Application for Funding
for Phase II of the Education Fund under the
State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Program

CFDA Number: 84.394

U.S. Department of Education

Washington, D.C. 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0695
Expiration Date: 05/31/2010

Paperwork Burden Statement

NOTE: OMB Control Number forthcoming.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPLICATION FOR FUNDING FOR PHASE II OF THE EDUCATION FUND UNDER THE STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION PROGRAM

Purpose of Program

The State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF or Stabilization) program provides approximately $48.6 billion in formula grants to States to help stabilize State and local budgets in order to minimize and avoid reductions in education and other essential services, in exchange for a State's commitment to advance essential education reform in key areas. Almost $36.8 billion have already been awarded during SFSF Phase I. Approximately $11.5 billion will be awarded under SFSF Phase II (through this application).

Program and Application Background

Section 14005(d) of Division A of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide assurances in four key areas of education reform: (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution, (b) improving collection and use of data, (c) standards and assessments, and (d) supporting struggling schools. For each area of reform, the ARRA prescribes specific action(s) that the State must assure that it will implement. In addition, section 14005(a) of the ARRA requires a State that receives funds under the Stabilization program to submit an application to the U.S. Department of Education (the Department) containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

As part of its application for Phase II funding under the Stabilization program, a State must demonstrate its ability to meet specific data and information requirements (the assurance indicators and descriptors) with respect to the statutory assurances. In addition, in cases where a State is not currently able to meet the specific data and information requirements, a State must submit a State plan to describe how it will respond to the requirements of each assurance indicator and descriptor. Together, these two sets of requirements aim to provide transparency on the extent to which a State is implementing the actions for which it has provided assurances.

Increased access to and focus on this information will better enable States and other stakeholders to identify strengths and weaknesses in education systems and determine where concentrated reform effort is warranted. The Department will also use the data and information that States collect and report in assessing whether a State is qualified to participate in and receive funds under other reform-oriented programs administered by the Department.

An assurance indicator or descriptor may relate to data or other information that States currently collect and report to the Department, or to data or other information for which the Department is itself the source. In those cases, there are no new data or information collection requirements for a State; rather, the Department will provide the State with the relevant data or other information that the State will be required to confirm and make publicly available. In the other cases, requirements constitute new data or information collection and/or public reporting responsibilities for the State, to the extent the State does not currently collect and publicly report such data or information for other purposes.

The Department recognizes that requests for data and information should reflect an integrated and coordinated approach among the various programs supported with ARRA funds, particularly the SFSF, Race to the Top, School Improvement, and Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant programs. Accordingly, the Department has taken into consideration the context of those other programs in developing the requirements for SFSF Phase II.

Background Information on Assurances

Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

Regarding education reform area (a), achieving equity in teacher distribution, section 14005(d)(2) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to assure that it will take actions to improve teacher effectiveness and comply with section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA) (20 U.S.C. 6311), in order to address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high- and low-poverty schools and to ensure that low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers. A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the extent to which students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; on steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; on how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how the results of those evaluations are used for decisions regarding compensation, promotion, retention, and removal; and on the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Improving Collection and Use of Data

Regarding education reform area (b), improving collection and use of data, section 14005(d)(3) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide an assurance that it will establish a statewide longitudinal data system that includes the elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871). To provide indicators of the extent to which a State is meeting that requirement, the State must provide information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system and on whether the State provides teachers with: (1) data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and (2) reports of teacher impact on student achievement.

Standards and Assessments

Regarding education reform area (c), standards and assessments, section 14005(d)(4) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to assure that it will: (A) enhance the quality of the academic assessments it administers pursuant to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311) through activities such as those described in section 6112(a) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7301a); (B) comply with the requirements of paragraphs (3)(C)(ix) and (6) of section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311) and section 612(a)(16) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1412) related to the inclusion of children with disabilities and limited English proficient students in State assessments, the development of valid and reliable assessments for those students, and the provision of accommodations that enable their participation in State assessments; and (C) take steps to improve State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards for secondary schools consistent with section 6401(e)(1)(A)(ii) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871). To provide indicators of the extent to which a State is taking these actions, the State must collect and publicly report data and other information regarding State assessment systems, including the assessment of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students, the public reporting of State National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data, and data on the number of students who graduate from high school, enroll in an Institute of Higher Education (IHE) (whether public or private, in-state or out-of-state), and complete at least one year of coursework (towards a degree) within two years of enrollment in a public in-state IHE.

As States prepare to significantly improve the rigor and effectiveness of their standards and assessment systems, this information will, in general, provide stakeholders with vital transparency on the current status of those systems and on the efforts to improve them that are currently underway.

Supporting Struggling Schools

Regarding education reform area (d), supporting struggling schools, section 14005(d)(5) of the ARRA requires a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program to provide an assurance that it will ensure compliance with the requirements of section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv) and section 1116(b)(8)(B) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6316) with respect to Title I schools identified for corrective action and restructuring. In order to provide indicators of the extent to which a State is implementing the statutory assurance, the State must provide data on the extent to which dramatic reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in Title I schools in improvement under section 1116(b)(1)(A) of the ESEA, in corrective action, or in restructuring and secondary schools that are Title I eligible, but not receiving funds. Additionally, a State must provide data on the operation and performance of its charter schools.

Requirements for Phase I Funding

Earlier this year, States applied to receive their initial allocation under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (Stabilization) program. States with approved applications were awarded at least 67 percent of their Education Fund allocation and all of their Government Services Fund Allocation. Governors submitted assurances that their State would commit to advancing education reform in the four assurance areas, and confirmed baseline data for purposes of demonstrating the State's current status in each of the four education reform areas for which the State provided assurances, or submitted alternative baseline data. In addition, to receive SFSF Phase I funds, States provided maintenance of effort (MOE) information (see Part 2 of this application for more information), including an assurance that the State would comply with the Stabilization program MOE requirements (or, if applicable, an assurance that the State met or would meet the eligibility criterion for a waiver of those requirements), as well as MOE baseline data.[1] States were also required to describe how they intended to use the funds allocated under (1) the Education Stabilization Fund and (2) the Government Services Fund, in addition to submitting accountability, transparency and reporting assurances.

[1] Guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and MOE Waiver Form are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

About the Application for Phase II Funding

States requesting the remainder of their State Fiscal Stabilization Fund monies—in most cases, the remaining 33 percent of the Education Fund allocation[2]—must complete and submit the application contained in this packet in its entirety. To receive funding, applications will need to meet standards of both completeness and quality. The Department will employ a two-tier review process to evaluate State applications. The first review will verify that a State submitted a complete Phase II application. The second review will judge the application against the approval criteria identified in the NFR to assess the quality of the plan.

The Department is taking steps to ensure that the process for awarding SFSF Phase II funds is transparent. Immediately upon the Department's receipt of a State application, the application will be made available for public viewing on the Department's web site at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/index.html. The final approved version of a state application will also be posted on the Department's web site in addition to any revisions subsequent to an approved application. In addition to facilitating transparency, the Department's public sharing of applications will allow members of the public to learn about the availability of data and information related to the four assurance areas in each state. Also, such a level of transparency provides an additional layer of accountability for States.

Data Collection

This application asks States to answer questions about 37 separate items: indicators (of which there are 34) and descriptors (of which there are three). The Department is, as a general rule, *not asking States to submit the actual data* that respond to these indicators and descriptors; rather, the Department wants to know how States will respond to the requirements of the indicators and descriptors and make the data and information accessible to the public. Specifically, for assurances (a), (c), and (d) (with the exception of, in some cases, indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), the application requests a response as to whether or not States are collecting and publicly reporting the data or information via a State website for each indicator and descriptor. If the State is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the data for a particular indicator or descriptor, the Department also is requesting the State's plan for doing so as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011. In the case of indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), if a State will develop, but not implement, the capacity to collect and publicly report the data, the State plan need only address the development of capacity, and not implementation and public reporting for the relevant indicator (s). For indicators (b)(1) and (b)(2), a State must specify whether or not the State collects the information, and if not, what its plans and timelines are for developing and implementing the capacity to do so as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011. For indicator (b)(3), a State must specify whether or not the State collects the information, and, if not, what its plan and timeline are for developing and implementing the capacity to implement this requirement.

[2] If a State's FY 2009 shortfall exceeded 67 percent of the Education Fund allocation, they could request an amount equal to the needed restoration amount, up to 90 percent of the State's total Education Fund allocation.

Public Reporting on a State Website

For the purposes of this program, indicator and descriptor data are largely intended for public use, rather than for Federal reporting. Individual States and communities have the greatest power to hold their schools accountable for the reforms that are in the best interest of their students. Rather than the Department collecting and warehousing this information, it is the intention that State Education Agencies (SEAs) and Local Education Agencies (LEAs) will make the information available to the public in a manner that is useful for stakeholders to understand key information about education in each state and community.

As such, the Department believes that the most effective and expeditious way for States to share information with the public is via the internet. For the purposes of this program, *publicly report* means that the data or information required for an indicator or descriptor are made available to anyone with access to an Internet connection without having to submit a request to the entity that maintains the data and information in order to access that data and information. Therefore, States are required to maintain a public website that provides the data and information that are responsive to the indicator and descriptor requirements. If a State does not currently provide the required data or information, it must provide on this website its plan with respect to the indicator or descriptor and its reports on its progress in implementing that plan.

The URLs (i.e., website addresses) where the data and information are available should be provided where requested in Part 3A of the application. URLs should link to the actual page where the data are available, rather than the main page of the website. Websites where the required data and information are available should show the last date on which the data and information were updated. For example, the URL should not link to the main page for an SEA or Governor's office. For further information on public reporting and website submission, please refer to SFSF Phase II guidance.

Preparing the Application

The Department strongly recommends that States involve parents, educators, content experts, policy makers, technical advisors, teachers' union(s), business, community, and civil rights leaders, and other community stakeholders when preparing the application. While such involvement is not a requirement for approval of State applications, the Department believes that stakeholder input and expertise will help States develop stronger applications and more successful implementation strategies.

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

To receive the remaining portion of a State's allocation under Education Fund of the Stabilization program, a Governor must submit to the Department an application that provides the following information:

- A completed application cover sheet that includes the signature of the Governor or authorized representative *(Part 1 of the Application).*
- A complete updated and/or reaffirmation of Maintenance-of-Effort (MOE) data *(Part 2A of the Application).*
- An attestation that the State has met all MOE requirements for FY 2009 that includes the signature of the Governor or authorized representative, or acknowledgement of inability to meet MOE requirements *(Part 2B of the Application).*
- The State's status with regard to collection, public reporting and other information related to the indictors and descriptors in the following education reform assurance areas:
  (a) achieving equity in teacher distribution;
  (b) improving collection and use of data;
  (c) standards and assessments; and
  (d) supporting struggling schools *(Part 3A of the Application).*
- A completed State plan that describes how the applicant will collect and publicly report the data and information related to the assurance indicators and descriptors *(Part 3B of the Application).*
- Complete responses to the questions in the General Requirements section *(Part 3C of the Application).*

STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND PHASE II APPLICATION

PART 1: APPLICATION COVER SHEET

(CFDA No. 84.394)

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor): Office of the Governor, Indiana	Applicant's Mailing Address: Office of Governor Mitch Daniels 200 West Washington Street Room 206 Indianapolis, IN 46204
State Contact for the Education Stabilization Fund Name: Chris Ruhl Position and Office: Director, Indiana State Budget Agency Contact's Mailing Address: Chris Ruhl, Director Indiana State Budget Agency 200 West Washington Street State House Room 212 Indianapolis, IN 46204Telephone: (317) 232-5617 Fax: (317) 233-3323 E-mail address: cruhl@omb.in.gov	
To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.	
Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Governor Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr. CHRISTOPHER A. RUHL FOR GOV. DANIELS	Telephone: (317)232-4567
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: X	Date: 3/17/2010
Recommended Statement of Support from the Chief State School Officer *(Optional)*: The State educational agency will cooperate with the Governor in the implementation of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program.	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Tony Bennett, Superintendent of Public Instruction	Telephone: (317) 232-6610
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: X	Date: 3/17/2010

Form Approved OMB Number: 1810-0695; Expiration Date: 05/31/2010

PART 2: MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT INFORMATION

In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit the following in order to receive the first portion of funds:

- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance* (Part 4, Section A) of maintaining State support for elementary and secondary education and for public institutions of higher education (IHEs) at least at the level of such support in FY 2006 for FYs 2009, 2010, and 2011.
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Waiver Assurance* (Part 4, Section B). In the event that a State anticipated being unable to comply with one or more of the Stabilization program MOE requirements referenced in the Maintenance-of-Effort Assurance, the State would provide an assurance that it met the eligibility criteria for a MOE waiver.[3]
- A *Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data* form.

In order to complete this Phase II Application, States must reaffirm and/or update the MOE baseline data referenced above as requested in Phase I. Part 2A of this application, *Update of Maintenance-of-Effort Data*, asks that a State reaffirm or update the baseline data provided in Phase I (Maintenance-of-Effort Baseline Data), including actual levels of support for FY 2009.

In Part 2B, a Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor must provide an attestation that the State has met the MOE requirements as was assured in Phase I. If a State cannot meet the MOE requirements, it must submit a Waiver of MOE Requirements or note that it has submitted one already.

Additional information on the MOE requirements can be found in Appendix D—*Instructions for Part 2, Maintenance-Of-Effort.*

[3] Guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and MOE Waiver Form are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

PART 2A: UPDATE OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT DATA

SPECIAL NOTES:

- In the SFSF Phase I Application, States were required to submit MOE data. The Department is requesting that States reaffirm these data for Phase II, and in particular, to update FY 2009 data to actual levels of State support.
- *For further information, see* Appendix D – Instructions for Part 2: Maintenance of Effort.

1. **Levels of State support for elementary and secondary education** *(the amounts may reflect the levels of State support on either an aggregate basis or a per-student basis):*

   FY 2006 **$_3,754,700,000__**

   FY 2009 **$_5,829,900,000__**

   FY 2010* **$_6,548,900,000__**

   FY 2011* **$_6,568,500,000__**

   (* Provide data to the extent that data are currently available.)

2. **Levels of State support for public institutions of higher education** *(enter amounts for each year)*:

   FY 2006 **$_1,241,612,139*_**

   FY 2009 **$_1,309,288,634__**

   FY 2010* **$_1,271,513,104__**

   FY 2011* **$_1,268,164,793__**

*Please note the Levels of State support for public institutions of higher education for FY06 has been revised. The previous application included $4,975,000 in capital funds that were inadvertently included.

