

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended in 2001**

**For reporting on  
School Year 2011-12**

**INDIANA**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012  
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 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 *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2011-12 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 ED Facts 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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>	
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2011-12 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2011-12	
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Indiana Department of Education	
Address: 115 West Washington, South Tower, Suite 600 Indianapolis, IN 46204	
Person to contact about this report:	
Name: Jeffrey J. Coyne	
Telephone: 317-232-0551	
Fax: 317-233-0218	
e-mail: jcoyne@doe.in.gov	
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jeffrey J. Coyne	
_____	Friday, March 8, 2013, 3:48:49 PM
Signature	

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2011-12**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012  
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**

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

No changes were made.

**1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science**

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (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.

No Revisions or changes	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

No changes were made.

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

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (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.

No Revisions or changes	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or "Not Applicable" to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Regular Assessments in High School	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.

### 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 2011-12, 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)	90.00
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	10.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	<input type="checkbox"/> No
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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	<input type="checkbox"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> ) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> No
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	<input type="checkbox"/> No
Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Conducted a new alignment study of our Alternate Assessment (1%) and enhanced the reporting and display of the growth model data.	

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

### 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	S	547,285	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,486	98
Asian	S	9,493	>=99
Black or African American	S	65,744	97
Hispanic or Latino	S	48,485	98
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	253	>=98
White	S	398,272	>=99
Two or more races	S	23,552	98
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	79,618	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	25,062	>=99
Economically disadvantaged students	S	261,581	98
Migratory students	S	161	91
Male	S	279,050	98
Female	S	268,235	>=99
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory Students' Data is Correct and Has Been Verified			

**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.

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	15,563	19.55
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,880	53.86
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	14,828	18.62
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,347	7.97
Total	79,618	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 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	S	543,491	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	1,472	97
Asian	S	9,047	98
Black or African American	S	64,937	96
Hispanic or Latino	S	47,832	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	249	>=98
White	S	396,557	98
Two or more races	S	23,397	98
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	79,520	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	24,292	97
Economically disadvantaged students	S	259,425	97
Migratory students	S	161	91
Male	S	276,975	98
Female	S	266,516	98
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory Students' Data is Correct and Has Been Verified			

#### 1.2.3.1 Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	610
--	-----

### 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.

Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (*IDEA*) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

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	15,265	19.20
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	42,052	52.88
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	15,854	19.94
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6,349	7.98
LEP < 12 months, took ELP		
Total	79,520	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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	S	232,009	98
American Indian or Alaska Native	S	634	98
Asian	S	3,964	96
Black or African American	S	27,441	96
Hispanic or Latino	S	19,856	97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	S	112	94
White	S	170,268	98
Two or more races	S	9,734	97
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	S	32,653	98
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	S	10,034	98
Economically disadvantaged students	S	108,374	98
Migratory students	S	59	69
Male	S	118,215	98
Female	S	113,794	98
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory Students' and Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander's Data is Correct and Has Been Verified			

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	7,682	23.53
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	16,949	51.91
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards	5,364	16.43
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	2,658	8.14
Total	32,653	////////////////////
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

### 1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

#### 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	76,725	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	S	79
Asian	1,482	S	84
Black or African American	9,241	S	60
Hispanic or Latino	7,899	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	36	S	83
White	54,235	S	84
Two or more races	3,639	S	75
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,083	S	66
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,989	S	64
Economically disadvantaged students	39,626	S	71
Migratory students	29	S	66
Male	39,440	S	80
Female	37,285	S	78
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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	76,373	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	192	S	88
Asian	1,413	S	86
Black or African American	9,175	S	72
Hispanic or Latino	7,848	S	76
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	34	S	88
White	54,087	S	89
Two or more races	3,624	S	83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,008	S	68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,891	S	67
Economically disadvantaged students	39,401	S	79
Migratory students	29	S	76
Male	39,201	S	83
Female	37,172	S	88
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana does not assess students for Grade 3 Science			

**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	77,450	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	S	76
Asian	1,413	S	87
Black or African American	9,575	S	58
Hispanic or Latino	7,578	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	S	69
White	54,998	S	83
Two or more races	3,662	S	75
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,483	S	65
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,636	S	63
Economically disadvantaged students	39,754	S	70
Migratory students	23	S	61
Male	39,657	S	78
Female	37,793	S	78
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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	77,181	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	185	S	78
Asian	1,347	S	85
Black or African American	9,538	S	68
Hispanic or Latino	7,535	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	74
White	54,881	S	85
Two or more races	3,657	S	80
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,441	S	63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,543	S	60
Economically disadvantaged students	39,593	S	74
Migratory students	23	S	61
Male	39,489	S	78
Female	37,692	S	85
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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	77,710	S	74
American Indian or Alaska Native	186	S	69
Asian	1,415	S	80
Black or African American	9,644	S	47
Hispanic or Latino	7,617	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	39	S	64
White	55,129	S	81
Two or more races	3,680	S	71
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,536	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,656	S	51
Economically disadvantaged students	39,964	S	63
Migratory students	23	S	48
Male	39,788	S	73
Female	37,922	S	76
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander's Data is Correct and Has Been Verified			

**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	80,698	S	85
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	S	83
Asian	1,388	S	93
Black or African American	9,871	S	69
Hispanic or Latino	7,696	S	79
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	27	S	81
White	57,851	S	89
Two or more races	3,644	S	83
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,274	S	69
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,368	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	40,554	S	79
Migratory students	30	S	67
Male	41,281	S	85
Female	39,417	S	85

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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	80,517	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	S	73
Asian	1,336	S	83
Black or African American	9,846	S	61
Hispanic or Latino	7,657	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	27	S	70
White	57,784	S	82
Two or more races	3,647	S	76
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	12,249	S	59
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4,301	S	52
Economically disadvantaged students	40,486	S	69
Migratory students	31	S	61
Male	41,167	S	74
Female	39,350	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander and Limited English proficient (LEP) students' Data is Correct and Has Been Verified

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana does not assess students for Grade 5 Science			

