

**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 2009-10  
INDIANA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011**

**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) 2009-10 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>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</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Part I, 2009-10	<input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10
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		
<a href="mailto:jzaring@doe.in.gov">e-mail: jzaring@doe.in.gov</a>		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jeffery P. Zaring		
Friday, April 29, 2011, 9:58:05 AM		
Signature	Date	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2009-10**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010  
5PM EST**

**1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT****STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of *ESEA*.

**1.1.1 Academic Content Standards**

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

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

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

The Indiana State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards on August 3, 2010. The standards will be implemented as assessed as follows:

**2011-2012 School Year**

\*Teachers will teach Math 2000 standards and English 2006 standards.

\*Teachers also will begin teaching aspects of Common Core standards.

\*ISTEP+ (Grades 3 - 8), Algebra I End of Course Assessment (ECA), and English 10 ECA will test Math 2000 standards and English 2006 standards.

\*Kindergarten teachers will teach only Common Core standards

**2012-2013 School Year**

\*Teachers will teach Math 2000, English 2006 and Common Core Math and English standards

\*ISTEP+, Algebra I End of Course Assessment (ECA), and English 10 ECA will test Math 2000 standards and English 2006 standards. Common Core Standards math and English test questions will be piloted.

\*Kindergarten and Grade 1 teachers will teach only Common Core Math and English standards.

**2013-2014**

\*Teachers will teach Math 2000, English 2006 and Common Core Math and English standards

\*ISTEP+, Algebra I End of Course Assessment (ECA), and English 10 ECA will test Math 2000 standards and English 2006 standards. Common Core Standards math and English items will be piloted.

\*Kindergarten, Grade 1 teachers, and Grade 2 teachers will teach only Common Core Math and English standards.

**2014-2015**

\*Teachers will teach Common Core Math and English standards.

\*Common Core Math assessments include Grades 3—Algebra II and replace ISTEP+ and Algebra I ECA.

\*Common Core English assessments include Grades 3-11 and replace ISTEP+ and English 10 ECA.

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

**1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science**

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana administered its modified achievement standards test (Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test or IMAST) in English and mathematics in Grades 3 through 8 and science at Grades 4 and 6 during the 2009-2010 school year. The Indiana State Board of Education adopted performance standards for these assessments on August 3, 2010.

Indiana administered end of course assessments in English 10 and Algebra I during the 2009-2010 school year as new tests to meet ESEA high school testing requirements. The Indiana State Board of Education adopted performance standards on August 3, 2010.

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

**1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities****1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	92.1
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	7.9
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development**

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	Yes
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	No
Other	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

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

**1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	554,016		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,682		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,781		>97
Black, non-Hispanic	66,674	63,982	96.0
Hispanic	41,579		>97
White, non-Hispanic	410,562		>97
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	84,473	80,727	95.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,427		>97
Economically disadvantaged students	251,297		>97
Migratory students	166	159	95.8
Male	282,679		>97
Female	271,337		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment**

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,521	24.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	49,767	61.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	5,472	6.8
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,967	7.4
Total	80,727	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	553,392		>97
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,682		>97
Asian or Pacific Islander	8,475	8,173	96.4
Black, non-Hispanic	66,632	64,174	96.3
Hispanic	41,356		>97
White, non-Hispanic	410,516		>97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	84,473	81,227	96.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,427	22,695	96.9
Economically disadvantaged students	251,075		>97
Migratory students	165	158	95.8
Male	282,349		>97
Female	271,043		>97
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	19,465	24.0
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	49,952	61.5
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	5,841	7.2
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	5,969	7.3
Total	81,227	
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	234,009	170,039	72.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	720	534	74.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	3,780	2,725	72.1
Black, non-Hispanic	28,245	21,077	74.6
Hispanic	17,058	13,369	78.4
White, non-Hispanic	174,176	124,416	71.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	33,947	25,584	75.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	23,427	21,887	93.4
Economically disadvantaged students	103,475	80,666	78.0
Migratory students	60	43	71.7
Male	119,187	87,011	73.0
Female	114,822	83,028	72.3

**Comments:** Percentage of migrant students participating appears low because the n size is very low to begin with; however, in looking at the data, only 3 identified migrant students were not tested. For high school CSPR reporting, we use the same denominator that we use for AYP for English and Math--a 10th grade cohort. The numerator is the number of students in that 10th grade cohort with Biology 1 results. Biology 1 is a required course for graduation, and all students who take the course must take the exam. However, there is currently no requirement that the exam/course be completed by the end of 10th grade.

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

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	7,436	29.1
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,384	64.0
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards	1,764	6.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards		
Total	25,584	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

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

**1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). The student group "limited English proficient (*LEP*) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former *LEP* students.

**1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	81,207	62,669	77.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	157	72.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,380	1,181	85.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,908	5,559	56.1
Hispanic	7,091	4,764	67.2
White, non-Hispanic	58,312	47,918	82.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,977	8,005	61.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,075	3,144	62.0
Economically disadvantaged students	40,401	27,485	68.0
Migratory students	32	18	56.2
Male	41,682	32,681	78.4
Female	39,525	29,988	75.9

**Comments:** All students total is 81,207 students (218 American Indian; 1,380 Asian; 9,908 Black; 7,091 Hispanic; 58,312 White. There are 4,298 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 81,207.

There was a large influx of Hispanic students to Indiana, thus the increase in number of students tested. The decrease in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in the state. The change in performance is simply a function of the small n size.