3. **Additional Submission Requirements**: In an attachment to the application –

(a) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education; - and –

For 2008 and 2009, the tuition support distribution formula found in the Indiana As Passed budget was used. The formulas are written and limited by State appropriations on a calendar year basis.

The Indiana school funding formula can be found at IC 20-43 and is addressed every two years by the Indiana General Assembly. See IC 20-43-2-2 as amended by Section 329 HEA 1001-2009(ss). For CY 2010 and CY 2011, the tuition support caps were used as adopted by the Indiana General Assembly. The Indiana General Assembly revised the CY 2009 tuition support cap in HB 1001-2009(ss).

Indiana has a per student foundation based school funding formula. Foundation is currently set at $4,825 per student. The Foundation amount is increased on a corporation basis via a complexity index factor based on students on free or reduced price lunch. This amount per student is then multiplied by the adjusted student count for a school corporation. There are over 300 school corporations in Indiana, each with a different complexity index. For 2010, foundation is set at $4,550. However, the restoration portion of the formula created a minimum guarantee that limits the increase/decrease to $25 per student.

(b) Identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of State support for public IHEs.

For FY 2008 and FY 2009 the Indiana As Passed budget was used to determine State Support for IHEs. For FY 2010 and FY 2011 HEA 1001(ss) was used to determine State Support for IHEs.

PART 2B: ATTESTATION OF MAINTENANCE-OF-EFFORT COMPLIANCE

The Governor or his/her authorized representative attests to the following:

To the best of his/her knowledge and based on the best available data, the State has met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 (check all that apply):

☒ for elementary and secondary education.

☒ for public Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs).

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Governor Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.	
Signature:	Date:

If a State has not met or cannot meet MOE for either elementary and secondary education or public IHEs, or both, it must complete the following:

The State has not met all maintenance-of-effort requirements for the State Fiscal Stabilization Program for FY 2009 and

(check one):

☐ has already submitted a MOE Waiver Request to the US Department of Education.

☐ is submitting a MOE Waiver Request with this application package.

PART 3: DATA COLLECTION, PUBLIC REPORTING, AND PLANNING

Requirements

The State plan must describe the State's current ability to collect the data or other information needed for the assurance indicators and descriptors as well as the State's current ability to publicly report (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, included here as Appendix E) the data. If the State is currently able to fully collect and publicly report the required data or other information, the State must provide a URL where the most recent data or information may be accessed. If a State is not currently able to collect or publicly report the data or other information, the plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to do so as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011. These requirements apply to the assurance indicators and descriptors in the following education reform assurance areas: (a) Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution, (c) Standards and Assessments (with the exception, in many cases, of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d) Supporting Struggling Schools. Sections related to these assurances are located in sections I, III, and IV of Part 3A and Section I of Part 3B in the application.

In the event that a State will develop, but not implement, the ability to fully collect and publicly report the data for Indicator(s) (c)(11) and/or (c)(12), its plan need not meet the requirements of Section I of Part 3B. Rather, a State should complete a plan that meets the requirements of Section V of Part 3B for the relevant indicator(s). If a State will be able to both develop and implement collection and public reporting of either of these indicators, the plan requirements of Section I of Part 3B will apply to the relevant indicator(s).

Regarding education reform assurance area (b) Improving Collection and Use of Data, the State must describe in the State plan whether the State's data system includes the required elements of a statewide longitudinal data system and whether the State provides teachers with their students' growth data and information related to individual teacher impact. If the State does not meet the requirement, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to meet the requirement in accordance with the requirements in the notice. Sections related to this assurance are Section II of Part 3A and Sections II, III, and IV of Part 3B.

The data or information needed for an assurance indicator or descriptor are in some cases already reported to the Department by the State, or are provided by the Department. In those cases, it is understood that the State does and is currently able to collect the data or information. For those elements, the State's plan only needs to address the State's ability to publicly report the data or information, and the State does not need to include a plan for collecting the data or information in Part 3B. The indicators and descriptors involving data or information currently reported to the Department or provided by the Department are marked below with a Confirm icon (see Icon Key below). Sections requiring States to confirm data or information already reported to the Department contain specific links to the appropriate Department webpage. The overall webpage housing all information for indicators requiring confirmation is http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/confirm-indicators.html.

Some elements in this application are of a cross-cutting nature, sharing indicators and/or definitions with another Recovery Act initiative, Race to the Top. These elements are marked by a Cross-Cutting icon with the recovery.gov logo and the Race to the Top logo (see Icon Key below). It is the Department's hope that marking these cross-cutting elements will facilitate consistency and improve the ease of completing the application for the Race to the Top program.

Icon Key

Confirm Icons

Cross-Cutting Icon

Numbering of Fields

Applicants may notice small numbers to the left of checkboxes and text fields in Part 3A. These numbers do not have any significance in terms of point values or codes. Rather, they are designed to be used by both applicants and Department staff alike as a convenient reference point when referring to a particular part of the application.

Overview of Part 3

Part 3A, *Indicators and Descriptors under the Assurances*, is designed to collect short answers about the State's current status with respect to each indicator and descriptor. If you are using the macro-enabled[4] MS Word version of this form, you will be able to check boxes and type your answers directly into the form. If you wish to attach narrative answers in a separate document, you may do so, but be sure to clearly note in the relevant text box that the response is attached and mark the attachment with the citation of the indicator or descriptor to which you are responding.

[4] To enable macros in Microsoft Word, select Save As (if you are using the 2007 version, Save As is under the round icon in the top left hand corner; in older versions, Save As is under the File menu) and from the Save File as Type menu, select Word Macro-Enabled Document.

Part 3B is the *State Plan* section. For those indicators and descriptors for which the State is not currently collecting and/or publicly reporting the requested data and information in such a way that addresses the program requirements, you must provide a plan for doing so in Part 3B. If, based on your answer, you are directed to address the element in Part 3B, write the element reference in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B to keep a running list of the items you will need to address in your State Plan. Directions for which elements must be addressed in the State Plan are embedded into each indicator and descriptor boxes below. Part 3B contains five subsections. The subsections provide separate instructions for the plan elements that must be included for:

I. Assurances (a), (c) (with the exception of Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)), and (d);
II. Indicator (b)(1);
III. Indicator (b)(2);
IV. Indicator (b)(3); and,
V. If applicable, Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12) (Section V).

PART 3A: ASSURANCE INDICATORS AND DESCRIPTORS

Instructions

For each indicator and descriptor, please follow the specific directions in the boxes below. There are two basic types of elements: indicators and descriptors.

- An **indicator** requests a discrete response (e.g., a yes/no answer or short answer) about whether a State is collecting or publicly reporting certain information, as well as where the information can be found. Indicators that involve data already submitted by States to the Department through preexisting collections will only need to be confirmed. The Department will ask States to confirm whether or not these data are accurate and to verify public reporting of them. States need not submit the actual data for each indicator; rather, the data should be reported directly to the public per the application instructions.
- A **descriptor** asks about information which could be provided in a narrative response (e.g., about the development of a type of assessment or teacher evaluation system) about the progress or development of system elements. The Department of Education also asks whether information requested in descriptors is publicly reported. As with the indicators, States do not have to submit the actual descriptor information to the Department. Rather, the State must publicly report the information per the application instructions.

I. Assurance (a): Achieving Equity in Teacher Distribution

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on: (1) the extent that students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; (2) the extent that current strategies and efforts to address inequities in the distribution of inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; (3) how teacher and principal performance is evaluated and how performance ratings are used; and (4) the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals.

Indicator (a)(1)	Confirm, for the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified consistent with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA).	Confirm

Please respond (Yes or No): Are the data related to this indicator at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-a1.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] http://www.doe.in.gov/hqt Click on "2008-2009 Highly Qualified Teacher Breakdown."

Please respond (check only one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *annually* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the data are provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.doe.in.gov/hqt

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

8 ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(2) **Confirm whether the State's Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).** Confirm

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the State's Teacher Equity Plan located at http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/hqtplans/index.html correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

→ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the State's most updated Teacher Equity Plan. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] http://www.doe.in.gov/hqt

Please respond (check only one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *annually* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the information is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.doe.in.gov/hqt

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but updates it *less than annually*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 2B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating the information annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 4B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(1)	Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of teachers in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(3)	**Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.**

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State request information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of teachers includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: 5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(4)	**Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level.**

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(5) **Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA.**

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column. Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (a)(2)	Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State collect a description of the manner in which each LEA uses the results of the evaluation systems described above related to the performance of principals in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal?

[8] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[9] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[10] Click here to enter text.

[11] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information are provided by the State to the public: [12] Click here to enter text.

[13] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[14] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (a)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(6)	Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect information on whether the system each LEA uses to evaluate the performance of principals includes student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates it *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates it *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (a)(7)	Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect and publicly report, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage of principals rated at each performance rating or level?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☒ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating the data annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (a)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

II. Assurance (b): Improving Collection and Use of Data

A State must collect and publicly report information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system, on whether teachers receive data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and on whether the State provides teachers with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement.

Indicator (b)(1) **Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.**

Race to the Top

Instructions: Please indicate which of the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(1) A unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #1 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(2) Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #2 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(3) Student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete pre-K through postsecondary education programs?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #3 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

4) The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #4 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(5) An audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #5 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For pre-K through grade 12 education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(6) Yearly State assessment records of individual students?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #6 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(7) Information on students not tested, by grade and subject?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #7 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(8) A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #8 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(9) Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned?

☐ Yes.
X No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #9 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(10) Student-level college readiness test scores?

X Yes.
☐ No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #10 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Please respond (check Yes or No): For postsecondary education, does the State's statewide longitudinal data system include the following elements:

(11) Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework?

☐ Yes.
X No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #11 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

(12) Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education?

☐ Yes.
X No. Provide a plan for including this element in your statewide longitudinal data system in Part 3B. Cite #12 in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section II.

Indicator (b)(2)	Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section III, check "Not Applicable."

X No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section III.

Indicator (b)(3)	Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments?

☐ Yes. You are not required to provide further information. In Part 3B, Section IV, check "Not Applicable."

X No. Provide a plan for providing this information to teachers in Part 3B, Section IV.

III. Assurance (c): Standards and Assessments

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on whether students are provided high-quality State assessments; whether students with disabilities and limited English proficient students are included in State assessment systems; whether the State makes information available regarding student academic performance in the State compared to the academic performance of students in other States; and on the extent to which students graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma and continue on to pursue a college education.

Indicator (c)(1)	Confirm the approval status, as determined by the Department, of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA with respect to reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments.

Please respond (check one): Is the status of the Department's approval, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

→ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.doe.in.gov/esea/welcome.html

☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date.*

→ If checked, provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(2) **Confirm whether the State has developed and implemented valid and reliable alternate assessments for students with disabilities that are approved by the Department.**

Confirm

Please respond (Yes or No): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the status is correct.

→ [2] ☐ No, the status is not correct. If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the status information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the status is provided by the State to the public:[5] http://www.doe.in.gov/esea/welcome.html

[6] ☐ The State makes the status information *publicly available* on a website and *does not keep it up-to-date*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the status information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the status publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(3) **Confirm whether the State's alternate assessments for students with disabilities, if approved by the Department, are based on grade-level, modified, or alternate academic achievement standards.**

Confirm

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any other supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient: [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available: [5] https://ican.doe.state.in.us/beta/istarinfo.htm

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available: [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(4)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State, within the last two years, completed an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

[1] ☐ Yes, this has been completed within the last two years.

[2] ☐ No, this has been completed, but it occurred more than two years ago.

[3] ☒ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5]

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(5) **Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.**

Confirm

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5]
http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/aypstate.cfm?year=2008

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of students with disabilities who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c5m.xls , are correct?

[9] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

→ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13]
http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/aypstate.cfm?year=2008

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of students with disabilities on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(6)	Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Please respond (check one): Has the State completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments?

1 ☐ Yes, this was completed within the last two years.

2 ☐ No, this was completed more than two years ago.

3 ☒ No, this has never been completed.

Please respond (check one):

4 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5]

6 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

8 ☒ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(7) **Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department.**

Confirm

Please respond (check one): Is the information related to this indicator, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c1.xls, correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the information is correct.

[2] ☐ No, the information is not correct.

→ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct information and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one): Is the State's current status available on the State's website?

[4] ☒ The State makes the information *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[5]
http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code/title1/ar2/ch10.pdf

[6] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(8)	Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments.	Confirm

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *reading/language arts* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8r.xls , are correct?

[1] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

→ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/aypstate.cfm?year=2008

[6] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date.*

→ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *reading/language arts publicly available* on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please respond (check one): Can the State confirm that the number and percentage of limited English proficient students who are included in State *mathematics* assessments, available at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-c8m.xls , are correct?

[9] ☒ Yes, the data are correct.

[10] ☐ No, the data are not correct.

➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
[11] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[12] ☒ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[13]
http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/aypstate.cfm?year=2008

[14] ☐ The State makes the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date.*

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[15] Click here to enter text.

[16] ☐ The State does not make the data relative to the inclusion of limited English proficient students on State assessments in *mathematics* publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(9) **Confirm that the State's annual State Report Card (under section 1111(h)(1) of the ESEA) contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results as required by 34 CFR 200.11(c).**

Confirm

Please respond (check one): Does the State Report Card include the most recent available State reading and math National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results?

☒ Yes, the State Report Card includes this information.

☐ No, the State Report Card does not include this information.

➔ If checked, please provide a plan for including this information on the State Report Card in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I, and mark the Public Reporting column.

Please supply the following information:

Please attach the State Report Card or provide the URL where the State Report Card is provided to the public:
http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/aypstate.cfm?year=2008

Indicator (c)(10)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i).**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(10))?

[1] X **X** Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] **X** The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/stn/stn_application_center.html (STN Application Center, where data are collected)
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/gradrate (SEA, LEA, and school data by subgroup, including numerator, denominator and percentage)

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (c)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Collection and Public Reporting column.

Indicator (c)(11)	Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(11))?

[1] Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data. **Partial. The state collects data only on students who plan to attend post-secondary. See the state's plan for linking data with higher education.**

If No, please respond (check one):

X The State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification

Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

→ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

Indicator (c)(12)	**Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data (as defined in Indicator (c)(12))?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Mark the Public Reporting column next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

[7] X No, the State does not collect these data.

If No, please respond (check one):

X The State will <u>develop and implement</u> the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State <u>will</u> collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

→ Provide the State's plan for collecting, making the data publicly available, and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B, Section I. Mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns next to "Indicator (c)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I.

☐ The State will <u>develop but not implement</u> the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State <u>will not</u> collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011.

→ Provide the State's plan for developing the means to collect and to publicly report the data (but not the State's implementation of those means) in Part 3B, Section V.