**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	78,819	S	82
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	S	75
Asian	1,379	S	88
Black or African American	9,557	S	63
Hispanic or Latino	6,804	S	74
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	89
White	57,406	S	86
Two or more races	3,420	S	79
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,504	S	61
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,367	S	61
Economically disadvantaged students	38,321	S	73
Migratory students	13	S	62
Male	40,309	S	82
Female	38,510	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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	78,610	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	213	S	72
Asian	1,314	S	81
Black or African American	9,542	S	59
Hispanic or Latino	6,765	S	69
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	84
White	57,323	S	82
Two or more races	3,416	S	76
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,466	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,279	S	49
Economically disadvantaged students	38,210	S	68
Migratory students	13	S	62
Male	40,176	S	74
Female	38,434	S	82

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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	79,182	S	61
American Indian or Alaska Native	215	S	57
Asian	1,381	S	70
Black or African American	9,662	S	29
Hispanic or Latino	6,854	S	45
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	37	S	54
White	57,584	S	69
Two or more races	3,449	S	55
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,587	S	25
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3,386	S	23
Economically disadvantaged students	38,594	S	46
Migratory students	13	S	46
Male	40,514	S	62
Female	38,668	S	60
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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	77,822	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	208	S	72
Asian	1,270	S	87
Black or African American	9,290	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	6,572	S	70
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	34	S	82
White	57,154	S	82
Two or more races	3,294	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,267	S	54
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,888	S	56
Economically disadvantaged students	36,498	S	68
Migratory students	22	S	55
Male	39,572	S	77
Female	38,250	S	79

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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	77,568	S	75
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	S	72
Asian	1,216	S	82
Black or African American	9,247	S	55
Hispanic or Latino	6,499	S	66
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	34	S	68
White	57,080	S	80
Two or more races	3,286	S	71
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,206	S	48
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,775	S	44
Economically disadvantaged students	36,332	S	64
Migratory students	22	S	55
Male	39,432	S	71
Female	38,136	S	80

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander's Data is Correct and Has Been Verified

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana does not assess students for Grade 7 Science			

**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	77,199	S	79
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	S	77
Asian	1,261	S	85
Black or African American	9,030	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	6,126	S	72
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	89
White	57,399	S	84
Two or more races	3,122	S	74
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,083	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,523	S	53
Economically disadvantaged students	35,235	S	69
Migratory students	22	S	55
Male	39,093	S	79
Female	38,106	S	80
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Migratory students' Data is Correct and Has Been Verified			

**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	76,889	S	73
American Indian or Alaska Native	220	S	70
Asian	1,217	S	79
Black or African American	8,994	S	53
Hispanic or Latino	6,065	S	63
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	38	S	79
White	57,249	S	77
Two or more races	3,106	S	72
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	11,005	S	44
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,437	S	35
Economically disadvantaged students	35,066	S	62
Migratory students	22	S	55
Male	38,889	S	68
Female	38,000	S	79
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana does not assess students for Grade 8 Science			

**1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - 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	78,572	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	240	S	70
Asian	1,300	S	89
Black or African American	9,180	S	57
Hispanic or Latino	5,810	S	71
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	42	S	79
White	59,229	S	82
Two or more races	2,771	S	73
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,924	S	55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,291	S	58
Economically disadvantaged students	31,593	S	68
Migratory students	22	S	64
Male	39,698	S	77
Female	38,874	S	80

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - 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	76,353	S	78
American Indian or Alaska Native	236	S	73
Asian	1,204	S	78
Black or African American	8,595	S	56
Hispanic or Latino	5,463	S	68
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	41	S	76
White	58,153	S	83
Two or more races	2,661	S	76
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,145	S	46
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,066	S	38
Economically disadvantaged students	30,337	S	67
Migratory students	21	S	71
Male	38,621	S	75
Female	37,732	S	81

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**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	75,117	S	45
American Indian or Alaska Native	233	S	36
Asian	1,168	S	61
Black or African American	8,135	S	19
Hispanic or Latino	5,385	S	30
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	36	S	50
White	57,555	S	51
Two or more races	2,605	S	39
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	8,530	S	15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,992	S	8
Economically disadvantaged students	29,816	S	29
Migratory students	23	S	<=10
Male	37,913	S	48
Female	37,204	S	43
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. This data is correct. For SY 2010-11, Indiana included students that took Biology test only when they were enrolled at Grade 10. For 2011-12, Indiana also included students that took Biology test at either Grade 09 or 10. This is consistent with the logic Indiana have been using for reporting data for high school Math and Language Arts.			

## 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 SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	1,936		
Districts	394		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana is a Flexibility Waiver state and is not required to submit AYP Status for LEAs and Schools.

### 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 SY 2011-12. 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 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	921		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	503		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	416		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana is a Flexibility Waiver state and is not required to submit AYP Status for LEAs and Schools.

### 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 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
346		

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana is a Flexibility Waiver state and is not required to submit AYP Status for LEAs and Schools.

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	5
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	16
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	25
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	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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.

--

**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.

Twenty-two LEAs exited improvement in 2011-2012. There were a total of sixteen LEAs in improvement, eleven of which entered a new level of LEA improvement. IDOE provided intensive technical assistance and support to districts in improvement and continuing corrective actions under NCLB. Support is provided in the following areas:

1. Technical assistance and support in writing and revising District Improvement/ Action Plan. Tools and resources were provided which included: Samples and templates for designing Curriculum Mapping and Aligning: Implementation Plan
2. District Workbooks have been created, modeled, and facilitated by the state to guide districts in examining data and determining root cause analyses for districts to use in working with principals and school staff.
3. Designation of a School Improvement Specialist to oversee and manage the efforts in this area.
4. The 8-Step Process with School Improvement Consultant, Patricia Davenport. Training components include a 5-day training, which provides an overview of the process and team action planning. Process Checks are scheduled to discuss what is working and what barriers are hindering successful implementation.