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

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	80,988	65,498	80.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	218	168	77.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,325	1,139	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,888	6,497	65.7
Hispanic	7,042	4,887	69.4
White, non-Hispanic	58,223	49,447	84.9
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,937	7,698	59.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	5,009	3,074	61.4
Economically disadvantaged students	40,289	29,230	72.6
Migratory students	31	18	58.1
Male	41,547	32,349	77.9
Female	39,441	33,149	84.0

**Comments:** All students total is 80,988 students (218 American Indian; 1,325 Asian; 9,888 Black; 7,042 Hispanic; 58,223 White. There are 4,292 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 80,988.

There was a large influx of Hispanic students to Indiana, thus the increase in number of students tested. The decrease in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in the state. The change in performance is simply a function of the small n size.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	79,074	60,686	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	244	174	71.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,332	1,119	84.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,736	5,343	54.9
Hispanic	6,307	4,347	68.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,553	46,922	81.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,780	7,667	60.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,167	2,578	61.9
Economically disadvantaged students	38,380	25,662	66.9
Migratory students	19	N<10	
Male	40,517	31,025	76.6
Female	38,557	29,661	76.9

**Comments:** All students total is 79,074 students (244 American Indian; 1,332 Asian; 9,736 Black; 6,307 Hispanic; 57,553 White. There are 3,902 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 79,074.

The 20% change in American Indiana or Alaskan native number is a result of a small n size. The change in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in Indiana.

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

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	78,844	62,432	79.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	245	179	73.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,259	1,060	84.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9,706	5,965	61.5
Hispanic	6,267	4,339	69.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,476	47,902	83.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,730	7,215	56.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,092	2,396	58.6
Economically disadvantaged students	38,255	26,732	69.9
Migratory students	18	12	66.7
Male	40,374	30,867	76.5
Female	38,470	31,565	82.1

**Comments:** All students total is 78,844 students (245 American Indian; 1,259 Asian; 9,706 Black; 6,267 Hispanic; 57,476 White. There are 3,891 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 78,844.

The 20% change in American Indiana or Alaskan native number is a result of a small n size. The change in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in Indiana. The change in proficiency level is a result of small n size.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	78,249	59,941	76.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	242	178	73.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,320	1,054	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9,586	4,833	50.4
Hispanic	6,257	4,201	67.1
White, non-Hispanic	56,984	46,928	82.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,991	7,137	59.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,128	2,394	58.0
Economically disadvantaged students	37,903	25,035	66.1
Migratory students	18	13	72.2
Male	39,995	30,481	76.2
Female	38,254	29,460	77.0

**Comments:** All students total is 78,249 students (242 American Indian; 1,320 Asian; 9,586 Black; 6,257 Hispanic; 56,984 White. There are 3,860 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 78,249.

In 08-09 Indiana tested in the fall on 4th grade and 6th grade standards but the test was given to 5th graders and 7th graders. In 09-10 Indiana changed to a spring test and therefore 4th and 6th grade students were given the science test when they were still 4th and 6th graders, not the next year in the fall.

**1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,947	63,745	81.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	225	177	78.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,264	1,087	86.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9,430	6,044	64.1
Hispanic	6,083	4,627	76.1
White, non-Hispanic	57,165	48,899	85.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,307	7,428	60.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,650	2,490	68.2
Economically disadvantaged students	37,029	27,298	73.7
Migratory students	26	16	61.5
Male	39,664	32,502	81.9
Female	38,283	31,243	81.6

**Comments:** All students total is 77,947 students (225 American Indian; 1,264 Asian; 9,430 Black; 6,083 Hispanic; 57,165 White. There are 3,780 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 77,947.

The decrease in number of migrant students is a result of the overall decrease in the number of migrant students in the state.

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

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,861	56,742	72.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	224	161	71.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,208	964	79.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9,411	5,002	53.2
Hispanic	6,045	3,703	61.3
White, non-Hispanic	57,198	44,310	77.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,280	5,597	45.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,583	1,627	45.4
Economically disadvantaged students	36,983	22,982	62.1
Migratory students	26	12	46.2
Male	39,595	27,182	68.7
Female	38,266	29,560	77.2

**Comments:** All students total is 77,861 students (224 American Indian; 1,208 Asian; 9,411 Black; 6,045 Hispanic; 57,198 White. There are 3,775 Multiracial students.) Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 77,861.

The decrease in number of migrant students is a result of the overall decrease in the number of migrant students in the state.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Indiana changed to a spring test in 09-10. In prior years 5th and 7th graders were tested on 4th and 6th grade standards. However, starting in 09-10, 4th and 6th graders were tested at the end of the 4th/6th grade year on current year standards.			

**1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,886	61,019	78.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	187	78.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,230	1,038	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,257	5,570	60.2
Hispanic	5,813	4,119	70.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,850	47,578	82.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,492	5,982	52.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,063	1,812	59.2
Economically disadvantaged students	36,170	24,866	68.7
Migratory students	21	11	52.4
Male	39,592	30,875	78.0
Female	38,294	30,144	78.7
<b>Comments:</b> Decrease in number of migrant students represents overall decrease in number of migrant students in Indiana. Decrease in LEP students represents overall decrease in number of 6th grade LEP students.			