IV. Assurance (d): Supporting Struggling Schools

A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the progress of certain groups of schools in the State on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; on the extent to which reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State; and on the extent to which charter schools are operating in the State.

Indicator (d)(1)	**Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/ayp/ (main AYP page)
- ➔ See spreadsheet 2008 AYP ratings by SCHOOL (on AYP page)
- ➔ See spreadsheet List of Title I SCHOOLS in improvement status and List of Title I SCHOOLS in improvement status by differentiated accountability category placement
- ➔ See spreadsheet Title I schools improvement status this year for list of Title I schools leaving improvement status
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttoncorpnew.cfm?corp=5385&year=2008 (LEA level AYP status including subgroups as well as Title I school or corporation status)
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttonschlnew.cfm?schl=0137&year=2008 (school level AYP including subgroups and Title I school status)
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/IS/iststate1.cfm (disaggregated ISTEP+ results by subject)
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5347 (general ISTEP+ results at the school level)

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite

"Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(2)	Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect these data?

[1] X Yes, the State collects these data.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the data *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- → Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- → http://www.doe.in.gov/ayp/ (main AYP page)
- → See spreadsheet 2008 AYP ratings by SCHOOL (on AYP page)
- → See spreadsheet List of Title I SCHOOLS in improvement status and List of Title I SCHOOLS in improvement status by differentiated accountability category placement
- → See spreadsheet Title I schools improvement status this year for list of Title I schools leaving improvement status
- → http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttoncorpnew.cfm?corp=5385&year=2008 (LEA level AYP status including subgroups as well as Title I school or corporation status)
- → http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttonschlnew.cfm?schl=0137&year=2008 (school level AYP including subgroups and Title I school status)
- → http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/IS/iststate1.cfm (disaggregated ISTEP+ results by subject)
- → http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5347 (general ISTEP+ results at the school level)

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the data *less than annually*.

- → Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- → Provide the State website where the most recently updated data are provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

- → Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite

"Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 ☐ No, the State does not collect these data.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(2)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Descriptor (d)(1) **Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) that the State uses to identify such schools.**

Race to the Top

Please respond (check Yes or No): Does the State have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in the Definitions section of the NFR) for the purposes of this indicator?

[1] X Yes, the State has a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

➔ Provide the definition here:[2] Click here to enter text.

Title I schools in improvement that are in the lowest 5% of all Title I schools in improvement based on a combination of growth percentile and performance on ISTEP+ OR Title I high schools in improvement with an average four-year graduation cohort rate of less than 60%, AND secondary schools eligible for but not receiving Title I funds that are in the bottom 5 of all secondary schools eligible for but not receiving funds, or secondary schools eligible for but not receiving Title I funds that have average four-year graduation cohort rates of less than 60%.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[3] X The State has made the definition *publicly available* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the definition is publicly available:[4] Click here to enter text.
➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/ayp/

[5] ☐ The State does not make the definition publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the definition publicly available in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[6] ☐ No, the State does not have a definition of "persistently lowest achieving schools" for the purposes of this indicator.

➔ Provide the State's plan for developing a definition and making it publicly available on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Descriptor (d)(1)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(3) **Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3]
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/ayp/
- ➔ Click on "definitions for lowest achieving list"
- ➔ Then click on "Expanded Persistently Lowest Achieving List"

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
  [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(3)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(4)	Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in the NFR) in the last year.	Race to the Top

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

1 ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

2 ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

4 ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
5 Click here to enter text.

6 ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

7 X No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(4)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(5) **Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/ayp/
- ➔ Click on "definitions for lowest achieving list"
- ➔ Then click on "Expanded Persistently Lowest Achieving List"

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(5)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(6)	**Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] ☐ Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

→ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

→ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
[5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] X No, the State does not collect this information.

→ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(6)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(7) **Provide, for the State and, if applicable, for each LEA in the State, the number of charter schools that are currently permitted to operate under State law.**

Race to the Top

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the data *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/charterschools/faq.html#3.

[4] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(7)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(8) **Confirm, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number of charter schools currently operating.**

Confirm

Please respond (check one): Is the number of charter schools publicly reported as currently operating for the State and for each LEA at http://www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/indicator-d8.xls correct?

[1] ☐ Yes, the data are correct.

[2] X No, the data are not correct.

- ➔ If checked, provide below or in an attachment the correct data and any supporting information. A URL linking to the correct data on the State's website is also sufficient:
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/charterschools/welcome.html -- 3rd bullet on page, List of Indiana Charter Schools and Contact Information.
  [3] Click here to enter text.

Please respond (check one):

[4] X The State makes the data *publicly available* and keeps it *up-to-date* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the data are collected and publicly available:[5] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/charterschools/welcome.html -- 3rd bullet on page, List of Indiana Charter Schools and Contact Information.

[6] ☐ The State makes the data *publicly available* on a website but *does not keep it up-to-date*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
  [7] Click here to enter text.

[8] ☐ The State does not make the data publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the data publicly available and up-to-date on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(8)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

Indicator (d)(9)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/data/ (main page)
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttonschlnew.cfm?schl=1535&year=2008 (charter school level AYP)

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(9)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(10)	Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/data/ (main page)
- ➔ http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/AP/buttonschlnew.cfm?schl=1535&year=2008 (charter school level AYP)

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public:
  [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(10)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(11)	**Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and identity of charter schools that have closed (including schools that were not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years.**

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.

➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/charterschools/faq.html#5

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(11)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

Indicator (d)(12)	Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

Please respond (check one): Does the State collect this information?

[1] X Yes, the State collects this information.

If Yes, please respond (check one):

[2] X The State makes the information *publicly available* and updates the information *at least annually* on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State website where the information is collected and publicly available:[3] Click here to enter text.
- ➔ http://www.doe.in.gov/charterschools/faq.html#5 .

[4] ☐ The State makes the information *publicly available* on a website and updates the information *less than annually*.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.
- ➔ Provide the State website where the most recently updated information is provided by the State to the public: [5] Click here to enter text.

[6] ☐ The State does not make the information publicly available on a website.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark the Public Reporting column.

[7] ☐ No, the State does not collect this information.

- ➔ Provide the State's plan for making the information publicly available and updating it annually on a website in Part 3B. Cite "Indicator (d)(12)" in the Plan Element Verification Chart in Part 3B, Section I and mark both the Collection and Public Reporting columns.

PART 3B: DATA COLLECTION & PUBLIC REPORTING PLAN

Requirement: The State must collect and publicly report the data or other information required by an assurance indicator or descriptor. If the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report, at least annually through September 30, 2011, the State plan must describe the State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect and publicly report the data or information, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy. The plan must also include the nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II), the amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

I. ASSURANCES (a), (c), AND (d)

- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan.

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please fill out the following chart to indicate which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in the State plan, and whether they must address collection, public reporting, or both. Do not list elements that do not need to be addressed in the State plan. Only list those for which the State has been directed to do so in completing Part 3A.

Element	Collection (check if applies)	Public Reporting (check if applies)
D (a) (1) Describe for each LEA the **systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers** and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	X	X
I (a) (3) Indicate for each LEA whether the **systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement** outcomes as an evaluation criterion.	X	X
I (a) (4) Provide for each LEA the number and percentage of **teachers rated at each performance rating or level** (for those whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system).	X	X
I (a) (5) Indicate for each LEA whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage of **teachers rated at each performance rating or level are available for the LEA in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public**.	X	X
D (a) (2) Describe for each LEA the **systems used to evaluate the performance of principals** and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.	X	X
I (a) (6) Indicate for each LEA whether the **systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement** outcomes as an evaluation criterion.	X	X
I (a) (7) Provide for each LEA the number and percentage of **principals rated at each performance rating or level** (for those whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system).	X	X
I(c)(4)	X	X
I(c)(6)	X	X
I (c)(11)	X	X
I(c)(12)	X	X
I(d)(4)	X	X
I(d)(6)	X	X

Assurance (a): Process and Timeline

D (a) (1) Describe for each LEA the **systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers** and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Collect sample teacher evaluation	3/15/2010	IDOE	Local	1x/year	0

instrument from each LEA			Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA)[5]		
Collect 2008-09 teacher evaluations for each teacher from each LEA	3/15/2010	IDOE	Local CBAs[6]	once	0
Survey each LEA on how current systems are used regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. Align survey with the data reporting tool described in I (a) (4).	3/15/2010	IDOE	Local CBAs[7]	1x/year via online survey	0
Publicly report on teacher evaluation systems used by each LEA and the use of results from those systems	7/1/2010	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

I (a) (3) Indicate for each LEA whether the **systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement** outcomes as an evaluation criterion.

Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Analyze current teacher evaluation instruments for each LEA	4/15/2010	IDOE		1x/year	$40K[8]
Synthesize data from 2008-09 teacher evaluations for each LEA	5/15/2010	IDOE		once	
Report on whether current teacher evaluation systems for each LEA include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	7/1/2010	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

[5] IDOE believes the obstacles posed by local CBAs can be overcome by the projected date. In many cases, local CBAs may not even factor in as a significant issue given that the related milestones generally deal with data collection.
[6] See footnote 1.
[7] See footnote 1.
[8] $40K reflects the total costs for the first two milestones in I(a)(3) and I(a)(6) These funds will be federal Title II dollars.

I (a) (4) Provide for each LEA the number and percentage of **teachers rated at each performance rating or level** (for those whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system).					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Develop statewide teacher evaluation instrument	3/15/2010	IDOE, teachers, school corps, ISTA		once	$20K[9]
Develop data reporting tool for LEA reporting of teacher evaluation results	4/1/2010	IDOE		once	
Pilot statewide teacher evaluation instrument (esp. in schools identified for state sanctions)	4/1/2010	IDOE	Local CBAs[10]	once	
Collect completed teacher evaluation instruments from pilot schools	7/1/2010	IDOE		once	0
Collect completed data reporting tool from pilot schools	7/1/2010	IDOE		once	0
Implement statewide teacher evaluation instrument (incl. professional development)	9/1/2010	IDOE, ESCs	Local CBAs[11]	1x/year via training	$40K[12]

I (a) (5) Indicate for each LEA whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage of **teachers rated at each performance rating or level are available for the LEA in a manner easily accessible and a format easily understandable by the public.**					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Publicly report the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers at each performance rating or level, for each LEA, on the statewide teacher evaluation instrument	9/30/2011	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

[9] $20K reflects the total costs for the first three milestones in I(a)(4) and I(a)(7). Work has already begun on these items. These funds will be federal Title II dollars. IDOE will finalize these with support from The Joyce Foundation, Public Impact and NCTQ.
[10] See footnote 1.
[11] See footnote 1.
[12] $40K reflects the total costs for implementation of both the teacher AND principal evaluation instruments. These funds will be federal Title II dollars.

D (a) (2) Describe for each LEA the **systems used to evaluate the performance of principals** and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal.					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Collect sample principal evaluation instrument from each LEA	3/15/2010	IDOE		1x/year	0
Collect 2008-09 principal evaluations for each principal from each LEA	3/15/2010	IDOE		once	0
Survey each LEA on how current systems are used regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal. Align survey with the data reporting tool described in I (a) (7).	3/15/2010	IDOE		1x/year via online survey	0
Publicly report on principal evaluation systems used by each LEA and the use of results from those systems	7/1/2010	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

I (a) (6) Indicate for each LEA whether the **systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement** outcomes as an evaluation criterion.					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Analyze current principal evaluation instruments for each LEA	4/15/2010	IDOE		1x/year	See I(a)(3)
Synthesize data from 2008-09 principal evaluations for each LEA	5/15/2010	IDOE		once	
Report on whether current principal evaluation systems for each LEA include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion	7/1/2010	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

I (a) (7) Provide for each LEA the number and percentage of **principals rated at each performance rating or level** (for those whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system).					
Milestones	***Date***	***Key Stakeholder(s)***	***Obstacles***	***Nature & Frequency***	***Amount of Funds***
Develop statewide principal evaluation instrument	3/15/2010	IDOE, principals, school corps, ISTA		once	See I(a)(4)
Develop data reporting tool for LEA reporting of principal evaluation results	4/1/2010	IDOE		once	
Pilot statewide principal evaluation instrument (esp. in schools	4/1/2010	IDOE		once	

identified for state sanctions)					
Collect completed principal evaluation instruments from pilot schools	7/1/2010	IDOE		once	0
Collect completed data reporting tool from pilot schools	7/1/2010	IDOE		once	0
Implement statewide principal evaluation instrument (incl. professional development)	9/1/2010	IDOE, ESCs		1x/year via training	See I(a)(4)
Publicly report the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals at each performance rating or level, for each LEA, on the statewide principal evaluation instrument	9/30/2011	IDOE		1x/year on IDOE website	0

Updates for all portions of Assurance (a) may be found on the IDOE website: http://www.doe.in.gov/communications/educators.html.

Indicator (c) (4) Plan for analyzing appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations provided to students with disabilities on the State assessments.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has planned of the collection and analysis of accommodations permitted on the State assessment using a new electronic IEP system.

Background

Until the 2009-10 school year, Indiana did not have the ability to directly collect at the student level, information on the specific accommodation or accommodations students are permitted to use on the State assessments. The introduction and implementation of a statewide electronic IEP will allow for systematic collection and analysis of accommodations data.

Milestones

Summer 2009 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division will provide training for Special Education Directors and Case Conference Committee members on ISTART7, the state's web based electronic IEP system.

December 1, 2009 – Usage for ISTART7 system approaches 80% of Indiana schools.

April 1, 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division (which includes both Special Education and English Language Learning) will establish a system to collect the needed accommodations data from schools not using the ISTART7 system.

Summer 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division continues training on and promotion of the ISTART7 system to all eligible users.

August 1, 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division will award a combined contract for analysis of appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations for both students with disabilities and limited English proficient students participating on statewide assessments during the 2010-2011 school year. The analysis will be independent and follow the recommendations and best practices as outlined by the

National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and he CCSSO collaborative Assessing Special Education Students (ASES).

December 1, 2010 – IDOE will conduct a midyear harvest of accommodations data for compliance and quality assurance final plans for collection of student accommodations information from schools not using ISTART7.

August 1, 2011 – Results of the study will be available and posted to the IDOE ISTEP+ website.

Obstacles

The most significant obstacle to conducting theses analyses is the burden of collecting and tracking the specific accommodation(s) each individual student receives on the State assessments, but it will not prevent the analysis from occurring.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

IDOE will use up to $25,000 of State assessment funds to contract for an independent analysis and report on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Indicator (c) (6) Plan for analyzing appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students with disabilities on the State assessments.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has planned of the collection and analysis of accommodations permitted on the State assessment using a new electronic IEP system.