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 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	10
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 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts		
Schools		
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Indiana is a Flexibility Waiver state and is not required to submit AYP Status for LEAs and Schools.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	
---	--

**1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

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 2011-12.

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

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) 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*: 4.00%

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

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

For SY 2011-12 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 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana has established a state team of School Improvement Specialists to focus on accountability and results. Each grantee received a series of school visits and reviews throughout the school year. Communications were made via monthly telephone calls and quarterly onsite meetings. The purpose of the calls and meetings was to follow-up and provide technical assistance on challenges and areas of improvement.

In addition, IDOE contracted with an external reviewer, Michael Burns Consulting, LLC to conduct external evaluations of schools awarded 1003g funding.

IDOE also held a SIG networking summit for all 1003g schools to share best practices.

Additional State Support Grants were awarded to all 1003g schools based on each LEA's analysis of school-level data.

External support was provided to certain 1003g schools based on the Indiana State Board of Education's action to intervene in the state's lowest-performing schools, per our state's school accountability law - Public Law 221-1999.

**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 2011-12 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.

Online learning modules were made available as part of professional development for each year that a school remains in improvement. The online module(s) chosen were to 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 were designed to address the curriculum, instruction, and formative assessments of student groups not meeting AYP.

The Schoolwide Planning Support Team of Title I Specialists provided a series of schoolwide training videos and webcasts for schools interested in operating schoolwide programs. A series of WebEx trainings were offered to help schools revise PL 221 school improvement plans that address all mandatory components as stated in NCLB. The process included:

- 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
- Determining effective professional development opportunities
- Providing technical assistance in the review of Schoolwide Plans for compliance

Note: Schoolwide planning support included both schools identified for improvement and not identified for improvement. Online Title I and School Improvement workshops included LEA and School Improvement presentations from distinguished and high-performing schools. Presenters were able to share effective strategies attributing to the success of their schools. Content and resources from all workshops were made available online.

### 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	112,965
Applied to transfer	3,398
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	3,178
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	\$ 3,786,140

**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	41

**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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

<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	56,096
Applied for supplemental educational services	17,871
Received supplemental educational services	14,777
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	\$ 14,752,061
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>	<b>Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified</b>
All classes	276,987	272,162	98.26	4,825	1.74
All elementary classes	143,673	141,976	98.82	1,697	1.18
All secondary classes	133,314	130,186	97.65	3,128	2.35

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.	<input type="checkbox"/> 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.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	95.70
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	4.30
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Secondary School Classes</b>	
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)	86.80
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	13.20
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	0.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00</b>

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.

**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).

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 a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

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
<b>Elementary Schools</b>			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	44,945	44,512	99.04
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	30,469	30,281	99.38
<b>Secondary Schools</b>			
High Poverty secondary Schools	38,366	37,160	96.86
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	29,613	29,302	98.95

#### 1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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	57.10	26.10
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	
Secondary schools	43.80	20.60
Poverty metric used	Students eligible for free and reduced-price meals.	

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

- a. *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.
- b. *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.
- c. *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.
- d. *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/rcd/BE021775/Glossary\\_of\\_Terms.pdf](http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf).
2. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
Yes	Dual language	Spanish
Yes	Two-way immersion	Spanish
Yes	Transitional bilingual programs	Spanish
Yes	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Spanish
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
Yes	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Many school corporations throughout Indiana utilize push-in instruction where students are served in the mainstream classroom, receiving instruction in English, but a teacher or instructional aide is present to provide native language support (as needed), clarification, and strategies. Several school corporations also offer high school ENL courses which count toward a portion of students' Language Arts graduation requirement. Lastly, a few school corporations offer "New Comers" programs for students who are new to the country.

**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	51,240
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

	<b>#</b>
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	49,011
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	40,018
Burmese	1,915
German	1,537
Arabic	929
Chinese	739

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' 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 (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	57,884
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	361
Total	58,245
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 1.6.3.1.1 includes all students tested including LEP students and Level 5, fluent English proficient (FEP), students needing to attain a second Level 5 score in order to enter the two-year monitoring period per Indiana state policy. The State ELP assessment, LAS Links, was administered at the end of the 2011-12 school year in February/March 2012. This results in a higher number of students than was identified in 1.6.2.1.	

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

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	13,398
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	23.15
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	55,393
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	310
Total	55,703
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. "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.	

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 AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).

	#
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.	10,311

**1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

**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 Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State 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 percent of students 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%).

Title III Results	Results	Results	Targets	Targets
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	21,803	48.36	22,085	49.00
Attained proficiency	12,707	22.94	7,201	13.00
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

**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).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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.

Language(s)
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.



**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 (MFLEP) 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
3,594	4,410	8,004
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics**

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 who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,978	S	95	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts**

In the table below, report results for 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. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
4,952	S	95	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science**

In the table below, report results for MFLEP 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 MFLEP 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. This will be automatically calculated.
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
2,002	S	77	S
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

**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	156
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	90
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	152
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	116
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	64
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	3
////////////////////////////////////	
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	13
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	4
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	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:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. 55 grantees had too few LEP students for AMAO 3 therefore determinations were based off of AMAOs 1 and 2 only.

Updated response: All LEAs that participated in a consortia are represented separately in the table

**1.6.4.2 State Accountability**

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

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

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>      </u> No
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The state progress rate is actually 70%. The discrepancy in rates is attributed to Indiana's calculation of progress. For Indiana, the numerator excludes students who previously scored their first 'level 5' (based on LAS Links). Indiana also excludes these students from the denominator. Indiana requires two 'level 5's' for the purpose of exiting from the program. The federal formula does not account for Indiana's formula difference.	
The State did not meet AMAO 3.	