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

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,683	57,854	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	238	182	76.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,161	936	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,239	5,246	56.8
Hispanic	5,772	3,632	62.9
White, non-Hispanic	57,783	45,382	78.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,444	4,823	42.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,992	1,282	42.8
Economically disadvantaged students	36,057	22,942	63.6
Migratory students	21	N<10	
Male	39,473	27,313	69.2
Female	38,210	30,541	79.9
<b>Comments:</b> Decrease in number of migrant students represents overall decrease in number of migrant students in Indiana. Decrease in LEP students represents overall decrease in number of 6th grade LEP students.			

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	76,908	45,418	59.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	128	54.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,214	829	68.3
Black, non-Hispanic	9,104	2,620	28.8
Hispanic	5,768	2,374	41.2
White, non-Hispanic	57,135	37,688	66.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	10,645	3,526	33.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,022	661	21.9
Economically disadvantaged students	35,623	15,749	44.2
Migratory students	21	N<10	
Male	38,987	23,700	60.8
Female	37,921	21,718	57.3
<p><b>Comments:</b> All students total is 76,908 students (236 American Indian;1,214 Asian;9,104 Black;5,768 Hispanic;57,135 White. There are 3,451 Multiracial students.)  Summing all five race plus the multiracial and missing is equal to 76,908.</p> <p>Indiana changed to a spring test in 09-10. In prior years 5th and 7th graders were tested on 4th and 6th grade standards. However, starting in 09-10, 4th and 6th graders were tested at the end of the 4th/6th grade year on current year standards.</p>			

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,929	58,533	75.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	269	197	73.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,153	966	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9,092	4,688	51.6
Hispanic	5,591	3,670	65.6
White, non-Hispanic	58,478	46,653	79.8
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,391	5,234	45.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,767	1,448	52.3
Economically disadvantaged students	34,547	21,966	63.6
Migratory students	24	16	66.7
Male	39,363	29,568	75.1
Female	38,566	28,965	75.1

**Comments:** The 20% change in American Indian or Alaskan native number is a result of a small n size. The change in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in Indiana.

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

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	77,736	57,769	74.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	270	191	70.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,102	888	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	9,059	4,997	55.2
Hispanic	5,541	3,550	64.1
White, non-Hispanic	58,421	45,749	78.3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,346	4,391	38.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,698	1,153	42.7
Economically disadvantaged students	34,423	21,561	62.6
Migratory students	24	N<10	
Male	39,263	27,284	69.5
Female	38,473	30,485	79.2

**Comments:** The 20% change in American Indian or Alaskan native number is a result of a small n size. The change in number of migrant students is a result of a continued decrease in the number of migrant students in Indiana.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> Indiana changed to a spring test in 09-10. In prior years 5th and 7th graders were tested on 4th and 6th grade standards. However, starting in 09-10, 4th and 6th graders were tested at the end of the 4th/6th grade year on current year standards.			

**1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	78,827	59,327	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	174	72.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,158	977	84.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9,145	4,568	50.0
Hispanic	5,509	3,627	65.8
White, non-Hispanic	59,705	47,862	80.2
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,404	5,180	45.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,524	1,250	49.5
Economically disadvantaged students	33,382	21,042	63.0
Migratory students	23	13	56.5
Male	40,267	30,035	74.6
Female	38,560	29,292	76.0
<b>Comments:</b> Change in Am. Ind. or Alaskan native is result of small n size. There was a general decrease in number of migrant students.			

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

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	78,433	56,736	72.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	239	159	66.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,111	885	79.7
Black, non-Hispanic	9,108	4,645	51.0
Hispanic	5,456	3,349	61.4
White, non-Hispanic	59,459	45,627	76.7
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,294	4,005	35.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,456	850	34.6
Economically disadvantaged students	33,200	19,726	59.4
Migratory students	23	14	60.9
Male	40,002	26,295	65.7
Female	38,431	30,441	79.2
<b>Comments:</b> Change in Am. Ind. or Alaskan native is result of small n size. There was a general decrease in number of migrant students. Difference in proficiency percentage for migrant students is result of small n size.			

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian or Pacific Islander			
Black, non-Hispanic			
Hispanic			
White, non-Hispanic			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	70,074	46,601	66.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	211	122	57.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,085	862	79.4
Black, non-Hispanic	7,414	2,933	39.6
Hispanic	4,286	2,364	55.2
White, non-Hispanic	54,793	38,903	71.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,376	3,261	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,686	697	41.3
Economically disadvantaged students	24,865	12,862	51.7
Migratory students	14	N<10	
Male	34,898	23,178	66.4
Female	35,176	23,423	66.6
<b>Comments:</b> Changes for migrant students are results of small n size.			

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

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	71,655	46,800	65.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	120	55.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,007	714	70.9
Black, non-Hispanic	7,763	3,144	40.5
Hispanic	4,270	2,083	48.8
White, non-Hispanic	56,014	39,219	70.0
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,196	2,730	29.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,516	283	18.7
Economically disadvantaged students	25,564	12,745	49.9
Migratory students	15	N<10	
Male	35,729	21,927	61.4
Female	35,926	24,873	69.2
<b>Comments:</b> Changes for migrant students and Am. Ind. or Alaskan Native are results of small n size. Change in proficiency level for LEP students may be result of change in high school assessment.			