Background

Until the 2009-10 school year, Indiana did not have the ability to directly collect at the student level, information on the specific accommodation or accommodations students are permitted to use on the State assessments. The introduction and implementation of a statewide electronic IEP will allow for systematic collection and analysis of accommodations data while this tool directly addresses the planning and documentation requirements of students with disabilities the tool can be used to plan and document the learning plan for any student.

Milestones

Summer 2009 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division will provide training for Special Education Directors and Case Conference Committee members on ISTART7, the state's web based electronic IEP system

December 1, 2009 – Usage for ISTART7 system approaches 80% of Indiana schools.

April 1, 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division (which includes both Special Education and English Language Learning) will establish a system to collect the needed accommodations data from schools and for student groups not using the ISTART7 system.

Summer 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division continues training on and promotion of the ISTART7 system to all eligible users.

August 1, 2010 – IDOE's Differentiated Learners Division will award a combined contract for analysis of appropriateness and effectiveness of accommodations for both students with disabilities and limited

English proficient students participating on statewide assessments during the 2010-2011 school year. The analysis will be independent and follow the recommendations and best practices as outlined by the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) and he CCSSO collaborative Assessing Special Education Students (ASES).

December 1, 2010 – Midyear harvest of accommodations data for compliance and quality assurance final plans for collection of student accommodations information from schools not using ISTART7.

August 1, 2011 – Results of study are available and posted to the IDOE ISTEP+ website.

Obstacles

The most significant obstacle to conducting theses analyses is the burden of collecting and tracking the specific accommodation(s) each individual student receives on the State assessments, but it will not prevent the analysis from occurring.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

IDOE will use up to $25,000 of State assessment funds to contract for an independent analysis and report on the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments.

Indicator (c)(11)

Background

As noted in its plan for meeting the core elements of the America COMPETES Act, IDOE is currently working with the CHE to build bridges to identify the same student-level data it collects for K-12 students for students who have gone into post-secondary education. Currently higher education information is collected and maintained by the CHE and independent universities. IDOE has piloted a data exchange with higher education under a current MOU using a small subset of data, and IDOE is working to implement a Web service that will facilitate the exchange of data using the Student Test Number (STN), a unique student identifier currently used by K-12 education (the Web service will allow the STN to be used into higher education for data tracking and matching).

Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), because they are similar and will require the same processes in order to accomplish them, share the same milestones and funding breakdowns (in other words, in order to be able to both identify students who have enrolled in post-secondary education within 16 months of graduation (c)(11), as well as those who have completed at least one year of college credit (c)(12), we will use the same projects and funding sources. As such, the milestones and funding overlap for both indicators.

Milestones

CHE and IDOE data matching/Web services for STN

End of 2009: IDOE and CHE will pilot data matching between K-12 and IHEs. IDOE provides validated STN (student test number) data back to CHE

February 2010: IDOE and CHE renew data sharing agreement through 2013

Spring 2010: High School feedback reports based on higher education data are generated and provided to high schools (currently CHE collects data on which high schools students attended from public institutions of higher education, allowing for feedback reports; however, because student-student linkages are not yet available, it's not yet possible to track students back from 12^{th} grade. However, see continued plans to do so.

Summer 2010: IDOE constructs a Web service that allows authorized higher education users to look up directory information on students and obtain the students' previously assigned STN, if the student attended high school at an Indiana public or accredited non-public high school. IDOE assigns blocks of never before used STNs that institutions of higher education can assign to students transferring in from out of state or never before attending a K-12 institution (or graduating prior to 2004, the first year Indiana used STN).

Winter 2010: IDOE exchanges data with higher education, validates STN information, and provides K-12 information to institutions of higher education. IDOE also obtains and analyzes higher education data, including number of students enrolled in post-secondary institutions and percentage of students enrolled in remedial education.

Summer 2011: IDOE and CHE create high school feedback reports based on data exchanged; aggregated high school feedback information is posted on IDOE's public site.

E-Transcript Repository

In order to further enhance its student-level course completion and course-taking pattern data collection, Indiana is requesting funds from the ARRA SLDS grant to expand its e-transcript initiative and create a transcript repository (as well as facilitate automated student record exchange). From the transcript repository, IDOE will be able to generate reports on course-taking patterns, the impact of course-taking patterns on college success (and whether students are being required to take remedial courses), and diploma audit reports. IDOE plans to partner with the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) on this project.

Summer 2010: IDOE identifies vendor to create e-transcript repository

Fall 2010: IDOE, vendor, and Commission for Higher Education identify requirements for transcript exchange system and transcript repository and reports to be created from the e-transcript repository, as well as requirements for transcript content (including Student Test Number, STN)

Spring 2011: Transcript exchange system and transcript repository are implemented and functional (including reports created)

Spring 2011: State and local courses are mapped to SCED to standardize transcripts and create diploma auditing capabilities

Spring 2012: Data are extracted from transcript repository; K-12 and higher education data are integrated using STN

Obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated for milestone one. If SLDS funding is not awarded, funding could prove to be an obstacle to accomplishing milestone two.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

For milestone one, no use of additional funds is anticipated (IDOE staff time is approximately 1.5 FTE for a developer and DBA/data warehouse architect for data matching and data load). IDOE currently provides in-kind support for the project in the form of 1.5 FTE; CHE provides support for the project in the form of .75 FTE. For milestone two, IDOE is requesting

approximately $4 million in SLDS funding (with approximately $3 million directly related to accomplishing indicator (c)(11). IDOE and partner agency CHE plan to contract with a vendor to work on milestone two. Funding breakdown for the approximately $3 million is as follows:

$1,370,000 over three years to implement high school e-transcript with state transcript repository services; cost includes full project and account management throughout project launch, rollout, and lifecycle; live Web-based training for high school personnel and on-demand training modules; licensing fees; unlimited e-transcript submissions; support services to school end-user personnel; and marketing and instructional materials for students and school staff.

$1,176,297 over three years for a higher education e-transcript initiative with state transcript repository services, including licensing fees, implementation of transcript capture client system, unlimited e-transcript submissions; and live and on-demand training.

$536,250 for mapping state course codes to SCED; cost includes deployment and ongoing support for mapping of courses; administrator and state interface for mapping courses; normalized course and grade information sent to participating public in-state postsecondary institutions.

Project Management and Governance Plan

Indiana recognizes that its efforts will not be successful without a clearly defined governance structure; moreover, IDOE recognizes that it must include multiple agencies and partners in its SLDS efforts. Indiana will take care to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in some capacity in decision-making for activities proposed in this grant application. Activities proposed in this grant application will be managed in a similar way to activities that are being conducted under the current SLDS grant that Indiana receives.

Governance Structure

All IDOE project activities are governed by a Project Oversight Committee (POC), also called the IDOE senior management team, which is chaired by Todd Huston, the Chief of Staff for the Indiana Department of Education. The POC also includes the Chief Information Officer of the Indiana Department of Education, Jason Thacker. Jason also serves on the SLDS project steering committee, described below. The POC governs all IDOE projects and consists of executive-level staff at IDOE, including the Deputy Chief of Staff; General Counsel; Chief Assessment Officer; Chief Financial Advisor; Chief of School Reform and Accountability; Chief Policy Advisor; Communications Director; Assistant Superintendent of Student Learning (encompassing special education, Title I, English Language Learners, adult education, and curriculum); and the Assistant Superintendent for Learning Support (including career and technical education, educator licensing and development, school accreditation, and school and community nutrition). Indiana's state superintendent, Tony Bennett, also participates on the POC and co-chairs meetings. The Committee provides overall governance for projects to ensure the proper alignment among participating entities, external vendors, and the overall project management apparatus, as well as to ensure alignment with IDOE mission, vision, and objectives. Moreover, the Committee (with the input of the Chief Financial Officer) ensures that project expenditures are within budget. The Committee reviews progress, approves budget changes, tracks performance, and addresses any issues stemming from operational development and deployment.

Under the POC is an IDOE-level SLDS steering committee, which oversees the day-to-day operations of the grant projects. The steering committee is made up of the project sponsor (Jason Thacker), the project director (Molly Chamberlin), the project manager (Sharon Oshry), and other IDOE representatives with a vested interest in SLDS projects (including John Keller, who oversees the Learning Connection project; Paul Kreitl, IDOE's Director of Application Development; Marcie Brown, Policy Director; and Kim Clement, special projects liaison to the Office of Student Learning). The steering committee meets weekly to discuss progress on the project plan, make budget and project plan changes (which are ultimately approved by the POC), and review evaluation progress. The steering committee has been in operation since the receipt of Indiana's initial SLDS grant in 2007 and plans to continue its operations for oversight of the proposed SLDS/ARRA grant, with the possibility of including additional IDOE representation on the SLDS steering committee (especially from the communications area).

The project director is responsible for providing day-to-day oversight of the project. The project director monitors implementation and ensures deliverables. The project director is required to report periodically on progress to the project steering committee. The project director works closely with the project manager to manage and monitor day-to-day operations of contractor, IDOE, and internal and external resources in keeping with the project plan and budget and in keeping with the project's commitments. The project manager reports progress to the project director and project sponsor and is a member of the SLDS steering committee. The project manager is also responsible for scheduling steering committee meetings, revising the project plan (as necessary), and maintaining monthly progress notes for federal reporting on SLDS project progress.

In addition to internal governance and controls, IDOE will also involve local stakeholders, as well as stakeholders from other agencies, as it has in its current SLDS project. As previously noted, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (CHE) will be a partner in the proposed projects and will assist the IDOE project director and project manager in oversight of the proposed project, especially when it comes to data linkages and course completion data collection. CHE will provide a project liaison (Ken Sauer) to assist in the implementation of the of the project, as well as a staff member to assist in the continued implementation of the e-transcript project (see the staffing section for more information). The IDOE has already obtained input from both Workforce and CHE in the crafting of its current proposal. The IDOE will also work closely with the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) in the implementation of its proposed project, especially as it has to do with the integration of K-12, higher education, and workforce data through the IWIS project. The IDOE SLDS steering committee will periodically report on progress to the IWIS steering committee, which is made up of representatives from DWD, CHE, IDOE (the SLDS project director), the Indiana Governor's office, and the Indiana Office of Technology.

IDOE's project will also include technical support from current IDOE Information Technology staff. Specifically, IDOE will have technical support in the areas of data collection and reporting (Karla Carr, Karen Lane, and Hammad Rahman); data warehousing and database administration (Nick Buchanan and Rick Hoffman); and network administration (Gary Grist and Lisa Preston). The technical support staff will provide regular input and feedback to the project director, project manager, and SLDS steering committee.

IDOE will also involve subject matter experts in the implementation of the project, especially for feedback in various aspects of the project. Indiana's subject matter experts will primarily be its 29 data stewards, who will provide in-kind support for the project. Subject matter experts will include IDOE staff with experience in curriculum and instruction; career and technical education; school counseling; special education; English language learning; reading and literacy; Title I; and school reform. Moreover, the IDOE's STN Collection Team, who oversees all student- and teacher-level data collections and provides technical assistance and support to school districts in submitting student-level data, will provide support as subject matter experts for STN and SPN collections.

IDOE also plans to recruit Indiana-based universities and research organizations to provide support to school districts in the form of evaluation and professional development, especially as it relates to data-driven instruction and use of data. IDOE has already obtained the support of Indiana University (the Indiana Business Research Center) and University of Indianapolis (Center for Excellence of Leadership and Learning) and plans to broaden support by reaching out to additional universities and organizations in the state.

LEA personnel have proven to be a key source of guidance and feedback for Indiana's current SLDS grant, and they will continue to act as such for the proposed project. IDOE actively utilizes its STN Advisory Council, which is a group of key data managers at a variety of schools and districts throughout the state. This group provides insight on proposed data projects (such as real-time data collection), as well as data collections and data reporting burden. In addition, IDOE has also utilized its educator fellows for feedback in the first iteration of its Learning Connection project. The educator fellows are teachers and administrators from local districts who have provided input and testing for the current Learning Connection project. It is envisioned that this group of fellows would also provide input on projects identified in this proposal.

In order to receive input and continuous feedback from other stakeholders, including local-level stakeholders and the university and research community, IDOE also plans to work with its external evaluator to create Web-based surveys and stakeholder interviews, offering insight into stakeholder input related to proposed projects. The surveys will allow external stakeholders to weigh in on projects being conducted. Stakeholder interviews and surveys will help IDOE shape and reshape project plans. IDOE has used stakeholder surveys and interviews to inform its 2007 SLDS project and believes that continuing to do so will remain helpful in ensuring that stakeholder input is included in the project.

In addition to internal governance, IDOE also involves its two partner agencies, CHE and DWD. CHE provides a project liaison to assist in the implementation of the P-20 student data linkages and e-transcript repository project, as well as a staff member to oversee the implementation of the e-transcript project at the higher education level.

IDOE further works with DWD and CHE to provide governance for the projects specifically related to data linkages (including the IWIS project). IDOE leadership participates on the IWIS steering committee, which meets monthly. The project director for IDOE's SLDS project meets at least monthly with the lead staff members of the IWIS project at both CHE and DWD. Data sharing agreements and memoranda of understanding are in place to ensure data security and confidentiality. No data can be shared from IWIS without the express written consent of the agency that "owns" the IWIS data (e.g., reports using shared K-12 education data cannot be shared without the permission of IDOE; reports using shared CHE data cannot be reported without the permission of CHE, etc.). The IWIS steering committee makes decisions as to which types of reports are to be created from IWIS.

Project Management

The IDOE is confident that it will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget by utilizing a project management framework that includes project charters, project scope documents, and a detailed project management plan (using Microsoft Project) that includes detailed timelines and responsibilities. Knowing that this project will be complex and involve participation from many departments, agencies, and individuals, it will be paramount to have effective communication and keep the common goal in mind. In order to deliver as planned, the appropriate disciplines, structure, tools, and communication need to be in place. IDOE will use the four steps to project management approach: initiate, plan, execute and control, and close. SharePoint will be used as a document repository and project team site, and regular steering committee meetings will be held.

The IDOE already utilizes the project management plan described (project charter, project, scope, etc.) for a variety of its current SLDS projects and subprojects, including its enterprise data warehouse project, Learning Connection project, and reduction of data redundancy project. In addition to its SLDS project manager, Sharon Oshry, IDOE will also utilize the insight of two of its additional project managers, Dana Schroder and Rich Arroyo. Although Sharon is IDOE's overall project manager for the SLDS project, Dana is managing IDOE's enterprise data warehouse project. Rich is managing IDOE's online IEP project and will be a key resource for core element three, the integration of the online IEP system into the Learning Connection.