**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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	___No_
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

**Note: All immigrant students are not LEP 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 only 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
6,162	1,549	3

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	972
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*.	900

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 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 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants** = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	////////////////////
Instructional strategies for LEP students	110	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	57	////////////////////
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	55	////////////////////
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	46	////////////////////
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	37	////////////////////
Other (Explain in comment box)	11	////////////////////
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	106	16,432
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	89	2,404
PD provided to principals	90	1,075
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	83	926
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	60	1,127
PD provided to community based organization personnel	19	369
Total	447	22,333

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Professional development was delivered by all subgrantees that meets the requirements of Section 3115 (c) (2). "Other" professional development activities included, but were not limited to: Information on civil rights of EL students and immigration issues affecting EL students; laws/policies that govern the EL services that are provided to students (Lau and Supplemental); Monthly meetings to discuss/analyze progress of EL students and services; Cultural Competency; EL/General Education Teacher Leader cadre.

### 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 submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

##### 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 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

<b>Date State Received Allocation</b>	<b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b>	<b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b>
07/01/11	09/23/11	83
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

#### 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.

Beginning in school year 2012-2013, Title III grants were reviewed through the Office of Grants Management, Monitoring and Reporting. This transition has resulted in more capacity to review grants in an expedited manner.
--

**1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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	300	300
LEAs with subgrants	23	23
Total	323	323
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

**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:

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42	80
K	656	827
1	671	1,023
2	649	914
3	609	826
4	542	830
5	533	804
6	439	639
7	438	577
8	373	557
9	292	416
10	317	434
11	281	389
12	347	365
Ungraded		
Total	6,189	8,681

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The count for Ungraded is ZERO. IN submitted 'ZERO' count through EDFacts file but ESS is not populating it.

**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.

	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants</b>	<b># of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants</b>
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	910	1,145
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	4,717	7,065
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	140	50
Hotels/Motels	422	421
Total	6,189	8,681

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

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

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	80
K	813
1	1,013
2	901
3	809
4	822
5	795
6	631
7	571
8	557
9	414
10	432
11	389
12	364
Ungraded	0
Total	8,591

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	352
Migratory children/youth	10
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	1,502
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	680

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

### 1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

#### 1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of enrolled homeless children and youths 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	560	406
4	568	412
5	527	347
6	427	269
7	324	185
8	314	182
High School	145	90

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State 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	563	371
4	570	360
5	527	393
6	430	284
7	324	199
8	316	194
High School	149	91

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

#### 1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science 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		
4	582	343
5		
6	449	185
7		
8		
High School	140	31

**Comments:** The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

## 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	121
K	64
1	66
2	60
3	76
4	67
5	70
6	71
7	64
8	76
9	82
10	61
11	56
12	30
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	55
Total	1,019
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 2011-2012 increased by 23.6% relative to the previous year. Much of this increase can be attributed to the integration of RealTime (RT) data into Indiana's migrant student database, Migrant Information and Data Access System (MIDAS). RT is an Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) data collection which includes information on student enrollment and attendance. All Indiana LEAs are required to submit this weekly during the regular school year.

Indiana counts all students that have resided in Indiana during the reporting period. We further breakdown those students that resided in Indiana for one day by RT matching, race, grade level, and QAD for the time period of 0-12 months, 13-24 months, 25-36 months and 37-48 months.

While Indiana's count is up from last year, we believe there were factors that contributed to not as many migrant children coming to Indiana this summer. These included an early thaw and subsequent freeze which caused berry and apple crop failures. Severe drought in the Midwest during summer 2012 affected the corn crop and lessened the number of families that came to Indiana for corn detasseling and sorting. Lastly, as in other recent years, IDOE has observed a trend toward more migrant workers in Indiana being single men or men who did not bring their family.

To further improve Indiana's Migrant Education Program, a Request for Proposal (RFP) for an Indiana Migrant Education Resource Center has been created, finalized and forwarded to the Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA) for release. The creation of a Migrant Education Resource Center will allow Indiana to increase our capacity and continue to make program improvements, specifically in the area of ID&R.

**FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013):** IDOE implemented the RealTime (RT) data collection, which is a required weekly data collection for all Indiana school corporations. RT contains information on student enrollment, attendance, days or unexcused absence, free/reduced price lunch status, dropout and mobility. RT was a data collection that was instituted fully during the 2011-2012 SY (so it was not available in 2010-2011 SY). The increase is attributed to the integration of RT, while these children were in RT and in MIDAS, they were not attending a MEP funded school and did not have a documented qualifying move during the 2011-2012 SY. From the technical aspect MIDAS included these children in the 3 year eligible student pool, but excluded them in the child count due to unknown Indiana residency for the 2011-2012 SY. MIDAS looks at current year COE's, residency verification, and grant enrollment to establish reporting year known residency. RT allows us to include children who attended an Indiana school for at least 1 day during the 2011-2012 SY as an additional residency verification step. While Indiana makes every effort possible with the recruiting staff that is in place, using RT is assisting IDOE to identify 95 additional children that attending at least 1 day of school in the state of Indiana that would allow them to be included in the Category 1 Child Count.

**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, 2011 through August 31, 2012. 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)	19
K	21
1	18
2	22
3	22
4	23
5	16
6	20
7	10
8	7
9	10
10	5
11	6
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	2
Total	204
<b>Comments:</b> The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

**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 child count for 2011-2012 increased by 12.1% relative to the previous year.

In particular, two Migrant Education Projects (MEPs) increased their enrollment by taking children from a wider geographic area. One MEP saw a significant decrease in enrollment because of failed crops and less families migrating to the area. Other projects saw normal year-to-year changes in enrollment.

To further improve Indiana's Migrant Education Program, a Request for Proposal (RFP) for an Indiana Migrant Education Resource Center has been created, finalized and forwarded to the Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA) for release. The creation of a Migrant Education Resource Center will allow Indiana to increase our capacity and continue to make program improvements, specifically in the area of ID&R.

**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.

Indiana used the Migrant Information & Data Access System (MIDAS), a proprietary database, to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child counts for this reporting period. Child counts for the last reporting period were generated using the same system.

### 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.

Data was collected from four sources to report on the CSPR: (1) Family interviews, (2) End of Project Performance Reports from Migrant Projects, (3) Information entered directly into MIDAS by Local Education Agencies (LEAs), and (4) Information reported by LEAs to Real Time.