**1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School**

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	14,882	3,186	21.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	56	8	14.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	191	45	23.6
Black, non-Hispanic	2,387	199	8.3
Hispanic	1,344	178	13.2
White, non-Hispanic	10,297	2,629	25.5
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	2,948	267	9.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	584	19	3.3
Economically disadvantaged students	7,140	977	13.7
Migratory students	N<10		
Male	8,029	1,943	24.2
Female	6,853	1,243	18.1
<b>Comments:</b> The changes in number tested and proficiency levels are a result of including high school science (Biology 1) for the first time.			

**1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

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

**1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
Schools	1,861	1,090	58.6
Districts	291	274	94.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10
All Title I schools	956	651	68.1
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	313	163	52.1
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	643	488	75.9
<b>Comments:</b> There was an increase in the number of schools served with Title I dollars.			

**1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds**

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10
292	274	93.8
<b>Comments:</b> Charter schools are counted as LEAs for the purpose of funding (e.g. Title I) but are not included in this count. Charters are not assessed for AYP as districts, however they are assessed as schools.		

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement - Year 1, School Improvement - Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>1</sup>)
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (*This column **must be completed** by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.*)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

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

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

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

**1.4.4.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	1
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	1
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	5
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	12
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Restructuring Action</b>	<b># of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented</b>
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	7
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	5
<b>Comments:</b>	

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other restructuring consisted of appointing an outside expert and replacing the school principal and adding additional central office administrator.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action<sup>2</sup>)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (**This column must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement.** This column is optional for States that list only districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

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

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Support provided in the following areas:

1. Technical assistance and support in writing and revising District Improvement/ Action Plan and/or Curriculum Mapping and Aligning: Implementation Plan
2. Fall Administrative Workshops provided districts with an introduction to Common Core Standards and State Developed Curriculum Maps.
3. Workbooks have been created, modeled, and facilitated by the state to examine data and determine root causes analyses for districts to use in working with principals and school staff.
5. Designation of a Title I Specialist to oversee and manage the efforts in this area.

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

**1.4.5.3 Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

<b>Corrective Action</b>	<b># of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10</b>
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	26
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	
Restructured the district	
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The State of Indiana moved to Spring testing, implemented for the first time in the 2008-2009 school year. The AYP results reported in 2008-2009 were also used as designations in the 2009-2010 school year. LEAs maintained the same improvement status for the 2009-2010 school year at which time 26 LEAs continued implementation of a new curriculum based on State standards.	

**1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

	<b># Appealed Their AYP Designations</b>	<b># Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation</b>
Districts	0	0
Schools	87	27
<b>Comments:</b> The State of Indiana moved to Spring testing, implemented for the first time in the 2008-2009 school year. The AYP results reported in 2008-2009 were also used as designations in the 2009-2010 school year.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete	04/10/09
---	----------

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

*Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in SY 2009-10.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2009-10.
  - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

*States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):*

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2010.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA that were administered in fall 2010.
  - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

Category	SY 2009-10	SY 2008-09
Total number of students who completed the <b>mathematics</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	18,079	18,613
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	10,230	9,663
Percentage of students who were proficient or above in <b>mathematics</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	56.6	51.9
Total number of students who completed the <b>reading/language arts</b> assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	17,957	18,571
Total number of students who were proficient or above in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	9,785	9,064
Percentage of students who were proficient in <b>reading/language arts</b> in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10	54.5	48.8
<b>Comments:</b>		

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that:

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

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>made adequate yearly progress</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	32
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that <b>exited improvement status</b> based on testing in SY 2009-10	5

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

51

**Comments:** The State of Indiana moved to Spring testing, implemented for the first time in the 2008-2009 school year. The AYP results reported in 2008-2009 were also used as designations in the 2009-2010 school year. Schools maintained the same improvement status as identified in 2008-2009.



### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

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

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used</b>  (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.)  If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.	<b>Description of "Other Strategies"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies)</b>  (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D"</b>  This response is limited to 500 characters.
1		15	1	6	A	
2		3	0	2	A	
5	Extended Learning Time (e.g. summer school, extended day/year)	1	1	0	A	
6 = Combo 1	Combination of #1 and #2	41	0	12	A	
7 = Combo 2	Combination of #2 and #5	4	2	0	A	
8 = Combo 3	Combination of #1, #2, and #5	5	1	1	A	
<b>Comments:</b>						

#### Column 1 Response Options Box

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

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

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other



#### 1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies

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

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

\*Title I Administrative workshops included presentations from distinguished and high-performing schools. Presenters were able to share effective strategies attributing to the success of their schools. Additional applicable topics included Evaluating Effectiveness using Process and Outcome Measurement and The Continuous Improvement Classroom. There were three opportunities to attend these workshops around the state and content from all workshops was made available online.

\*The SEA continues the Institute for School Leadership Teams, in partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center. The Institute is a two-year program for school leaders that are ready to:

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

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

\*Instructional Coaches Training - Through continuous professional development on using state assessment tools, Indiana assists instructional coaches working in high poverty, high performing schools in:

- gaining new information and skills related to coaching teachers and paraprofessionals and literacy or math content through training.
- sharing information and skills regarding data, curriculum, instruction and assessment with school staff using a variety of coaching processes (e.g., verbal explanation, modeling, co-teaching, and other forms of professional development.
- providing leadership and guidance in developing an effective school-wide literacy or mathematics program, including the development and implementation of the school improvement plan.
- coaching/teaching school staff to understand and appropriately use diagnostic tools and formative assessments and other student data to determine appropriate instruction and to develop and implement differentiated instructional methods that correspond to specific students needs.
- collaborating with the principal to establish a climate and focus on the literacy or mathematics as a schoolwide program and creating a literacy- or mathematics- focused professional development plan.