As previously noted, the project will be overseen by a Project Oversight Committee (POC). The POC is made up of executive-level IDOE staff. The Committee provides overall governance of the project to ensure the proper alignment among participating entities, external vendors, and the overall project management apparatus. The Committee reviews progress, approves budget changes, tracks performance, and addresses any issues stemming from operational development and deployment. In addition, the SLDS project director meets regularly with representatives from other stakeholder agencies (e.g., the Commission for Higher Education and Department of Workforce Development) who act in an advisory capacity. Because the Commission will play a very important role in grant activities described in this application and has played an important role in providing input for the objectives of this grant proposal, meetings and discussions with representatives from CHE currently occur at least twice monthly and will continue to do so. The IDOE project director also participates in the IWIS steering committee (IWIS is described in the needs section of this grant application). The IWIS steering committee includes representation from the Department of Workforce Development, Commission for Higher Education, Indiana Office of Technology, and Indiana Governor's Office. The steering committee meets at least monthly to discuss progress on the IWIS project.

Progress Reporting

IDOE will provide the public with information on its progress toward attaining indicator (c)(11) in the form of regular progress reports via the DOE website, http://www.doe.in.gov/.

Indicator (c)(12)

Background

As noted in its plan for meeting the core elements of the America COMPETES Act, IDOE is currently working with the CHE to build bridges to identify the same student-level data it collects for K-12 students for students who have gone into post-secondary education. Currently higher education information is collected and maintained by the CHE and independent universities. IDOE has piloted a data exchange with higher education under a current MOU using a small subset of data. and IDOE is working to implement a Web service that will facilitate the exchange of data using the Student Test Number (STN), a unique student identifier currently used by K-12 education (the Web service will allow the STN to be used into higher education for data tracking and matching).

Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), because they are similar and will require the same processes in order to accomplish them, share the same milestones and funding breakdowns (in other words, in order to be able to both identify students who have enrolled in post-secondary education within 16 months of graduation (c)(11), as well as those who have completed at least one year of college credit (c)(12), we will use the same projects and funding sources. As such, the milestones and funding overlap for both indicators.

Milestones

CHE and IDOE data matching/Web services for STN

End of 2009: IDOE and CHE will pilot data matching between K-12 and IHEs. IDOE provides validated STN (student test number) data back to CHE

February 2010: IDOE and CHE renew data sharing agreement through 2013

Spring 2010: High School feedback reports based on higher education data are generated and provided to high schools (currently CHE collects data on which high schools students attended from public institutions of higher education, allowing for feedback reports; however, because student-student linkages are not yet available, it's not yet possible to track students back from 12th grade. However, see continued plans to do so.

Summer 2010: IDOE constructs a Web service that allows authorized higher education users to look up directory information on students and obtain the students' previously assigned STN, if the student attended high school at an Indiana public or accredited non-public high school. IDOE assigns blocks of never before used STNs that institutions of higher education can assign to students transferring in from out of state or never before attending a K-12 institution (or graduating prior to 2004, the first year Indiana used STN).

Winter 2010: IDOE exchanges data with higher education, validates STN information, and provides K-12 information to institutions of higher education. IDOE also obtains and analyzes higher education data, including number of students enrolled in post-secondary institutions and percentage of students enrolled in remedial education.

Summer 2011: IDOE and CHE create high school feedback reports based on data exchanged; aggregated high school feedback information is posted on IDOE's public site.

E-Transcript Repository

In order to further enhance its student-level course completion and course-taking pattern data collection, Indiana is requesting funds from the ARRA SLDS grant to expand its e-transcript initiative and create a transcript repository (as well as facilitate automated student record exchange). From the transcript repository, IDOE will be able to generate reports on course-taking patterns, the impact of course-taking patterns on college success (and whether students are being required to take remedial courses), and diploma audit reports. IDOE plans to partner with the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) on this project.

Summer 2010: IDOE identifies vendor to create e-transcript repository

Fall 2010: IDOE, vendor, and Commission for Higher Education identify requirements for transcript exchange system and transcript repository and reports to be created from the e-transcript repository, as well as requirements for transcript content (including Student Test Number, STN)

Spring 2011: Transcript exchange system and transcript repository are implemented and functional (including reports created)

Spring 2011: State and local courses are mapped to SCED to standardize transcripts and create diploma auditing capabilities

Spring 2012: Data are extracted from transcript repository; K-12 and higher education data are integrated using STN

Obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated for milestone one. If SLDS funding is not awarded, funding could prove to be an obstacle to accomplishing milestone two.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

For milestone one, no use of additional funds is anticipated (IDOE staff time is approximately 1.5 FTE for a developer and DBA/data warehouse architect for data matching and data load). IDOE currently provides in-kind support for the project in the form of 1.5 FTE; CHE provides support for the project in the form of .75 FTE. For milestone two, IDOE is requesting approximately $4 million in SLDS funding (with approximately $3 million directly related to accomplishing indicator (c)(11). IDOE and partner agency CHE plan to contract with a vendor to work on milestone two. Funding breakdown for the approximately $3 million is as follows:

$1,370,000 over three years to implement high school e-transcript with state transcript repository services; cost includes full project and account management throughout project launch, rollout, and lifecycle; live Web-based training for high school personnel and on-demand training modules; licensing fees; unlimited e-transcript submissions; support services to school end-user personnel; and marketing and instructional materials for students and school staff.

$1,176,297 over three years for a higher education e-transcript initiative with state transcript repository services, including licensing fees, implementation of transcript capture client system, unlimited e-transcript submissions; and live and on-demand training.

$536,250 for mapping state course codes to SCED; cost includes deployment and ongoing support for mapping of courses; administrator and state interface for mapping courses; normalized course and grade information sent to participating public in-state postsecondary institutions.

Project Management and Governance Plan

Indiana recognizes that its efforts will not be successful without a clearly defined governance structure; moreover, IDOE recognizes that it must include multiple agencies and partners in its SLDS efforts. Indiana will take care to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are involved in some capacity in decision-making for activities proposed in this grant application. Activities proposed in this grant application will be managed in a similar way to activities that are being conducted under the current SLDS grant that Indiana receives.

Governance Structure

All IDOE project activities are governed by a Project Oversight Committee (POC), also called the IDOE senior management team, which is chaired by Todd Huston, the Chief of Staff for the Indiana Department of Education. The POC also includes the Chief Information Officer of the Indiana Department of Education, Jason Thacker. Jason also serves on the SLDS project steering committee, described below. The POC governs all IDOE projects and consists of executive-level staff at IDOE, including the Deputy Chief of Staff; General Counsel; Chief Assessment Officer; Chief Financial Advisor; Chief of School Reform and Accountability; Chief Policy Advisor; Communications Director; Assistant Superintendent of Student Learning (encompassing special education, Title I, English Language Learners, adult education, and curriculum); and the Assistant Superintendent for Learning Support (including career and technical education, educator licensing and development, school accreditation, and school and community nutrition). Indiana's state superintendent, Tony Bennett, also participates on the POC and co-chairs meetings. The Committee provides overall governance for projects to ensure the proper alignment among participating entities, external vendors, and the overall project management apparatus, as well as to ensure alignment with IDOE mission, vision, and objectives. Moreover, the Committee (with the input of the Chief Financial Officer) ensures that project expenditures are within budget. The Committee reviews progress, approves budget changes, tracks performance, and addresses any issues stemming from operational development and deployment.

Under the POC is an IDOE-level SLDS steering committee, which oversees the day-to-day operations of the grant projects. The steering committee is made up of the project sponsor (Jason Thacker), the project director (Molly Chamberlin), the project manager (Sharon Oshry), and other IDOE representatives with a vested interest in SLDS projects (including John Keller, who oversees the Learning Connection project; Paul Kreitl, IDOE's Director of Application Development; Marcie Brown, Policy Director; and Kim Clement, special projects liaison to the Office of Student Learning). The steering committee meets weekly to discuss progress on the project plan, make budget and project plan changes (which are ultimately approved by the POC), and review evaluation progress. The steering committee has been in operation since the receipt of Indiana's initial SLDS grant in 2007 and plans to continue its operations for oversight of the proposed SLDS/ARRA grant, with the possibility of including additional IDOE representation on the SLDS steering committee (especially from the communications area).

The project director is responsible for providing day-to-day oversight of the project. The project director monitors implementation and ensures deliverables. The project director is required to report periodically on progress to the project steering committee. The project director works closely with the project manager to manage and monitor day-to-day operations of contractor, IDOE, and internal and external resources in keeping with the project plan and budget and in keeping with the project's commitments. The project manager reports progress to the project director and project sponsor and is a member of the SLDS steering committee. The project manager is also responsible for scheduling steering committee meetings, revising the project plan (as necessary), and maintaining monthly progress notes for federal reporting on SLDS project progress.

In addition to internal governance and controls, IDOE will also involve local stakeholders, as well as stakeholders from other agencies, as it has in its current SLDS project. As previously noted, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education (CHE) will be a partner in the proposed projects and will assist the IDOE project director and project manager in oversight of the proposed project, especially when it comes to data linkages and course completion data collection. CHE will provide a project liaison (Ken Sauer) to assist in the implementation of the of the project, as well as a staff member to assist in the continued implementation of the e-transcript project (see the staffing section for more information). The IDOE has already obtained input from both Workforce and CHE in the crafting of its current proposal. The IDOE will also work closely with the Department of Workforce Development (DWD) in the implementation of its proposed project, especially as it has to do with the integration of K-12, higher education, and workforce data through the IWIS project. The IDOE SLDS steering committee will periodically report on progress to the IWIS steering committee, which is made up of representatives from DWD, CHE, IDOE (the SLDS project director), the Indiana Governor's office, and the Indiana Office of Technology.

IDOE's project will also include technical support from current IDOE Information Technology staff. Specifically, IDOE will have technical support in the areas of data collection and reporting (Karla Carr, Karen Lane, and Hammad Rahman); data warehousing and database administration (Nick Buchanan and Rick Hoffman); and network administration (Gary Grist and Lisa Preston). The technical support staff will provide regular input and feedback to the project director, project manager, and SLDS steering committee.

IDOE will also involve subject matter experts in the implementation of the project, especially for feedback in various aspects of the project. Indiana's subject matter experts will primarily be its 29 data stewards, who will provide in-kind support for the project. Subject matter experts will include IDOE staff with experience in curriculum and instruction; career and technical education; school counseling; special education; English language learning; reading and literacy; Title I; and school reform. Moreover, the IDOE's STN Collection Team, who oversees all student- and teacher-level data collections and provides technical assistance and support to school districts in submitting student-level data, will provide support as subject matter experts for STN and SPN collections.

IDOE also plans to recruit Indiana-based universities and research organizations to provide support to school districts in the form of evaluation and professional development, especially as it relates to data-driven instruction and use of data. IDOE has already obtained the support of

Indiana University (the Indiana Business Research Center) and University of Indianapolis (Center for Excellence of Leadership and Learning) and plans to broaden support by reaching out to additional universities and organizations in the state.

LEA personnel have proven to be a key source of guidance and feedback for Indiana's current SLDS grant, and they will continue to act as such for the proposed project. IDOE actively utilizes its STN Advisory Council, which is a group of key data managers at a variety of schools and districts throughout the state. This group provides insight on proposed data projects (such as real-time data collection), as well as data collections and data reporting burden. In addition, IDOE has also utilized its educator fellows for feedback in the first iteration of its Learning Connection project. The educator fellows are teachers and administrators from local districts who have provided input and testing for the current Learning Connection project. It is envisioned that this group of fellows would also provide input on projects identified in this proposal.

In order to receive input and continuous feedback from other stakeholders, including local-level stakeholders and the university and research community, IDOE also plans to work with its external evaluator to create Web-based surveys and stakeholder interviews, offering insight into stakeholder input related to proposed projects. The surveys will allow external stakeholders to weigh in on projects being conducted. Stakeholder interviews and surveys will help IDOE shape and reshape project plans. IDOE has used stakeholder surveys and interviews to inform its 2007 SLDS project and believes that continuing to do so will remain helpful in ensuring that stakeholder input is included in the project.

In addition to internal governance, IDOE also involves its two partner agencies, CHE and DWD. CHE provides a project liaison to assist in the implementation of the P-20 student data linkages and e-transcript repository project, as well as a staff member to oversee the implementation of the e-transcript project at the higher education level.

IDOE further works with DWD and CHE to provide governance for the projects specifically related to data linkages (including the IWIS project). IDOE leadership participates on the IWIS steering committee, which meets monthly. The project director for IDOE's SLDS project meets at least monthly with the lead staff members of the IWIS project at both CHE and DWD. Data sharing agreements and memoranda of understanding are in place to ensure data security and confidentiality. No data can be shared from IWIS without the express written consent of the agency that "owns" the IWIS data (e.g., reports using shared K-12 education data cannot be shared without the permission of IDOE; reports using shared CHE data cannot be reported without the permission of CHE, etc.). The IWIS steering committee makes decisions as to which types of reports are to be created from IWIS.

Project Management

The IDOE is confident that it will achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget by utilizing a project management framework that includes project charters, project scope documents, and a detailed project management plan (using Microsoft Project) that includes detailed timelines and responsibilities. Knowing that this project will be complex and involve participation from many departments, agencies, and individuals, it will be paramount to have effective communication and keep the common goal in mind. In order to deliver as planned, the appropriate disciplines, structure, tools, and communication need to be in place. IDOE will use the four steps to project management approach: initiate, plan, execute and control, and close.

SharePoint will be used as a document repository and project team site, and regular steering committee meetings will be held.

The IDOE already utilizes the project management plan described (project charter, project, scope, etc.) for a variety of its current SLDS projects and subprojects, including its enterprise data warehouse project, Learning Connection project, and reduction of data redundancy project. In addition to its SLDS project manager, Sharon Oshry, IDOE will also utilize the insight of two of its additional project managers, Dana Schroder and Rich Arroyo. Although Sharon is IDOE's overall project manager for the SLDS project, Dana is managing IDOE's enterprise data warehouse project. Rich is managing IDOE's online IEP project and will be a key resource for core element three, the integration of the online IEP system into the Learning Connection.