(1) Family interviews were conducted from September 1, 2011 until August 31, 2012. These interviews were the source for demographic and move information used in determining child eligibility for the Migrant Education Program. This information was first recorded using Indiana's paper COE form, then transcribed by the original interviewer into MIDAS.

(2) The End of Project Performance Report (EPPR) is a report completed by the MEP sub-grantee at the end of each project. Indiana sub-grants for school year and/or summer projects. Questions correspond directly to CSPR data collections regarding student participation and services provided by the MEP. In 2011-12, collection and validation of EPPR data was improved relative to previous years. Questions which could be collected from other sources were eliminated. Instructions were simplified as much as possible, and the form was reformatted to improve readability. Upon receipt of the EPPRs, a Migrant Education Specialist teleconferenced with each local MEP director to carefully review the questions being asked and the information submitted. After having validated the information reported in each LEA's EPPR, the data was aggregated for report on the CSPR. For next year's reporting period, the EPPR will be reported by sub-grantees via MIDAS.

(3) LEAs with MEP Programs are required to enter enrollment and attendance data directly into MIDAS for migrant students who attend the MEP Program. This is required weekly during the duration of their MEP Program.

(4) All Indiana LEAs enter enrollment and attendance data into Real Time for all of their students. This information is submitted for the regular school year only, at least once per week during that time. Each student is assigned a unique identifier, their Student Test Number (STN). This number, also used in MIDAS, allows MIDAS to import data from Real Time.

FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013): Yes. Indiana's COE has all required data elements from the national COE. This confirmation and applicable evidence was submitted in Indiana's Corrective Actions to OME in December 2012 (please see Finding 3, Corrective Action 2).

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.

Data was collected for 9/1/2011-8/31/2012 based on eligible students within the MIDAS system. In Indiana, only permanent Migrant Specialists and temporary summer-staff recruiters (who have undergone ID&R training and are under close supervision of permanent IDOE staff) are authorized to complete a COE. Upon encountering a possible migrant child, the IDOE employee (whether permanent or temporary) conducts an interview with the child or guardian, utilizing Indiana's paper COE form. Through the family interview process, recruiters will gather the information needed to determine the students' eligibility for the MEP. The next step in the eligibility process is to fill out the COE. The COE is designed to record, on a

single form, all eligible children in a family who arrived on the same date in the state or school district where they obtained or sought employment in a qualifying agricultural or fishing activity. The paper (handwritten) COE, signed by the parent, is considered the original document. The data from each handwritten COE is transferred into MIDAS by the interviewer. Recruiters use MIDAS to document, verify and report migrant student eligibility data. Only eligible children (ages 0-21) are to be included on the COE. Recruiters are instructed to write notes in the "additional comments" section of the COE, if some of the children in a family are not eligible (including the names of the children and reason for the determination).

MIDAS is built with the capacity to run reports based on the data elements of the COE, including: family data; child data; qualifying move and work; comments for qualifying move; expected departure; additional comments; parent/guardian/spouse/worker signature; eligibility data certification.

FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013):

PROGRAM SIDE: In Indiana, only permanent Specialists and temporary summer-staff recruiters (who have undergone the

ID&R training described above and are under close supervision of permanent IDOE staff) are authorized to complete a COE.

Upon encountering a possible migrant child, the IDOE employee (whether permanent or temporary) conducts an interview with the child or guardian, utilizing Indiana's paper COE form. The IDOE employee carefully fills all information on the form, being sure to ask key eligibility questions regarding age, school completion, moves, purpose of moves, type of work, etc. Based on these responses, the recruiter determines whether he or she believes that the child qualifies for the MEP. If, at the end of the interview, the child is judged to qualify, both the recruiter and child or guardian sign the paper COE form.

Within 24 hours of the interview, the recruiter is responsible to create an electronic copy of the COE in Indiana's Migrant Information & Data Access System (MIDAS). They begin this process by carefully searching MIDAS for an existing record of each child on the COE. Recruiters are instructed to search using a minimum number of data elements, in several combinations, and account for any common variations in spelling. Additionally, MIDAS returns near-match search results (using a SOUNDEX methodology) in addition to exact matches. For example, a search for first name "Alberto" and last name "Lopez" might return results including "Alberta Lopes." STNs are not used as a criterion in this search since children who are new to Indiana do not yet have an STN and the STN is not collected in the COE interview. If a matching child is found, the new COE is attached to that child's record. If no matching child is found, the recruiter proceeds to create a new child record in MIDAS and input the COE. MIDAS requires a search to be done before a new child record can be created.

Next, the permanent SEA Specialist is responsible to review the electronic COE for uniqueness, accuracy, consistency, and whether it meets all eligibility criteria. The Specialist begins this process by first checking whether or not the children on the COE have past COE records in MIDAS. If so, no new child record has been created so there is no new risk of duplicates. If not, this being the first COE registered to that child, the Specialist conducts a search in the manner described above to prevent duplicates. Additionally, the Specialist searches for the child using MSIX to look for prior move history and to ensure successful merging of that child's information with other states' records.

If a new MIDAS student record has been created, the Specialist associates it to an STN at this point. (Summer Recruiters do not have the ability to assign or modify STNs in MIDAS.) If the newly-identified MEP student has previously enrolled at an Indiana school, his or her existing STN is used. If not, a new STN is generated.

If there is any doubt during the review process, the Specialist calls the family to confirm details on the COE. Families are called:

- o when the COE was completed by an inexperienced recruiter (approximately the first 20 COEs from each recruiter);
- o when no prior record of the family is found in MIDAS or MSIX;
- o when details of the COE are inconsistent with data found in MIDAS or MSIX;
- o or if fulfillment of the eligibility criteria seems uncertain.

Once approved by the Specialist, a COE is considered valid and the child is eligible for MEP services.

LEAs also have access to a change request process built into MIDAS. If LEAs find incorrect data regarding one of their students in MIDAS (e.g., grade level, spelling of name, date of birth), they use this process to alert the SEA.