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

- disaggregate student data.
- identify patterns and findings from the data, especially for student groups.
- determine root cause and draw conclusions.
- develop improvement plan to increase student achievement for those subgroups not meeting AYP.

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

- evaluate the quality and the content of their current English/language arts curriculum.
- implement the "curriculum mapping" process for district-wide improvement and/or development of a new E/LA curriculum.
- involve all appropriate teachers in the mapping process.
- establish corresponding formative assessments and instructional practices to align with the new curriculum map.
- use common core standards and state-developed curriculum maps.

\*School Support Teams - The IDOE, Office of Title I Academic Support contracted with School Support Teams to assist in achieving a continuous goal of "increasing the opportunity for all students to meet the State's academic content and student achievement standards".

-The B&D Consulting Education Team has developed a successful framework for getting schools in need of support back on track and to achieve results. The program focuses on building school capacity to increase student learning, continuously improving critical teaching practices and neutralizing barriers to success.

-The 8-Step Process with School Improvement Consultant, Patricia Davenport is an Integrated System made up of Effective Schools research, total quality management principles and an eight-step continuous improvement model that employs data driven decision-making and collaboration between teachers to:

- increase student achievement as reflected by the Indiana state assessment instrument.
- close the gap in student achievement scores between student groups.
- provide both excellence and equity in the cohort schools through system change.

(Training components include a 5-day training, which includes an overview of the process, site visits to M S D Warren Township schools,

and team action planning. Process Checks are scheduled to discuss what's working and what barriers are hindering successful implementation.

\*Participation in online learning modules are required as part of professional development for each year that a school remains in improvement. The online module(s) chosen must correspond to the curriculum and instruction of the specific student groups in the school that are not meeting AYP. Through discussion, reflection, and practice, the SEA's objective is to help teachers gain new knowledge and skills. The modules address the curriculum, instruction, and formative assessments of student groups not meeting AYP.

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

##### **1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*: 4.0 %

**Comments:**



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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

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

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

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Due to the redirection of the School Improvement 1003(g)(8) grant award, Indiana was unable to continue funding the strategies of the original school improvement grant 1003(g). Indiana worked with schools to identify other funding sources to maintain existing initiatives, programming, and staff positions. Meetings were held with the evaluation consultant for the purposes of terminating contracts and sharing evaluations and formative feedback with schools.

Under section 1003(g)(1) of the ESEA, Indiana identified Indiana's Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools as:

- Title I schools in improvement that are in the lowest 5% of all Title I schools in improvement that demonstrated a lack of progress over three years in the "all students" group
- Any Title I high school in improvement, that has had a graduation rate below 60%
- Title I eligible elementary schools in the bottom 20% of all schools in the State based on proficiency rates.
- Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds that is among the lowest-achieving 5% of secondary schools and demonstrates a lack of progress over three years in the "all students" group.
- Any high school that has an average graduation rate that is below 60% over 3 years.

Funding was awarded using a competitive application process. Grantees were required to select and implement one of four intervention models: Turnaround, Transformation, Restart, Closure.

Grantees were required to:

- Design and implement school improvement models consistent with federal application requirements.
- Recruit, screen, and select external providers and/or new principals or staff (whichever is applicable to the selected improvement model). -Modify LEA practices and policies to enable the school to implement the improvement model fully and effectively.
- Sustain the model after the funding period ends.
- Align other resources with the school improvement model.

Indiana has established a state team of Title I staff to focus on accountability and results. Each grantee will receive a series of school visits and reviews throughout the school year.

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

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2009-10 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

- Determining areas of need by reviewing ISTEP+ performance data as well as other data sources and conducting a comprehensive needs assessment
- Identifying instructional strategies that target the needs of struggling students
- Providing opportunities to strengthen teachers' knowledge and repertoire of best practices that will increase the achievement of all students
- Offering experiences for parents to participate in meaningful, educationally-oriented activities that will support the academic development of their children
- Maximizing daily instructional time and adding extended-time programming to help support struggling students

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

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

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

### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

#### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

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

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

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

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for public school choice	71,158
Applied to transfer	2,463
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	2,279
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2,889,873

**1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

<b># LEAs</b>	
	LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice 39

**FAQs about public school choice:**

- a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:
  - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
  - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
  - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

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

**Comments:**

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

**1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services**

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

**1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students**

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

	<b># Students</b>
Eligible for supplemental educational services	50,644
Applied for supplemental educational services	15,367
Received supplemental educational services	13,035
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services**

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

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 16,880,370
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.5 TEACHER QUALITY**

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

**1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified**

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
				Qualified	
All classes	283,260	274,748	97.0	8,512	3.0
All elementary classes	164,469	160,957	97.9	3,512	2.1
All secondary	118,791	113,791	95.8	5,000	4.2

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

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

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

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a

departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

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

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	56.5
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	21.8
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	21.7
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	38.8
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	23.2
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	38.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

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

**NOTE:** No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	39,781	38,428	96.6
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	37,943	37,300	98.3
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	30,713	28,093	91.5
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	34,602	33,338	96.3
1.5.3.1 In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.			