As previously noted, the project will be overseen by a Project Oversight Committee (POC). The POC is made up of executive-level IDOE staff. The Committee provides overall governance of the project to ensure the proper alignment among participating entities, external vendors, and the overall project management apparatus. The Committee reviews progress, approves budget changes, tracks performance, and addresses any issues stemming from operational development and deployment. In addition, the SLDS project director meets regularly with representatives from other stakeholder agencies (e.g., the Commission for Higher Education and Department of Workforce Development) who act in an advisory capacity. Because the Commission will play a very important role in grant activities described in this application and has played an important role in providing input for the objectives of this grant proposal, meetings and discussions with representatives from CHE currently occur at least twice monthly and will continue to do so. The IDOE project director also participates in the IWIS steering committee (IWIS is described in the needs section of this grant application). The IWIS steering committee includes representation from the Department of Workforce Development, Commission for Higher Education, Indiana Office of Technology, and Indiana Governor's Office. The steering committee meets at least monthly to discuss progress on the IWIS project.

Progress Reporting

IDOE will provide the public with information on its progress toward attaining indicator (c)(11) in the form of regular progress reports via the DOE website, http://www.doe.in.gov/.

Indicator (d)(4)

IDOE does not currently collect information on the number of lowest performing schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed because this is the first year (09-10) that IDOE has had schools that fit the category of "lowest performing", which is defined in indicator (d)(1).

IDOE will collect data on the schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. This information will be posted publicly on the IDOE K-12 data Website, http://www.doe.in.gov/data/.

Indicator (d)(6)

IDOE does not currently collect information on the number of lowest performing schools that are eligible for, but do not received Title I funds that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed because this is the first year (09-10) that IDOE has had schools that fit the category of "lowest performing", which is defined in indicator (d)(1).

IDOE will collect data on the schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. This information will be posted publicly on the IDOE K-12 data Website, http://www.doe.in.gov/data/.

II. INDICATOR (b)(1)

Plan Instructions

If (as indicated in Part 3A) the State does not have a statewide longitudinal data system that fully includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, as addressed in indicator **(b)(1),** please attach a plan that provides the process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act, including the following information:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Describe the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Describe the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please mark which elements, per the instructions in Part 1, must be addressed in your state plan:

COMPETES Element	Must be addressed in plan	Does not need to be addressed in plan
1		X
2		X
3		X
4		X
5		X
6		X
7		X
8		X
9	X	
10		X
11	X	
12	X	

Indicator (b)(1)

Indiana has not completed three of the twelve elements of the America COMPETES Act. This section details Indiana's plan to meet the additional four elements.

Element 9: Student-level transcript information, including on courses completed and grades earned.

Background

Indiana utilizes a student-level data collection but as of yet has not collected transcript-level data. Indiana's student-level data collection dates back to 2004. Indiana does use state standardized course codes at the elementary, middle, and secondary levels.

Milestones

Course Completion/Certified Positions Data Collection

Indiana plans to implement a pilot to collect information, at the student level, on courses taken, grades and credits earned, and whether courses taken were dual credit (and whether dual credit was earned). The Indiana Department of Education will utilize its current data collection system, the STN (Student Test Number) Application Center, which is a Web-based data upload mechanism that is used to collect data at the student level.

Summer 2010: Collection window opens; schools submit data via STN application center (note—the initial collection will be optional and will likely involve approximately 10-15 school corporations

August 2010: Pilot collection closes, pilot districts sign off on data

September 2010: IDOE analyzes data submitted, announces new collection for Winter 2010

Winter 2010: Period 1 required Course Completion and Certified Positions reports open; all public schools and charter schools are required to submit data

Spring 2011: IDOE analyzes data submitted and reports aggregate level data on public Web

Summer 2011: Period 2 required Course Completion and Certified Positions reports open; all public schools and charter schools are required to submit data

Fall 2011: IDOE analyzes data submitted and reports aggregate level data on public Web

Collection continues as described for subsequent years

E-Transcript Repository

In order to further enhance its student-level course completion and course-taking pattern data collection, Indiana is requesting funds from the ARRA SLDS grant to expand its e-transcript initiative and create a transcript repository (as well as facilitate automated student record exchange). From the transcript repository, IDOE will be able to generate reports on course-taking patterns, the impact of course-taking patterns on college success (and whether students are being required to take remedial courses), and diploma audit reports. IDOE plans to partner with the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) on this project.

Summer 2010: IDOE identifies vendor to create e-transcript repository

Fall 2010: IDOE, vendor, and Commission for Higher Education identify requirements for transcript exchange system and transcript repository and reports to be created from the e-transcript repository, as well as requirements for transcript content (including Student Test Number, STN)

Spring 2011: Transcript exchange system and transcript repository are implemented and functional (including reports created)

Spring 2011: State and local courses are mapped to SCED to standardize transcripts and create diploma auditing capabilities

Spring 2012: Data are extracted from transcript repository; K-12 and higher education data are integrated using STN

Obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated in reaching milestone one. If SLDS funding is not received, funding could prove an obstacle to implementing a full transcript repository and automated student record exchange as envisioned in milestone two. However, IDOE plans to build a Web service for higher education to obtain Student Test Numbers (STN) which can be placed on higher education transcripts, allowing for data exchange between K-12 and post-secondary education. IDOE will use existing funds to create the Web service.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

No use of additional funds is anticipated in reaching milestone one. Approximately 1.5 FTE will be needed for development around the course completion data collection (for the manual collection) and 1.5FTE to manage the collection (this will be in-kind support). Approximately $2.1 million in SLDS funding is strongly desired in order to complete milestone two. If SLDS funds are not awarded, IDOE will seek first-ever state funding for students data systems in order to complete this element during the 2010 budget session of the General Assembly. IDOE will use existing funds to create a Web service STN lookup function that will allow approved users at institutions of higher education to obtain students' STNs and implement the STN in the SIS of the higher education institution, allowing for linkages between K-12 and postsecondary education.

To implement the e-transcript repository, IDOE will contract with a vendor, and costs will be approximately $4 million over three years ($2.1 million for this portion of the project). Cost breakdown is as follows (note that costs are based on vendor estimates and are subject to change):

$1,370,000 over three years to implement high school e-transcript with state transcript repository services; cost includes full project and account management throughout project launch, rollout, and lifecycle; live Web-based training for high school personnel and on-demand training modules; licensing fees; unlimited e-transcript submissions; support services to school end-user personnel; and marketing and instructional materials for students and school staff.

$700,000 over two years to implement K-12 student record exchange services, including a common student record exchange report template, upload service, bi-directional request and retrieve interfaces, staff support services, unlimited in-state transfers, and on-demand training materials.

Progress Reporting

Reports on progress toward accomplishing this project will be provided to the public on the state's Website. IDOE will create a unique Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems web page within its main site on which it will report progress toward each of its objectives for indicators c11 and c12 as well as offer general information about the state's data system. Progress will be reported to the public quarterly, with the first progress report published Summer 2010. Once IDOE has collected information on indicators d5 and d6, information will be posted on the state's K-12 data page (www.doe.in.gov/data). In addition, information will be posted on each school's ASAP site (example: http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5481).

Element 11: Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework.

Background

The Indiana Department of Education and Indiana Commission for Higher Education (CHE) have been working together for nearly a year to identify mechanisms by which K-12 and higher education data can be connected. Currently, the CHE collects data from Indiana's public postsecondary institutions; however, students are identified using Social Security Number. IDOE does not use SSN; IDOE uses its unique student identifier, the Student Test Number (STN). As of 08-09, CHE began requesting that its public institutions use the STN.

Milestones

CHE and IDOE data matching/Web services for STN

End of 2009: IDOE and CHE will pilot data matching between K-12 and IHEs. IDOE provides validated STN (student test number) data back to CHE

February 2010: IDOE and CHE renew data sharing agreement through 2013

Spring 2010: High School feedback reports based on higher education data are generated and provided to high schools (currently CHE collects data on which high schools students attended from public institutions of higher education, allowing for feedback reports; however, because student-student linkages are not yet available, it's not yet possible to track students back from 12th grade. However, see continued plans to do so.

Summer 2010: IDOE constructs a Web service that allows authorized higher education users to look up directory information on students and obtain the students' previously assigned STN, if the student attended high school at an Indiana public or accredited non-public high school. IDOE assigns blocks of never before used STNs that institutions of higher education can assign to students transferring in from out of state or never before attending a K-12 institution (or graduating prior to 2004, the first year Indiana used STN).

Winter 2010: IDOE exchanges data with higher education, validates STN information, and provides K-12 information to institutions of higher education. IDOE also obtains and analyzes higher education data, including number of students enrolled in post-secondary institutions and percentage of students enrolled in remedial education.

Summer 2011: IDOE and CHE create high school feedback reports based on data exchanged; aggregated high school feedback information is posted on IDOE's public site.

E-transcript and Transcript Repository

While the plan to institute a Web service will greatly assist in the ability to link K-12 to post-secondary, further linkages are desired (including data on student transcript-level information).

IDOE's proposal for ARRA SLDS funds (in conjunction with CHE, a partner agency for the SLDS project proposal) includes expansion of its e-transcript project, including adding STN to the e-transcript, facilitating transcript exchange between high schools, from high school to college, and from college to college. In addition, a transcript repository will be created that will allow for report querying (including the extent to which students are taking remedial coursework) and high school feedback reports.

Summer 2010: IDOE identifies vendor to create e-transcript repository

Fall 2010: IDOE, vendor, and Commission for Higher Education identify requirements for transcript exchange system and transcript repository and reports to be created from the e-transcript repository, as well as requirements for transcript content (including Student Test Number, STN)

Spring 2011: Transcript exchange system and transcript repository are implemented and functional (including reports created)

Spring 2011: State and local courses are mapped to SCED to standardize transcripts and create diploma auditing capabilities

Spring 2012: Data are extracted from transcript repository; K-12 and higher education data are integrated using STN

K-12 and workforce data sharing

IDOE is a partner agency in the IWIS (Indiana Workforce and Education Intelligence System) project. IWIS is designed to be a secure repository for matched workforce, higher education, adult education, and K-12 (including career and technical education) data. Through IWIS, IDOE hopes to be able to facilitate matching with workforce data, as well as obtain reports generated from the IWIS warehouse on student success in higher education and the workforce. IDOE has already shared adult education data with Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and has obtained approval to amend its MOU with DWD and CHE to match career and technical education and K-12 data.

February 2010: IDOE and DWD revise data sharing agreement to include CTE and K-12 data and to extend through 2013

Spring 2010: DWD submits data set to IDOE (as done in the past with adult education data); IDOE matches data set with CTE and K-12 data using matching algorithm (first name, last name, DOB, race/ethnicity, and gender) and provides matched data to DWD using IWIS unique identifiers to place in IWIS system

Spring 2010: DWD uses IWIS identifier and further matches CTE data with existing higher education data in IWIS

Spring 2010: IDOE, DWD, and CHE identify reports to be created using matched CTE and K-12 data sets

Summer 2010: IDOE works with CHE and DWD to explore the possibility of creating a Web services lookup (similar to the lookup created for CHE) to be used by DWD entities, allowing STN to be utilized across P-20

Fall 2010: IDOE implements Web service for DWD (if determined feasible and useful), follows same processes as described in milestone two with CHE

Obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated in reaching milestone one. If SLDS funding is not received, funding could prove an obstacle to implementing a full transcript repository and automated student record exchange as envisioned in milestone two. No obstacles are anticipated in reaching milestone three; however, lack of a transcript repository and universal ID between higher education and K-12 education could present an obstacle in creating further linkages with workforce data. Implementation of a Web service for STN lookup as described in the milestones section will help mitigate these obstacles.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

No use of additional funds is anticipated in reaching milestone one. IDOE staff time is approximately 1.5 FTE in-kind support for data matching and loading (developer and DBA/Data Warehouse Architect). Approximately $4 million in SLDS funding is strongly desired in order to complete milestone two ($4 million for the entire transcript repository project, approximately $1.2 million which is related to K-12 to postsecondary data exchange and high school feedback reports). If SLDS funds are not awarded, IDOE will seek first-ever state funding for students data systems in order to complete this element during the 2010 budget session of the General Assembly. In addition, IDOE will use existing funds to create a Web service for STN lookup for institutions of higher education and potentially DWD entities.

To implement the e-transcript repository, IDOE will contract with a vendor, and costs will be approximately $4 million over three years (with approximately $1.2 million specifically related to Element 11). Cost breakdown is as follows (note that costs are based on vendor estimates and are subject to change):

$1,176,297 over three years for a higher education e-transcript initiative with state transcript repository services, including licensing fees, implementation of transcript capture client system, unlimited e-transcript submissions; and live and on-demand training.

Progress Reporting

Reports on progress toward accomplishing this project will be provided to the public on the state's Website. IDOE will create a unique Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems web page within its main site on which it will report progress toward each of its objectives for indicators c11 and c12 as well as offer general information about the state's data system. Progress reports will be provided quarterly, with the first progress report provided Summer 2010. Once IDOE has collected information on indicators d5 and d6, information will be posted on the state's K-12 data page (www.doe.in.gov/data). In addition, information will be posted on each school's ASAP site (example: http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5481).

Element 12: Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

Milestones

CHE and IDOE data matching/Web services for STN

End of 2009: IDOE and CHE will pilot data matching between K-12 and IHEs. IDOE provides validated STN (student test number) data back to CHE

February 2010: IDOE and CHE renew data sharing agreement through 2013

Spring 2010: High School feedback reports based on higher education data are generated and provided to high schools (currently CHE collects data on which high schools students attended from public institutions of higher education, allowing for feedback reports; however, because student-student linkages are not yet available, it's not yet possible to track students back from 12^{th} grade. However, see continued plans to do so.

Summer 2010: IDOE constructs a Web service that allows authorized higher education users to look up directory information on students and obtain the students' previously assigned STN, if the student attended high school at an Indiana public or accredited non-public high school. IDOE assigns blocks of never before used STNs that institutions of higher education can assign to students transferring in from out of state or never before attending a K-12 institution (or graduating prior to 2004, the first year Indiana used STN).

Winter 2010: IDOE exchanges data with higher education, validates STN information, and provides K-12 information to institutions of higher education. IDOE also obtains and analyzes higher education data, including number of students enrolled in post-secondary institutions and percentage of students enrolled in remedial education.

Summer 2011: IDOE and CHE create high school feedback reports based on data exchanged; aggregated high school feedback information is posted on IDOE's public site.

Course Completion/Certified Positions Data Collection

Indiana plans to implement a pilot to collect information, at the student level, on courses taken, grades and credits earned, and whether courses taken were dual credit (and whether dual credit was earned). The Indiana Department of Education will utilize its current data collection system, the STN (Student Test Number) Application Center, which is a Web-based data upload mechanism that is used to collect data at the student level.