MIDAS SIDE: From a MIDAS perspective, all STN numbers attached to student records must be unique. If a SEA representative tries to enter a duplicate STN number, MIDAS identifies them immediately. Also, the MIDAS team periodically runs a report, using SOUNDEX, to see if any recently added students have records similarly to older MIDAS records. Each record that is presented on the list is manually checked to verify that it is either the same record or unique. We verify this information using the IDOE Data Warehouse system called AppCenter as well as calls to the LEA. All records are cleaned up bi-monthly and before the MIDAS CSPR Stored Procedures execute.

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 Category 1 and Category 2 data are collected and maintained.

### 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.

Based upon the information specified in the EDFacts, MIDAS has specific stored procedures for each item in the CSPR. Each stored procedure requires two parameters: a Start Date and End Date. This information is supplied by the IDOE EDFacts Coordinator. Based upon the dates provided, the CSPR procedure runs in the following manner:

1. MIDAS gets a listing of students who had a COE within 3 years from the beginning of the reporting period, September 1 (per the specification)
  - a. MIDAS ensures that each record it receives has not been flagged for deletion or for graduation in a prior term
  - b. MIDAS ensures that the record is currently the active record (usually one per child but depending on overlapping summer and school sessions there is a possibility of two active records)
  - c. MIDAS removes duplicate children from its listing by getting only the most recent COE record of the child based upon QAD (the procedure is instructed to only choose the most recent one based upon its COEID number)
2. MIDAS looks at the individual student record to get their school corporation and school
3. MIDAS determines the maximum grade level of the student (just in case the student was between grades during this timeframe)
4. MIDAS determines Priority for Service (PFS), Limited English Proficiency (LEP), and Individual Education Plan (IEP) for the child

The above 4 items constitute the "pool" of eligible students. This "pool" of students is used for each of the 8 requirements for N121.

The reports are:

1. Report category set A, Count by Age/Grade and Race / Ethnicity. Based upon Report 6's numbers, the students are separated by grade level and by ethnicity.
2. Report category set B, Count by Age/Grade and PFS. Based upon Report 6's numbers, those students who qualify as PFS.
3. Report category set C, Count by LEP (Limited English Proficiency). Based upon Report 7's numbers, those students who are LEP
4. Report category set D, Count by IEP (Individual Educational Plan / Disability). Based upon Report 6's numbers, those students who are IEP
5. Report category set E, Student Count by Mobility Status (Qualifying Moves). Based upon Report 6's numbers, those students who have Mobility statuses of:
  - a. LQM12 (Within 12 months)
  - b. LQM13TO24 (Within previous

13 to 24 months c. LQM25TO36  
(Within previous 25 to 36 months  
d. LQM37TO48 (Within previous  
37 to 48 months

6. Report category set F, Student Count by Mobility Status (Regular School Year). This is the TOTAL count of all students that should be included during this reporting period that have resided in Indiana at least one day based upon QAD. (This will be changed in the future based upon residency date)

7. Report Subtotal 1, Subtotal by Age/Grade

8. Report Grand Total, Total by Education Unit (State) in accordance with ED Facts requirements.

Only includes children who are age 3-21:

MIDAS groups all individual children by grade level; from under 3 through out of school. The ED Facts Coordinator selects the appropriate grade levels for each requirement and enters the data into the appropriate columns on the CSPR.

Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity): When each of the MIDAS stored procedures execute, we add children that are within 3 years of their qualifying move.

```
INSERT INTO @ReportingStudents
SELECT cs.StudentID, NULL, NULL, NULL, 0, 0,
0, NULL, NULL FROM COEStudent cs WITH
(NOLOCK)
INNER JOIN COE c
WITH (NOLOCK) ON
cs.COEID = c.COEID
WHERE c.QualifyingArrivalDate >= DATEADD(year, -
3, @EndDate) AND c.QualifyingArrivalDate <=
@EndDate
AND c.IsDeleted = 0 -- Don't include deleted COEs
AND c.Reviewed_Date IS NOT NULL -- Only reviewed (valid) COEs
GROUP BY cs.StudentID
```

Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31): IDOE conducts ID&R to qualify all migrant students who reside in the state for at least one day during the reporting period. Every student who has a COE during the reporting period receives a residency only record in MIDAS. When a child is added to a MEP-funded project, they receive a project enrollment record within MIDAS. When the MIDAS stored procedure runs, it combines the residency only and MEP-funded project enrollment records. The result of this procedure gives us an unduplicated count of children who were residents in our state for at least one day.

Children who - in the case of Category 2 - received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term:

Every student who has a COE during the reporting period receives a record in MIDAS. If a child isn't associated with a grant that is active and eligible during the reporting period specified, they are not included in the count. This ensures we count only service related students in our Category 2 count.

Children once per age/grade level for each child count category:

When the MIDAS CSPR Stored Procedure executes, children are first added to a temporary table by grouping MIDAS Student ID's only. This ensures that only one student ID per child, even if they attended multiple sessions, are included in the list. Based upon the MIDAS Student ID (MSID) numbers in the temporary table, MIDAS builds out the rest of the information in the table including the child's maximum grade level during the reporting period. This ensures that we have only one child per reporting period and per grade level are counted.

FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013): To clarify, the State means that it includes children who have a COE with a QAD within the previous 3 years from the beginning of the reporting period.

The state includes children who have a COE with a QAD within the previous 3 years from the Start Date of the reporting period. To verify residency, the SEA begins on 9/1 and follows through until 10/31 with the primary focus being face to face visits with families. Beginning at the start of the school year, MIDAS collects data from RT to evaluate whether children are in an Indiana School.

All grade changes, except for children who are either in a project or in an Indiana school during the RSY (via RT), are a manual process. Due to this fact, if a child turns three (3) during the reporting period, they will not be included in our counts unless a residency verification is performed after the child turns three (3) or at the time of their next COE. Indiana realizes that this is an area we need to focus on and are currently exploring options on how to better capture these children within the MIDAS system; we have discussed the option of adding a dashboard view to the SEA side of MIDAS that would identify any child that is currently 2yrs and will be turning 3yrs old. This dashboard would update daily so that SEA recruiting staff can see this child and take action to do a verification of residency; this child will stay on the dashboard until action is taken. This will be a tracking tool that the SEA Migrant Director can use at any time to view the status of these children. Another verification tool that we have discussed if for Indiana will use MIDAS to create a monthly report that will give us an overview of children that turned 3 yrs old that month.