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.1	26.1
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	
Secondary schools	43.8	20.6
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.
- What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.
- How are the poverty quartiles determined?* Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, States use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced-price lunch program for this calculation.
- Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

**1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

- 1. **Types of Programs** = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/5/LanguageInstructionEducationalPrograms.pdf>.
- 2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

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

Number of ALL LEP students in the State 48,932

**Comments:** 48,932 is the Number of ALL LEP students in the State.  
 42,693 is only the Sum of five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State: (Spanish/Castilian 38,245; German 1,540; Burmese 1,457; Arabic 780; Chinese 671)

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	47,772

**Comments:**

**1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

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

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	38,245
German	1,540
Burmese	1,457
Arabic	780
Chinese	671

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

48,932 is the Number of ALL LEP students in the State.  
 42,693 is only the Sum of five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State: (Spanish/Castilian 38,245; German 1,540; Burmese 1,457; Arabic 780; Chinese 671)

**1.6.3 Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(a)(2).

**1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment**

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	54,003
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	366
Total	54,369
<p><b>Comments:</b> "Not tested" is based on students that did not have a complete annual ELP assessment score. The number tested includes not only LEP students but also first time FEP, Level 5, students that must receive a second consecutive Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year Title III monitoring period.</p>	

**1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results**

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	12,027
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	22.3
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	

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

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

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	52,956
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	355
Total	53,311
<b>Comments:</b> The number tested includes not only LEP students but also first time FEP, Level 5, students that must receive a second consecutive Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year Title III monitoring period.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	
	<b>#</b>
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	11,976

**1.6.3.2.2**

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

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

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	11,124	27.1	14,825	40.00
Attained proficiency	10,007	18.9	2,416	8.00
<b>Comments:</b>				

**1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments**

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

**1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language**

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

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

**1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given**

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


**Comments:**

**1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given**

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

**1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given**

Language(s)

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

**Language(s)**

**Comments:**

**1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students**

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

**1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored**

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

Monitored Former LEP students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

**Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
4,702	3,961	8,663
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.6.3.6.2** In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,095	5,503	90.3	592
<b>Comments:</b>			

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
6,104	5,448	89.3	656
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

**Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:**

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
2,053	1,568	76.4	485
<b>Comments:</b>			

**1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees**

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

**1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance**

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

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	99
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	83
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	93
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	84
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	97
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	0
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10)	5
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	5
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10)	0

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Consortia members are included as part of one sub-grantee (i.e., a consortium of 16 LEAs is counted as 1 sub-grantee).

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met all three Title III AMAOs

No

**Comments:** The state had two LEAs that did not make AYP for their LEP subgroups. One LEA failed to meet AYP based on scores from the E/LA portion of ISTEP. The other LEA failed to meet AYP based on scores from the math portion of ISTEP.

**1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs**

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

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

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students**

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
19,053	3,798	4

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development**

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

**1.6.6.1 Teacher Information**

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

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

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1,239
Estimate number of <b>additional</b> certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	990

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	99	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	99	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	99	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	99	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	99	
Other (Explain in comment box)	99	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	99	13,326
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	99	876
PD provided to principals	99	1,123
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	99	570
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	99	2,312
PD provided to community based organization personnel	99	892
Total	99	19,099

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Professional development was delivered by all sub-grantees as that is an assurance of the grant. Professional development activities included, but were not limited to: Title III Law, Developing Goals for ELs, Using Data to Inform Instruction, Design and Implementation of ILPs, Data Teams to Analyze AMAO data, SIOP, Response to Instruction (Rtl), Cultural Competency, Differentiating Learning (Tomlinson), INTESOL, EL State Conference, Parent and Community Involvement, Cultural Competency, Evaluation of Reserach-based Materials for ELs, Technology and ELs.

### 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

#### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

##### Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/01/09	09/01/09	60
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is currently working to design and implement an online Title III Grant Application and integrated database for Annual Performance Reporting (APR) for the 2011-12 school year. The system will allow for expedited communication between the SEA and LEA to make necessary grant and APR modifications as necessary, thus shortening the time between receipt of funds and notice of award.

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	
<b>Comments:</b> Indiana has '0' Persistently Dangerous Schools	

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	81.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	72.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	66.0
Hispanic	69.8
White, non-Hispanic	84.4
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	58.6
Limited English proficient	61.5
Economically disadvantaged	68.0
Migratory students	37.0
Male	77.7
Female	85.3
<b>Comments:</b> Change in graduation rate for migrant students is result of small n size	

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	<3
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	<3
Black, non-Hispanic	<3
Hispanic	<3
White, non-Hispanic	<3
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	<3
Limited English proficient	<3
Economically disadvantaged	<3
Migratory students	<3
Male	<3
Female	<3
<b>Comments:</b> Change in dropout rate for migrant students is result of small n size	

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

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

**1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM**

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	316	316
LEAs with subgrants	29	29
Total	345	345
<b>Comments:</b>		

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

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

**1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths**

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public
	School in LEAs Without Subgrants	School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	32	69
K	381	806
1	397	831
2	396	883
3	374	846
4	389	833
5	328	776
6	266	733
7	253	660
8	218	626
9	162	513
10	128	404
11	154	326
12	186	278
Ungraded		
Total	3,664	8,584

**Comments:** When students are identified by more than one LEA but with a consistent grade, the students are counted once. For example, if LEA A and LEA B both report a student as homeless and in the first grade, the student will be counted once. If however, two different LEAs report a student as homeless and two different grades, the student will be included in this count for both grades. The difference in methodology for disaggregation by type of housing vs. grade results in totals that do not match for the two data sets.