Summer 2010: Collection window opens; schools submit data via STN application center (note—the initial collection will be optional and will likely involve approximately 10-15 school corporations

August 2010: Pilot collection closes, pilot districts sign off on data

September 2010: IDOE analyzes data submitted, announces new collection for Winter 2010

Winter 2010: Period 1 required Course Completion and Certified Positions reports open; all public schools and charter schools are required to submit data

Spring 2011: IDOE analyzes data submitted and reports aggregate level data on public Web

Summer 2011: Period 2 required Course Completion and Certified Positions reports open; all public schools and charter schools are required to submit data

Fall 2011: IDOE analyzes data submitted and reports aggregate level data on public Web

Collection continues as described for subsequent years

E-transcript and transcript repository, including diploma auditing capabilities

IDOE's proposal for ARRA SLDS funds (in conjunction with CHE, a partner agency for the SLDS project proposal) includes expansion of its e-transcript project, including adding STN to the e-transcript, facilitating transcript exchange between high schools, from high school to college, and from college to college. In addition, a transcript repository will be created that will allow for report querying (including the extent to which students are taking remedial coursework) and high school feedback reports.

In order to further enhance its student-level course completion and course-taking pattern data collection, Indiana is requesting funds from the ARRA SLDS grant to expand its e-transcript initiative and create a transcript repository (as well as facilitate automated student record exchange). From the transcript repository, IDOE will be able to generate reports on course-taking patterns, the impact of course-taking patterns on college success (and whether students are being required to take remedial courses), and diploma audit reports. IDOE plans to partner with the Commission for Higher Education (CHE) on this project.

Summer 2010: IDOE identifies vendor to create e-transcript repository

Fall 2010: IDOE, vendor, and Commission for Higher Education identify requirements for transcript exchange system and transcript repository and reports to be created from the e-transcript repository, as well as requirements for transcript content (including Student Test Number, STN)

Spring 2011: Transcript exchange system and transcript repository are implemented and functional (including reports created)

Spring 2011: State and local courses are mapped to SCED to standardize transcripts and create diploma auditing capabilities

Spring 2012: Data are extracted from transcript repository; K-12 and higher education data are integrated using STN

IWIS Project—P-20 data linkages

IDOE is a partner agency in the IWIS (Indiana Workforce and Education Intelligence System) project. IWIS is designed to be a secure repository for matched workforce, higher education, adult education, and K-12 (including career and technical education) data. Through IWIS, IDOE hopes to be able to facilitate matching with workforce data, as well as obtain reports generated from the IWIS warehouse on student success in higher education and the workforce. IDOE has already shared adult education data with Department of Workforce Development (DWD) and has received approval to make changes to its MOU with DWD and CHE to match career and technical education data.

February 2010: IDOE and DWD revise data sharing agreement to include CTE and K-12 data and to extend through 2013

Spring 2010: DWD submits data set to IDOE (as done in the past with adult education data); IDOE matches data set with CTE and K-12 data using matching algorithm (first name, last name, DOB, race/ethnicity, and gender) and provides matched data to DWD using IWIS unique identifiers to place in IWIS system

Spring 2010: DWD uses IWIS identifier and further matches CTE data with existing higher education data in IWIS

Spring 2010: IDOE, DWD, and CHE identify reports to be created using matched CTE and K-12 data sets

Summer 2010: IDOE works with CHE and DWD to explore the possibility of creating a Web services lookup (similar to the lookup created for CHE) to be used by DWD entities, allowing STN to be utilized across P-20

Fall 2010: IDOE implements Web service for DWD (if determined feasible and useful), follows same processes as described in milestone two with CHE

Obstacles

No obstacles are anticipated in reaching milestone one. If SLDS funding is not received, funding could prove an obstacle to implementing a full transcript repository and automated student record exchange as envisioned in milestone two. No obstacles are anticipated in reaching milestone three; however, lack of a transcript repository and universal ID between higher education and K-12 education could present an obstacle in creating further linkages with workforce data. Moreover, without SLDS funding, lack of additional IDOE resources for creating high school feedback reports and diploma audits could be an obstacle (IDOE is proposing to work with a contractor to provide these services).

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

No use of additional funds is anticipated in reaching milestone one. IDOE staff time is approximately 1.5 FTE in-kind support for data matching and loading (developer and DBA/Data Warehouse Architect). Approximately $4 million in SLDS funding is strongly desired in order to complete milestone two (with approximately $1 million specifically related to element 12). If SLDS funding is not awarded, IDOE will seek first-ever funding for the state's student data system from the 2010 budget session of the General Assembly. To implement the e-transcript repository and full usage of e-transcript, IDOE must contract with a vendor, and costs will be approximately $4 million over three years (with approximately $1 million specifically related to element 12).

To implement the e-transcript repository, IDOE will contract with a vendor, and costs will be approximately $4 million over three years (with approximately $1 million specifically related to element 12). Cost breakdown is as follows (note that costs are based on vendor estimates and are subject to change):

$536,250 for mapping state course codes to SCED; cost includes deployment and ongoing support for mapping of courses; administrator and state interface for mapping courses; normalized course and grade information sent to participating public in-state postsecondary institutions.

$423,000 for student-level transcript audit reports, including exportable Excel reports reflecting normalized state and local course codes, and diploma audit reports and interface for report download, as well as on-demand and Web-based training.

Progress Reporting
Reports on progress toward accomplishing this project will be provided to the public on the state's Website. IDOE will create a unique Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems web page within its main site on which it will report progress toward each of its objectives for indicators c11 and c12 as well as offer general information about the state's data system. Progress will be reported quarterly, with the first progress report in Summer 2010. Once IDOE has collected information on indicators d5 and d6, information will be posted on the state's K-12 data page (www.doe.in.gov/data). In addition, information will be posted on each school's ASAP site (example: http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=5481).

III. INDICATOR (b)(2)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(2)**) the State does not provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011 (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

II. Indicator (b)(2) Plan for providing student growth data to teachers.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is well on the way to fully implementing a growth model using Student Growth Percentiles (SGP).

Background

The IDOE began investigating "growth models" in earnest in the spring of 2008. We worked with the M. A. Rooney Foundation and a panel of state accountability experts to explore all existing models of growth, to consult with national experts and to evaluate the models on Indiana student data. In April of 2009 the State Board of Education approved the IDOE to move forward with the complete testing and modification of the "Colorado" growth model (SGP) with the full Indiana student data set. In September of 2009 both the Indiana Education Roundtable and the State Board reviewed the SGP results and approved the 2009-10 rollout of growth data.

Milestones

October 26, 2009 – Phase 1 – Aggregate school level growth data was released to schools and LEAs (four quadrant report).

December 1, 2009 – Phase 1 – School growth data was released to public

February 1, 2010 – Phase 2 – Disaggregated data will be released to schools and LEAs (including grade level, gender, race, SES, ELL and SWD).

March 1, 2010 – Phase 2 – Disaggregated growth data will be released to the public.

April 5, 2010 – Phase 3 – Student level growth data will be made available to registered teachers and principals through the secure state portal, "The Learning Connection." This milestone will satisfy Indicators (b)(2) and (b)(3).

September 1, 2010 – Student level growth data for the May 2010 test will be available to registered teachers and principals through the secure state portal, "The Learning Connection." Teachers will have access to both the current year and a longitudinal growth profile for each student.

Obstacles

The biggest obstacle to providing growth data to teachers is the current lack of a consistent link between the teacher identifier and the student identifier. The 2010-11 school year will be the first time our student information system will collect the needed information to provide access to growth data for all of a student's teachers.

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

IDOE has partnered from the beginning with Damian Betebenner (creator of the SGP model) of National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and the Colorado Department of Education. We have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Colorado Department of Education to work on a common display platform, a common development environment and to share all enhancements and modifications to the SGP statistical and display tools. In the spring of 2009, Indiana utilized federal Title VI funds to execute a $31,000 contract for SGP work with NCIEA and IDOE is currently negotiating a longer-term agreement that will be in alignment with the MOU. This longer-term agreement will cost in the range of $100,000 per year and is likely to be covered with an equal split of state and federal funds.

In addition to the contracts with NCIEA and the Colorado MOU, Indiana has committed the following resources over the next year specifically to the implementation of the growth model.

Chief Assessment Officer	.30 FTE
Director of Assessment	.10 FTE
Project Manager	.25 FTE
Programmer	.50 FTE

In-state technical assistance and review continue to be provided by our state accountability panel (comprised of officials from three school corporations across the state, selected specifically to assist with this project) and the Testing Advisory Committee, a standing committee that gathers quarterly to advise the IDOE on assessment issues.

Growth data will be publicly linked directly to the profile page of each school and district in Indiana, the public will also be regularly informed as each "non-secure" phase of growth data is released. Each school and school corporation has a snapshot page on the IDOE website. Here is a sample link to a current school snapshot page:
http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/SEARCH/snapshot.cfm?schl=7537

An additional link will be added to each snapshot page for student growth data.

IDOE is also considering creating a dedicated webpage within the IDOE site for student growth, somewhat like is currently done for the federal and state school accountability systems. This page would be the primary resource for learning about updates on the growth model as it develops and more data is released.

III. INDICATOR (b)(3)

Instructions: If (as indicated in **Part 3A, Indicator (b)(3)**) the State does not provide teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement, please attach a plan that provides:

The process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide teachers with such data, including:

- The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means and the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone;
- Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

III. **Indicator (b) (3) Plan for providing Individual teacher impact reports.**

The SPG student level growth data (Indicator (b) (2)) will provide reports both of student growth and the impact of individual teachers on student achievement. The timelines and resources are one in the same. Since teachers will be provided current and longitudinal growth for their students they will have a context to evaluate their impact on the learning trajectory of each student.

Background

The IDOE began investigating "growth models" in earnest in the spring of 2008. We worked with the M. A. Rooney Foundation and a panel of state accountability experts to explore all existing models of growth, to consult with national experts and to evaluate the models on Indiana student data. In April of 2009 the State Board of Education approved the IDOE to move forward with the complete testing and modification of the "Colorado" growth model (SGP) with the full Indiana student data set. In September of 2009 both the Indiana Education Roundtable and the State Board reviewed the SGP results and approved the 2009-10 rollout of growth data.

Milestones

October 26, 2009 – Phase 1 – Aggregate school level growth data was released to schools and LEAs (four quadrant report).

December 1, 2009 – Phase 1 – School growth data was released to public

February 1, 2010 – Phase 2 – Disaggregated data will be released to schools and LEAs (including grade level, gender, race, SES, ELL and SWD).

March 1, 2010 – Phase 2 – Disaggregated growth data will be released to the public.

April 5, 2010 – Phase 3 – Student level growth data will be made available to registered teachers and principals through the secure state portal, "The Learning Connection." This milestone will satisfy Indicators (b)(2) and (b)(3).

September 1, 2010 – Student level growth data for the May 2010 test will be available to registered teachers and principals through the secure state portal, "The Learning Connection"

Obstacles

The biggest obstacle to providing growth data to teachers is the current lack of a consistent link between the teacher identifier and the student identifier. The 2010-11 school year will be the first time our student information system will collect the needed information to provide access to growth data for all of a student's teachers .

Funding, Resources and Technical Assistance

IDOE has partnered from the beginning with Damian Betebenner (creator of the SGP model) of National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and the Colorado Department of Education. We have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Colorado Department of Education to work on a common display platform, a common development environment and to share all enhancements and modifications to the SGP statistical and display tools. In the spring of 2009, Indiana utilized federal Title VI funds to execute a $31,000 contract for SGP work with NCIEA and IDOE is currently negotiating a longer term agreement that will be in alignment with the MOU. This longer term agreement will cost in the range of $100,000 per year and is likely to be covered with an equal split of state and federal funds.

In addition to the contracts with NCIEA and the Colorado MOU, Indiana has committed the following resources over the next year specifically to the implementation of the growth model.

Chief Assessment Officer	.30 FTE
Director of Assessment	.10 FTE
Project Manager	.25 FTE
Programmer	.50 FTE

In state technical assistance and review continue to be provided by our state accountability panel and the Testing Advisory Committee.

Growth data will be publicly linked directly to the profile page of each school and district in Indiana, the public will also be regularly informed as each "non-secure" phase of growth data is released.

IDOE is also considering creating a dedicated webpage within the IDOE site for student growth, somewhat like is currently done for the federal and state school accountability systems. This page would be the primary resource for learning about updates on the growth model as it develops and more data is released.

IV. INDICATORS (c)(11) AND (c)(12)

Important note regarding this section:

In the case of new Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), regarding the data States will collect from IHEs, the State is required to, at a minimum, possess the ability to collect and report the data. In such circumstances, a State plan need only address the development of capacity, and not implementation and reporting for the relevant indicators.

If the State will develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) for either of these indicators by September 30, 2011, the full plan requirements for this section **do** apply. If that is the case, please report all elements of that plan in Part 3B, Section I above.

State Plan Instructions: For each of *Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12)* for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), please attach a plan that provides:

(1) The process and timeline for achieving the ability to implement the means to fully collect and/or publicly report (as required) the data or information by September 30, 2011, including:

- The milestones established toward developing those means;
- The date by which the State expects to reach each such milestone; and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;
- The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing those means; and
- The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(2) A description of the evidence that the State will provide to the Department of Education to demonstrate that it has developed the means to collect and publicly report the data for each indicator for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data, by September 30, 2011.

Furthermore, the plan must satisfy the following general requirements:

(A) Identify the agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and describe the capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(B) Identify the agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and describe the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(C) Provide the overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan; and

(D) Describe the way the State will publicly report the plan and the State's progress reports on its plan, including the nature and frequency of updated reports to the public on State actions taken under the plan and the website where the State will make the plan and progress reports publicly available (as defined in the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria for the SFSF Phase II).

Plan Element Verification: Please check only the boxes that apply in the following chart to indicate which elements must be addressed in this section of your state plan:

Element	Not Applicable: The State will	Applicable: The State will

	develop and implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in Section I).	develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (Complete Plan in this section).
Indicator (c)(11)	X	
Indicator (c)(12)	X	

Indicator (c)(11)

Indicator (d)(4)

IDOE does not currently collect information on the number of lowest performing schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed because this is the first year (09-10) that IDOE has had schools that fit the category of "lowest performing", which is defined in indicator (d)(1).

IDOE will collect data on the schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. This information will be posted publicly on the IDOE K-12 data Website, http://www.doe.in.gov/data/.

Indicator (d)(6)

IDOE does not currently collect information on the number of lowest performing schools that are eligible for, but do not received Title I funds that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed because this is the first year (09-10) that IDOE has had schools that fit the category of "lowest performing", which is defined in indicator (d)(1).