After a COE is completed and verified by the SEA, the student is then added to a school corporations "MEP eligible pool of children". From there the LEA selects the appropriate children who will be served through the grant. It is these children that are served that are included in the Category 2 count.

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.

There is no difference in the way Category 1 and Category 2 data are collected and maintained.

### 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.

In Indiana, only permanent Specialists and temporary summer-staff recruiters (who have undergone ID&R training and are under close supervision of permanent IDOE staff) are authorized to complete a COE.

Upon encountering a possible migrant child, the IDOE employee (whether permanent or temporary) conducts an interview with the child or guardian, utilizing Indiana's paper COE form. The IDOE employee carefully fills all information on the form, being sure to ask key eligibility questions regarding age, school completion, moves, purpose of moves, type of work, etc. Based on these responses, the recruiter determines whether he or she believes that the child qualifies for the MEP. If, at the end of the interview, the child is judged to qualify, both the recruiter and child or guardian sign the paper COE form.

Within 24 hours of the interview, the recruiter is responsible to create an electronic copy of the COE in MIDAS. They begin this process by carefully searching MIDAS for an existing record of each child on the COE. Recruiters are instructed to search using a minimum number of data elements, in several combinations, and account for any common variations in spelling. Additionally, MIDAS returns near-match search results (using a SOUNDEX methodology) in addition to exact matches. The Student Test Number (STN), Indiana's unique student identifier, is not used as a criterion in this search since children who are new to Indiana do not yet have an STN and the STN is not collected in the COE interview. If a matching child is found, the new COE is attached to that child's record. If no matching child is found, the recruiter proceeds to create a new child record in MIDAS and input the COE. MIDAS requires a search to be done before a new child record can be created.

Next, the permanent IDOE Specialist is responsible to review the electronic COE for uniqueness, accuracy, consistency, and whether it meets all eligibility criteria. The Specialist begins this process by first checking whether or not the children on the COE have past COE records in MIDAS. If so, no new child record has been created so there is no new risk of duplicates. If not, this being the first COE registered to that child, the Specialist conducts a search in the manner described above to prevent duplicates. Additionally, the Specialist searches for the child using MSIX to look for prior move history and to ensure successful merging of that child's information with other states' records.

If a new MIDAS student record has been created, the Specialist associates it to an STN at this point. (Summer Recruiters do not have the ability to assign or modify STNs in MIDAS.) If the newly-minted MEP student has previously enrolled at an Indiana school, his or her existing STN is used. If not, a new STN is generated.

If there is any doubt during the review process, the Specialist calls the family to confirm details on the COE. Families are called:

- when the COE was completed by an inexperienced recruiter (approximately the first 20 COEs from each recruiter);
- when no prior record of the family is found in MIDAS or MSIX;
- when details of the COE are inconsistent with data found in MIDAS or MSIX; or
- if fulfillment of the eligibility criteria seems uncertain.

Once approved by the Specialist, a COE is considered valid and the child is eligible for MEP services.

FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013): Indiana uses the following best practices listed in the rating instrument:

- The SEA uses the national Certificate of Eligibility (COE) nationwide (per December 2012 Corrective Actions, Indiana's COE has been updated to reflect all data elements)
- Student eligibility is based on a personal interview with a parent, guardian or other responsible adult or youth-as-worker
- The SEA train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.
- The SEA has formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information (e.g. COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewers(s))
- Incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs are returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification
- The SEA provides recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g. a handbook)

- The SEA reviews eligibility documentation as part of regular monitoring
- The SEA reviews student attendance at summer/inter-session projects
- The SEA has both local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions (note: state-only, as recruiters are hired at the SEA level)
- The SEA periodically evaluates the effectiveness of recruitment efforts and revises procedures
- Written procedures are provided to summer/inter-session personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and attendance data
- Records/data entry personnel are provided training at least annually on how to review summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes

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.

Indiana's re-interview process was conducted with the goal of successfully re-interviewing 50 children who had been qualified for participation in Indiana's Migrant Education Program. IDOE designed its re-interview process on the basis of OME's Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing.

The process was conducted in 3 successive "Batches", with the goal of re-interviewing children soon after their initial interview to achieve a higher success rate in re-finding the families. Since Indiana is a summer-impacted state with a highly mobile migrant population, it is common for families to stay only a few weeks. Based on child counts and re-interview response rates from prior years, it was determined that 11% of children interviewed during the reporting period would be targeted for re-interview. All temporary and permanent IDOE employees who completed a COE during the reporting period had at least one of their eligibility determinations audited through this process.

IDOE conducted the process as follows: (1) Determine the children who have been interviewed during the Batch date range. (2) Randomly choose a desired number of children from that list, using a computer function. (3) Choose an recruiter

- different from the original interviewer - to re-interview the family of each child chosen and record the result of each attempted interview on a paper form.

Batch 1 was chosen on July 16 and included interviews up to July 15. 48 children were chosen for re-interview, with each child having an 11% chance of being chosen. Of those, 29 children were successfully re-interviewed and all of them were found to be eligible.

Batch 2 included interviews from July 16 to August 15. 36 children were chosen for re-interview, with each child having an 11% chance of being chosen. Of those, 28 children were successfully re-interviewed and all of them were found to be eligible.

Batch 3 included interviews from August 16 to August 31. 11 children were chosen for re-interview, with each child having an 11% chance of being chosen. Of those, 8 children were successfully re-interviewed and all of them were found to be eligible.

In total, 95 eligibility determinations were sampled, 65 tests were completed, and 65 were found eligible. The number of tests completed was higher than the target of 50 because IDOE achieved a higher than expected response rate for Batches 2 and 3. IDOE continued conducting re-interviews after reaching 50 in order to give all children an equal chance of being re-interviewed.