**1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths**

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	513	1,387
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	2,735	6,948
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	61	38
Hotels/Motels	196	374
Total	3,505	8,747

**Comments:** When a student is identified by multiple LEAs they are included multiple times. If one LEA reports a student as homeless multiple times, they are included in this count one time. The difference in methodology for disaggregation by type of housing vs. grade results in totals that do not match for the two data sets.

**1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

**1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	327
K	801
1	823
2	879
3	842
4	824
5	773
6	726
7	649
8	621
9	508
10	402
11	324
12	277
Ungraded	
Total	8,776

**Comments:** Indiana does not have universal preschool services; therefore the number of preschool children served by the grantees can be significantly higher than the number enrolled. Many districts do not consider preschool children enrolled, even when providing a preschool program.

**1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served**

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

	<b># Homeless Students Served</b>
Unaccompanied youth	248
Migratory children/youth	N<10
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,608
Limited English proficient students	692
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees**

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

	<b># McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer</b>
Tutoring or other instructional support	15
Expedited evaluations	9
Staff professional development and awareness	14
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	24
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	15
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	12
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	16
Coordination between schools and agencies	16
Counseling	10
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	14
Clothing to meet a school requirement	13
School supplies	15
Referral to other programs and services	15
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	11
Other (optional – in comment box below)	2
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1
Other (optional – in comment box below)	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2 grantees reported the provision of support groups, 1 grantee reported college tours, 1 grantee reported translation services, 1 grantee reported services for pregnant and parenting teens.

**1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth**

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

	<b># Subgrantees Reporting</b>
Eligibility for homeless services	4
School Selection	4
Transportation	5
School records	5
Immunizations	7
Other medical records	4
Other Barriers – in comment box below	1

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1 grantee reported an additional barrier of transportation upon obtaining permanent housing.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	737	486
4	726	445
5	654	339
6	598	311
7	536	293
8	511	221
High School	242	91
<b>Comments:</b>		

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient
3	739	460
4	731	430
5	663	427
6	605	361
7	547	295
8	525	225
High School	231	86
<b>Comments:</b>		

### 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

#### FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

**1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	192
K	67
1	76
2	78
3	75
4	86
5	63
6	71
7	85
8	80
9	98
10	79
11	77
12	76
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	248
Total	1,451

**Comments:** The category 1 child count for 2009-2010 is about 35.28% lower than 2008-2009. This decrease is attributed to students' end of eligibility; and changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work activities. Employers hire more adults with no children, also because the economy, employers are hiring more local seasonal workers as opposed to migrant workers.

**1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 1 child count for 2009-2010 is 35.28% lower than the 2008-2009 count. This decrease is attributed to students' end of eligibility and changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work. Also, employers are hiring more adults with no children and due to the economy, employers are hiring local and seasonal workers as opposed to migrant workers.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	99
K	35
1	40
2	47
3	39
4	48
5	31
6	39
7	48
8	42
9	56
10	49
11	41
12	36
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	140
Total	790
<b>Comments:</b>	

**1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Category 2 summer child count for 2009-2010 is 52.58% lower than the 2008-2009 count. The decrease is attributed largely to students' end of eligibility. Additionally, Indiana has experienced a decrease in the number of families traveling with children due to the economy as well as changes to ID&R practices related to qualifying "temporary" work activities.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Beyond the initial training, recruiters learn through the use of various instructional methods such as meetings, personal contact, interactive activities, regular question-and-answer sessions, reading the Field Handbook, role-playing and observation of actual interviews.

When recruiters interview families, they take the information on a paper COE, then they input the information in the Indiana data system, COEstar, using laptop computers then the electronic COE is transmitted via e-mail.

Electronic files are received by the Data Quality Control Specialist who performs the following

activities: - Migrant Education/Data Quality Control Specialist download the COEs

- Print color copies of the COEs

- Write the COEs on the ID&R Monitoring Checklist log The purposes of this log are: keep track of the sequence numbers of the COEs, identify mistakes in red ink, write them on the paper COE; these mistakes are documented in the log file. A written summary of errors are a topic of discussion and are addressed at staff meetings and additional training is provided as needed.

On the electronic paper COE, make all corrections with a red ink pen.

Once the electronic paper COE has been examined thoroughly and corrections, questions are marked in red; all COEs are checked against the COEstar database.

When the COE is verified, the Migrant Education/Data Quality Specialist enrolls each student on the COE in regular (R) term and/or summer (S) term according to the current school year calendar.

The COEs are then sent to LEAS administering a Migrant Education project. A Ineligible list is also sent to the MEP projects every Wednesday. School Food Directors from any school district in the state with a certified eligible migrant student will receive a copy of the student's COE to ensure compliance with the categorical eligibility for free meals and text books.

School migrant projects are required to send withdrawals forms as a migrant child leaves the school. As Student Withdrawal forms are received, the Migrant Education /Data Quality Control Specialist verifies the information and updates COEstar to reflect the withdrawal date, days enrolled, days present, health data, special education data and instructional and supportive services provided.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Category 1 and 2 Child Counts were provided to the SEA by the COEstar vendor, TROMIK. Data was collected from September 1, 2009 through August 31, 2010 based on eligible students as defined by Titel I, C. The CSPR 1.10 Migrant Child Count data reporting requirements were provided to TROMIK and the data was collected according to the reporting requirements.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In order to ensure that Indiana effectively locates and recruits all eligible migrant students, Identification and Recruitment (ID&R) duties are carried out at the SEA level. The Indiana Department of Education Migrant Education Program (IMEP), employs three full-time, permanent Migrant Education Specialists that are responsible for ID&R and associated data quality control and record keeping. Due to the volume of ID&R conducted over the summer, IMEP also employs intermittent Field Recruiters from the beginning of June through the end of October to conduct ID&R duties in various parts of the state. ID&R is conducted through a face-to-face family interview or may be conducted over the phone in some cases. The intermittent Field Recruiters must be bilingual in English and Spanish and report directly to and are supervised by the Migrant Education Specialists and Program Director. Intermittent Field Recruiters participate in a comprehensive training to ensure their understanding of program eligibility requirements.

