007-08: 18.7%			
				2008-09: 18.1%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 15.9%	2006-07: 14.4%	18.2%	2003
				2007-08: 13.5%			
				2008-09: 14.6%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents	Annual	2009	2006-07: 36.3%	2006-07: 39.7%	46.1	2003
				2007-08: 38.4			

use of alcohol in the last month.	Survey			2008-09: 35.7%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 18.8%	2006-07: 24.3%	28.8%	2003
				2007-08: 24.8			
				2008-09: 24.4%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 15.0%	2006-07: 15.8%	19.8%	2003
				2007-08: 16.2%			
				2008-09: 16.7%			

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 81.5%	2006-07: 75.6%	79.1%	2003
				2007-08: 76.6%			
				2008-09: 74.4%			

other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/Collection		Frequency of collection	Year of most recent collection	Actual		Year Baseline Established
	Data Source	Collection			Performance	Baseline	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 73.8%	2006-07: 66.5%	69%	2003
				2007-08: 68.0%			
				2008-09: 64%			

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator	Instrument/Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Actual Performance		Year Baseline Established
				Targets	Baseline	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2003	2006-07: 32%	2006-07: 30.7%	28.8%
				2007-08: 29.9%		
				2008-09: 29.4%		

**Comments:**

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	---------	--------------------	----------	---------------------------

Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 88.7%	2006-07: 79.4%	82.4%	2003
				2007-08: 79.3%			
				2008-09: 77.2%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Year of		Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				Targets	Actual Performance		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 61.0%	2006-07: 55.2%	57.4%	2003
				2007-08: 50.3%			
				2008-09: 51.2%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Year of		Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				Targets	Actual Performance		
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor) occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 27.2%	2006-07: 27.3%	24.1%	2003
				2007-08: 26.2%			
				2008-09: 26%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 88.5%	2006-07: 81.9%	85.9%	2003
				2007-08: 80.9%			
				2008-09: 79.2%			
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 54.3%	2006-07: 49.7%	51.9%	2003
				2007-08: 47.5%			
				2008-09: 44.0			
<b>Comments:</b>							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Annual	2009	2006-07: 22.9%	2006-07: 22.2%	19.3%	2003
				2007-08: 21.0%			
				2008-09: 22.5%			

themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally).							
<b>Comments:</b>							

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

## 2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

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

### 2.7.2.1 State Definitions

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

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	All data are reported based on local school district discipline code definitions of alcohol related violations.
Illicit drug related	All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category "drugs" which would be any suspension/expulsion for a drug other than alcohol or tobacco.
Violent incident without physical injury	All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category "Fighting" which would be any suspension/expulsion incident that does not rise to the level of Battery
Violent incident with physical injury	All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category "Battery" -student knowingly or intentionally touches another person in a rude, insolent, or angry manner causing or intent to cause bodily injury as defined by Indiana Code.
Weapons possession	All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category of "deadly weapons (other than firearms)" and under the categories of handguns, rifles or shotguns and other firearms as defined by U.S. Code.
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	7,632	348
6 through 8	13,614	348
9 through 12	9,553	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	348
6 through 8	257	348
9 through 12	455	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	3,184	348
6 through 8	2,708	348
9 through 12	1,572	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	348
6 through 8	99	348
9 through 12	161	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

#### 2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	479	348
6 through 8	473	348
9 through 12	354	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

#### 2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	29	348
6 through 8	129	348
9 through 12	141	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	12	348
6 through 8	139	348
9 through 12	392	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5		348
6 through 8	19	348
9 through 12	97	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

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

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	68	348
6 through 8	908	348
9 through 12	1,793	348
<b>Comments: The increase in illicit drug related expulsions/out-of-school suspensions may be due to an anomaly for SY08-09. Trends will be examined for causal factors such as increased enforcement activities within the schools, improvements in reporting that may affect the data reporting and/or errors in data reporting from LEA's.</b>		

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

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

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

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	N<10	348
6 through 8	262	348
9 through 12	721	348
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 2.7.3 Parent Involvement

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

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

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Department has a webpage within the Safe and Drug-Free Schools webpages specifically targeted to parents. The web page provides access to resources that are designed to assist parents with issues related to drug use and violence among youth. The Department has also provided assistance in the development of a website that will make community-based substance abuse prevention resource information easily accessible to parents.

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

## 2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

### 2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

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

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

### 2.8.2 Needs Assessments

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

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	44	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	44	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

### 2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

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

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

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	994,550	91.7
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	1,084,191	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

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

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

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	41	40
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	3	2
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	44	42
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

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

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

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

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

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

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

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	3
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	6
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	10
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	2
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the FY08 Rural and Low Income allocation, 16 school corporations in Indiana applied for and received funds.

Indiana's RLIS Goal One states that by 2014 all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics. Of the 16 school corporations which participated in the 08 RLIS grant, 50% (8 of 16) showed an increase in their English/Language Arts scores on the ISTEP test. Six of the 16 (37.5%) had scores higher than the state average. 9 of the 16 school corporations (56%) showed an increase in the Math ISTEP scores. In this category, 10 of the 16 (62.5%) had scores higher than the state average.

Goal Two states that school dropout rates will decrease by ½% during the life of the RLIS program. From 2002 -2008, the dropout rate has decreased for 11 of the 16 RLIS school corporations. 5 of these 11 have already met the goal of a ½% decrease during the life of the RLIS program.

The 3rd goal of the Indiana's RLIS program states that each RLIS school corporation will execute a professional development plan that provides scientifically based professional development for all instructional staff. Indiana State Board Rule 511 IAC 6.2 requires all schools in Indiana to have a School Continuous Plan in which a plan for professional development is required. See Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan at <http://www.doe.in.gov/asap/sip2.html>.

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

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

### 2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2008-09?	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

### 2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	81
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

#### 2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	82	15
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	21	37
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	44
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		2

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

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2009 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2,387,085.40	43,291.10
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	54,516.70	1,279,066.50
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	1,101,815.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		17,429.50
Total	2,577,601.10	2,577,601.10
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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