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.

In Indiana, only permanent Specialists and temporary summer-staff recruiters (who have undergone ID&R training and are under close supervision of permanent IDOE staff) are authorized to complete a COE.

Upon encountering a possible migrant child, the IDOE employee (whether permanent or temporary) conducts an interview with the child or guardian, utilizing Indiana's paper COE form. The IDOE employee carefully fills all information on the form, being sure to ask key eligibility questions regarding age, school completion, moves, purpose of moves, type of work, etc. Based on these responses, the recruiter determines whether he or she believes that the child qualifies for the MEP. If, at the end of the interview, the child is judged to qualify, both the recruiter and child or guardian sign the paper COE form.

Within

24 hours of the interview, the recruiter is responsible to create an electronic copy of the COE.

Next, the permanent IDOE Specialist is responsible to review the electronic COE for uniqueness, accuracy, consistency, and whether it meets all eligibility criteria. The Specialist begins this process by first checking whether or not the children on the COE have past COE records in MIDAS. If so, no new child record has been created so there is no new risk of duplicates. If not, this being the first COE registered to that child, the Specialist conducts a search in the manner described above to prevent duplicates. Additionally, the Specialist searches for the child using MSIX to look for prior move history and to ensure successful merging of that child's information with other states' records.

If a new MIDAS student record has been created, the Specialist associates it to an STN at this point. (Summer Recruiters do not have the ability to assign or modify STNs in MIDAS.) If the newly-minted MEP student has previously enrolled at an Indiana school, his or her existing STN is used. If not, a new STN is generated.

If there is any doubt during the review process, the Specialist calls the family to confirm details on the COE. Families are called:

- when the COE was completed by an inexperienced recruiter (approximately the first 20 COEs from each recruiter);
- when no prior record of the family is found in MIDAS or MSIX;
- when details of the COE are inconsistent with data found in MIDAS or MSIX; or
- if fulfillment of the eligibility criteria seems uncertain.

Once approved by the Specialist, a COE is considered valid and the child is eligible for MEP services.

**FOLLOW-UP RESPONSE (2/27/2013):** Please see 1.10.3.2 regarding the steps that are taken to ensure child count data is inputted and updated accurately.

Recruiting and entering of COEs is a responsibility held at the SEA level. Therefore, only full-time SEA staff and temporary summer staff are able to input COE information for a student. The state has written procedures/instructions in the MIDAS handbook, as well as short video tutorials for temporary summer staff on common questions they may encounter. In addition, the SEA also has a MIDAS user manual for LEAs, as well as video tutorials. The full-time SEA recruiter also provides significant one-on-one technical assistance to LEA Records Clerks in regards to using the MIDAS system.

There is a display of eligible pool of students provided in MIDAS for MEP-funded school corporations of students that are eligible and attending their school corporation. When a COE has been created and reviewed by the MEP Specialist and deemed eligible, the student is then added to the eligible pool of students. A school can then review individual student records and if there is a discrepancy in the records, schools have the ability to submit a "change of information" form.

IDOE conducts prospective re-interviews as described in OME's Technical Assistance Guide on Re-interviewing. In accordance with this manual and based on the size of Indiana's child count, Indiana uses a sample size of 50 children. This results in several COEs from each Specialist and Recruiter being audited. Recruiters are aware of this process and are conscious of the fact that their work will be audit. In 2011, the last time that Indiana contracted an outside organization to conduct its prospective re-interviews, zero cases of improper eligibility determinations were found. Indiana follows the regulations in regards to having an independent re-interviewer conduct re-interviews at least every three years.

The state does perform routine audits of child count for CSPR for Category I and Category II counts, SEA staff performs weekly audits of attendance reports to ensure there are no discrepancies between the LEA and the SEA . At the end of each grant period there is a report that is completed by the LEA - End of Project Performance Report and then is verified by the SEA staff for data accuracy.

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.

When Category 1 and 2 counts are ready to be ran, the MIDAS developer ensures that the IDOE's ED Facts Coordinator has the proper procedure for running the counts. After the counts are ran, the ED Facts Coordinator provides the MIDAS Developer and Business Analyst with the results for review. After review, the numbers are then shared with the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education. If any discrepancies arise during the process, the procedure/logic is re-verified by the MIDAS Developer and Business Analyst and if necessary, ran again.

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.

Indiana's prospective re-interviewing process did not find errors in eligibility determinations for the 2011-2012 reporting period. IDOE believes this is due, in part, to initial follow-up calls made to families by the Specialist at the time of COE review any time there is uncertainty about an eligibility determination. Moving forward, the creation of an Indiana Migrant Resource Center will ensure there is sufficient capacity and full-time, year-round recruiters to perform prospective re-interviewing throughout the course of the year.

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.

IDOE currently has a full-time MIDAS Developer and Business Analyst, as well as a Project Manager that oversees the process; because of the daily interaction that these individuals have with the MIDAS system and numbers, IDOE is confident that the Category 1 and 2 counts are correct.

IDOE verifies the student information fed into MIDAS with each LEA who had a MEP at the end of the project period. This was done to verify that the reported student count was unduplicated and matched with the entry into MIDAS.

Additionally, for all non-MEP funded school projects, the school enrollment of migrant students was captured via RT data submissions. These were validated with the COE records of the students in MIDAS and the STN of the students to eliminate any duplicates. Further, our developer checked the RT records for duplicate entries by running a battery of tests.

The EDFacts Coordinator ran procedures to get the child counts for the CSPR submissions. These child counts were matched with the child counts obtained by running procedures by our developer. There were no discrepancies that were found.

We are also confident in the eligibility determination criteria that are being followed. It involves detailed interviews with the families to determine migrant lifestyle, ages of the children and asking questions about QAD, etc. The information collected is put on a paper COE which is inputted into MIDAS and verified by the MEP staff at IDOE for each and every COE. MIDAS has a set of procedures in place to verify that each child record of the child count reported meets all the eligibility criteria that are specified in EDFacts