The SEA has developed comprehensive guidance and training materials, including an IMEP Handbook, related to migrant student eligibility and quality control. As outlined in the State's Service Delivery Plan (SDP), all identification and recruitment and eligibility decisions are made by full-time, permanent IMEP staff or by well trained intermittent IMEP staff.

For Summer 2010, the following measures were planned to be implemented to ensure that all intermittent staff members are accountable for their daily time and effort:

1. Field Recruiters will upload Certificate of Eligibility (C.O.E.) and Ineligible Form documents to the migrant database, COEStar, on a daily basis as a result of family interviews conducted each day;
2. Field Recruiters will call the office to check-in and report activities daily;
3. A performance review of intermittent field staff is conducted by the assigned Migrant Education Specialist to ensure the reliability of work time logged and quality of activity;
4. All intermittent staff will participate in staff meetings once a month to provide updates on activities, receive information about newly arrived families, and receive support and guidance from supervisors.

The data collected during the ID&R process includes all National COE reporting requirements and also addresses the social service needs of each family with referrals to migrant service providers and other community outreach agencies.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There is no difference in the way the data is collected.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Indiana MEP child counts are calculated based on the following:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;  
Even though the COEstar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data infiltrates into the system from another source. Since COEstar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. The age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can be counted for funding
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);  
Since COEstar keeps a copy of the actual COE, calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested against the eligible range; the residency on the COE is verified; the age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the databases multiple times (even though COEstar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility). By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the family and children listed on the COE are eligible, in compliance with laws and regulations, just as would be the case by using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.  
COEstar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track, but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.
- children who were resident in the State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);  
TROMIK Performance Reporter first examines the family's current address on the COE to be sure they are in the state. It then tests numerous dates to determine if a contact event or sequence of events occurred that would definitely show that the child resided in the State during the period. These include checking the School Year listed on school enrollment records, QAD dates, residency dates, enrollment dates, withdrawal dates, departure dates, LEP, needs assessment and graduation / termination dates, special services dates, and health record dates performed in this state during the period. Records are excluded from counting if departure dates indicate they left before the period began or if additional records demonstrate that the child was no longer in the State when the period began.
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term;  
Students' enrollment records must explicitly indicate enrollment in a summer or intersession term in order to be eligible to be considered for counting in the category 2 count. Entry of this data means that the State served the child during the summer/intersession term. Additional services information can be added to indicate the nature of services but the summer/intersession enrollment record must exist. In addition, summer/intersession enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the 3-year eligibility period when service began.
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.  
The Performance Reporter ranks the grades from 0-2, 3-5 (age), k-12, UG and OSY then determines the highest of those grades that the child attended during the year, as well as the highest regular term grade and summer term grade. Any child in the 3-5 age group who has a grade of K is given the grade of K. The grade ranking is the same as they appear on the CSPR. The Performance Reporter builds a profile that contains one record for each child for this and other unique annual data.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

- Missing information,
- Accuracy of dates such as Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and school district arrival date (residency),
- Qualifying move information,
- Birth dates for eligibility,
- Qualifying activity,
- School identification code,
- Misspelling

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In August/October 2010 a prospective re-interview was done based on a random selection of COEs created from May 2010 across the state including every qualifying activity during that time period.

The prospective re-interview was completed in August and September 2010 by intermittent Field Recruiters and Migrant Education Specialists that had not done the original family interview for each Certificate of Eligibility (COE). In the first set of COEs, 53 children were randomly selected and were divided among four intermittent Field Recruiters. The results are as follows:

FIRST SET 53

Left or gone after corn detasseling 24

Re-interviewed and qualify 29

Due to the amount of re-interviews that could not take place because the families were gone, it was necessary to run a second set of COEs, using the same random selection criteria. This second set of 27 students were divided among three intermittent Field Recruiters.

The results are as follows:

SECOND SET 27

Left or gone after corn detasseling 4

Re-interviewed and qualify 21

Re-interviewed and qualify after follow-up to verify eligibility\* 2

The 29 eligible students from the first set and the 21 eligible students from the second set met the criteria of the re-interview of 50 students, all of whose eligibility from the initial interview was confirmed through the re-interview process. For one COE with two students, the information on qualifying work gathered by the intermittent Field Recruiter during the re-interview was different than the information that had been gathered during the original family interview.\* The Migrant Education Specialist that handles ID&R/Data Quality and oversaw the Re-Interview process was able to confirm with the employer that the parents indeed had done qualifying work to confirm the original COE.

Re-Interview resulted in 29 students in the first set and 23 students in the second set all having their eligibility confirmed with a 100% accuracy rate."

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

Based on 210 prospective re-interviews, there was no evidence of corrective action necessary.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

MEP has no concerns about the underlying eligibility determinations.