IDOE will collect data on the schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed at the end of the 2009-2010 school year. This information will be posted publicly on the IDOE K-12 data Website, http://www.doe.in.gov/data/.

PART 3C-- GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Please attach the following information—

(1) Describe the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information on the indicators and descriptors.

IDOE's current data collection system includes error checks and data validations upon submission. Each student- and teacher-level data collection has written requirements for validations and error checks that are programmed into the collection. Data stewards at the IDOE are required to review and sign off on requirements. A data steward is a staff person who has extensive knowledge of program data and is using the data on a regular basis. The data steward is accountable for managing data, ensuring accuracy of data, and insuring that data collected are not redundant. A data steward understands the data and is able to guide users in interpreting and using the data. The data steward promotes or restricts access to data, where appropriate. The data steward facilitates the sharing of data and the use of data for policymaking and program evaluation.

Error checks include cross-field error checking and cross-collection validations. Error checks and validations are done at the student level. If records do not meet minimum validation requirements, records will fail to be accepted until errors have been rectified. The system also provides post-collection summary and exception reports at the student, school, and district level. IDOE data stewards are required to review post-collection summary reports and contact IDOE collection specialists with any concerns about data reviewed. Additionally, school district superintendents are required to review and sign off on all collections prior to the collections closing.

(2) Describe the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

IDOE has data security policies in place for data sharing to ensure that protected data are not made publicly available. IDOE follows cell suppression rules—cells with n sizes of 10 or fewer are not publicly reported. Any reported student-level data is housed in the STN Application Center, which is password protected. Prior to sharing de-identified student level data, individuals must complete and sign data sharing agreements, which are reviewed and approved by IDOE legal staff. Cell suppression rules apply to de-identified data as well. As per the data sharing agreement, de-identified data must be destroyed after use.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

STATE ALLOCATION DATA

State	SFSF Education Fund Amount Remaining
Alabama	59,635,587
Alaska	30,704,243
Arizona	274,516,879
Arkansas	119,807,496
California	487,549,876
Colorado	205,219,871
Connecticut	146,273,112
Delaware	36,405,622
District of Columbia	24,126,447
Florida	728,916,950
Georgia	416,063,701
Hawaii	51,876,575
Idaho	66,560,895
Illinois	554,773,126
Indiana	197,678,694
Iowa	127,503,336
Kansas	121,249,535
Kentucky	175,823,202
Louisiana	191,265,519
Maine	52,222,609
Maryland	237,493,405
Massachusetts	268,390,060
Michigan	429,781,767
Minnesota	220,403,088
Mississippi	129,382,422
Missouri	248,546,871
Montana	40,137,322
Nebraska	77,205,456
Nevada	107,053,560
New Hampshire	54,200,505
New Jersey	359,150,805
New Mexico	85,944,012
New York	814,624,071
North Carolina	383,437,416
North Dakota	28,262,631
Ohio	483,024,288
Oklahoma	156,030,836

State	SFSF Education Fund Amount Remaining
Oregon	**74,633,845**
Pennsylvania	**514,403,320**
Rhode Island	**44,521,007**
South Carolina	**56,774,130**
South Dakota	**34,416,587**
Tennessee	**255,794,562**
Texas	**1,072,589,804**
Utah	**129,552,001**
Vermont	**25,459,523**
Virginia	**324,675,748**
Washington	**270,582,460**
West Virginia	**71,930,420**
Wisconsin	**236,721,210**
Wyoming	**22,314,665**
Puerto Rico	**174,814,813**
TOTAL TO STATE GRANTS	**11,500,425,885**

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR PART 2: MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT (MOE)

Background

Section 14005(d)(1) of the ARRA contains maintenance-of-effort (MOE) requirements that apply to the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education, as well as to the levels of State support for public institutions of higher education. The requirements are as follows:

Elementary and Secondary Education

In each of FYs 2009, 2010, and 2011, the State will maintain State support for elementary and secondary education at least at the level of such support in FY 2006.

Public Institutions of Higher Education

In each of FYs 2009, 2010, and 2011, the State will maintain State support for public institutions of higher education (not including support for capital projects or for research and development or tuition and fees paid by students) at least at the level of such support in FY 2006.

Section 14012 of the ARRA authorizes the Secretary of Education to waive or modify these requirements if the following statutory criterion is met:

MOE Waiver Criterion

A State is eligible for a waiver of the elementary and secondary education MOE requirement or the higher education MOE requirement for a given fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the State will not provide for elementary, secondary, and public higher education, for the fiscal year under consideration, a smaller percentage of the total revenues available to the State than the percentage provided for such purpose in the preceding fiscal year.

The term "total revenues available to the State" as stated in the criterion includes total State revenues for education and other purposes. The MOE waiver criterion applies to both waivers of the elementary and secondary education MOE requirements and the higher education MOE requirements.

Sections 14005(d)(1) and (b)(2) of the ARRA requires each State to provide an assurance that it will comply with the MOE requirements and baseline data that demonstrates the State's current status regarding maintenance of effort. On May 1, 2009, the Department issued guidance on the Maintenance of Effort Requirements for SFSF and an MOE waiver form, which are available at http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/recovery/statutory/moe-guidance.pdf.

Additional Information For Completing Part 2A:
Update of Maintenance-Of-Effort Information

Determining the level of State support for elementary and secondary education

A State determines its level of State support for elementary and secondary education for a given fiscal year in a manner that is consistent with its governing statutes and regulations. One example of how a State may choose to quantify its level of support for elementary and secondary education is to use the data that is included as "Revenue from State Sources" in the National Public Education Finance Survey (NPEFS). (*See* http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/pdf/NPEFSmanual2004.pdf.) This is a survey of States that is conducted annually by the National Center for Education Statistics. NPEFS identifies four types of State support for LEAs:

- Unrestricted Grants-in-Aid: State grants to LEAs that can be used, without restriction, for any legal purpose desired by the LEA;
- Restricted Grants-in-Aid: State grants to an LEA that must be used for a "categorical" or specific purpose;
- Revenue in Lieu of Taxes: Commitments or payments made out of general revenues by a State to an LEA in lieu of taxes that the State would have had to pay had its property or other tax base been subject to taxation on the same basis as privately owned property. This revenue includes payments in lieu of taxes for privately owned property that is not subject to taxation on the same basis as other privately owned property because of action(s) taken by a State; and
- Revenue for, or on Behalf of, the LEA: State commitments or payments for the benefit of an LEA and contributions of equipment and supplies. Such revenue includes payments made for, or on behalf, of an LEA by a State to a pension fund for LEA employees.

In determining levels of State support for MOE purposes, a State may also use the amount of funds provided to LEAs through the State's primary funding formulae in a given year as the level of State support for elementary and secondary education for that year. Alternatively, a State may establish its own definition of State support for elementary and secondary education. In providing the MOE baseline data for the levels of State support for elementary and secondary education in Part 2A, a State must identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of such support.

Finally, a State may establish that it is complying with the elementary and secondary education MOE requirements on either an aggregate basis or a per-student basis.

Determining the level of State support for public institutions of higher education

In Part 2A, a State must also provide data on its level of State support for public IHEs for specific fiscal years. These data may *not* include support for capital projects or for research and development or tuition and fees paid by students.

In addition, State funding for financial assistance to students attending public IHEs is not considered State support for these institutions. Rather, such funding is considered support for students to enable them to pay their educational expenses, even if the IHEs administer the funding. However, unrestricted State funding for public IHEs is considered State support for such institutions even if those institutions choose to use a portion of that funding for financial assistance to students.

One example of how a State may quantify State support for public IHEs is to use the definitions from the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) State Higher Education Finance study, an annual data collection of all State and local revenue used to support higher education. (*See* http://sheeo.org/finance/shef-home.htm.) In that study, SHEEO identifies the following as State revenue sources for public IHEs:

- State tax appropriations set aside specifically to support public higher education;
- Funding under State auspices for appropriated non-tax support (e.g., tobacco settlement funds and lotteries) specifically set aside for public higher education; and
- Interest or earnings received from State-endowments pledged to public IHEs.

Alternatively, a State may establish its own definition of State support for public IHEs. In providing the MOE baseline data for the levels of State support for public IHEs in Part 2A, a State must identify and describe the data sources used in determining the levels of such support.

Specific Instructions Regarding Part 2A, Update of Maintenance-Of-Effort Data

In the SFSF Phase I Application for Initial Funding, States were required to submit MOE data identical to that requested here in Phase II. The Department is requesting that States reaffirm these data for Phase II, and in particular, to update FY 2009 data to actual levels of State support.

Specific Instructions Regarding Part 2B, Attestation of Maintenance-Of-Effort Compliance

The Governor or his/her authorized representative must attest that the State has complied with all MOE requirements of the SFSF program for FY 2009. In the event that a State is unable to meet MOE, it must submit a waiver request, if it has not done so already.

Appendix C

AUTHORIZING STATUTE FOR THE STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009

Public Law 111-5 (H.R. 1), February 17, 2009; 123 Stat. 115

As amended by Public Law 111-8 (H.R. 1105), the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009; Division A, Section 523; March 11, 2009; 123 Stat. 524

Below are excerpts from Public Law 111-5, as amended by Public Law 111-8, that relate to the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund administered by the U.S. Department of Education. The U.S. Department of Education has posted this information as a courtesy to readers. The official (and controlling) texts of this material will be printed in those two Public Laws.

DIVISION A, TITLE XIV – STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE FISCAL STABILIZATION FUND

For necessary expenses for a State Fiscal Stabilization Fund, $53,600,000,000, which shall be administered by the Department of Education.

GENERAL PROVISIONS – THIS TITLE

SEC. 14001. ALLOCATIONS.

(a) Outlying Areas. From the amount appropriated to carry out this title, the Secretary of Education shall first allocate up to one-half of 1 percent to the outlying areas on the basis of their respective needs, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, for activities consistent with this title under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine.

(b) Administration and Oversight. The Secretary may, in addition, reserve up to $14,000,000 for administration and oversight of this title, including for program evaluation.

(c) Reservation for Additional Programs. After reserving funds under subsections (a) and (b), the Secretary shall reserve $5,000,000,000 for grants under sections 14006 and 14007.

(d) State Allocations. After carrying out subsections (a), (b), and (c), the Secretary shall allocate the remaining funds made available to carry out this title to the States as follows:

(1) 61 percent on the basis of their relative population of individuals aged 5 through 24.

(2) 39 percent on the basis of their relative total population.

(e) State Grants. From funds allocated under subsection (d), the Secretary shall make grants to the Governor of each State.

(f) Reallocation. The Governor shall return to the Secretary any funds received under subsection (e) that the Governor does not award as subgrants or otherwise commit within two years of receiving such funds, and the Secretary shall reallocate such funds to the remaining States in accordance with subsection (d).

SEC. 14002. STATE USES OF FUNDS.

(a) Education Fund.

(1) In general. For each fiscal year, the Governor shall use 81.8 percent of the State's allocation under section 14001(d) for the support of elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education and, as applicable, early childhood education programs and services.

(2) Restoring state support for education.

(A) In general. The Governor shall first use the funds described in paragraph (1)—

(i) to provide the amount of funds, through the State's primary elementary and secondary education funding formulae, that is needed—

(I) to restore, in each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, the level of State support provided through such formulae to the greater of the fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 level; and

(II) where applicable, to allow existing State formulae increases to support elementary and secondary education for fiscal years 2010 and 2011 to be implemented and allow funding for phasing in State equity and adequacy adjustments, if such increases were enacted pursuant to State law prior to October 1, 2008.

(ii) to provide, in each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, the amount of funds to public institutions of higher education in the State that is needed to restore State support for such institutions (excluding tuition and fees paid by students) to the greater of the fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 level.

(B) Shortfall. If the Governor determines that the amount of funds available under paragraph (1) is insufficient to support, in each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, public elementary, secondary, and higher education at the levels described in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A), the Governor shall allocate those funds between those clauses in proportion to the relative shortfall in State support for the education sectors described in those clauses.

(C) Fiscal year. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "fiscal year" shall have the meaning given such term under State law.

(3) Subgrants to improve basic programs operated by local educational agencies.--After carrying out paragraph (2), the Governor shall use any funds remaining under paragraph (1) to provide local educational agencies in the State with subgrants based on their relative shares of funding under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) for the most recent year for which data are available.

(b) Other Government Services.

(1) In general. The Governor shall use 18.2 percent of the State's allocation under section 14001(d) for public safety and other government services, which may include assistance for elementary and secondary education and public institutions of higher education, and for modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities and institutions of higher education facilities, including modernization, renovation, and repairs that are consistent with a recognized green building rating system.

(2) Availability to all institutions of higher education. A Governor shall not consider the type or mission of an institution of higher education, and shall consider any institution for funding for modernization, renovation, and repairs within the State that—

(A) qualifies as an institution of higher education, as defined in subsection 14013(3); and

(B) continues to be eligible to participate in the programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965.

(c) Rule of Construction. Nothing in this section shall allow a local educational agency to engage in school modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law.

SEC. 14003. USES OF FUNDS BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.

(a) In General. A local educational agency that receives funds under this title may use he funds for any activity authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) ("SEA"), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) ("IDEA"), the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (20 U.S.C. 9201 et seq.), or the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 (20 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.) ("the Perkins Act") or for modernization, renovation, or repair of public school facilities, including modernization, renovation, and repairs that are consistent with a recognized green building rating system.

(b) Prohibition. A local educational agency may not use funds received under this title for—

(1) payment of maintenance costs;

(2) stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;

(3) purchase or upgrade of vehicles; or

(4) improvement of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities.

(c) Rule of Construction. Nothing in this section shall allow a local educational agency to engage in school modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law.

SEC. 14004. USES OF FUNDS BY INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) In General. A public institution of higher education that receives funds under this title shall use the funds for education and general expenditures, and in such a way as to mitigate the need to raise tuition and fees for in-State students, or for modernization, renovation, or repair of institution of higher education facilities that are primarily used for instruction, research, or student housing, including modernization, renovation, and repairs that are consistent with a recognized green building rating system.

(b) Prohibition. An institution of higher education may not use funds received under this title to increase its endowment.

(c) Additional Prohibition. No funds awarded under this title may be used for—

(1) the maintenance of systems, equipment, or facilities;

(2) modernization, renovation, or repair of stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public; or

(3) modernization, renovation, or repair of facilities—

(A) used for sectarian instruction or religious worship; or

(B) in which a substantial portion of the functions of the facilities are subsumed in a religious mission.

SEC. 14005. STATE APPLICATIONS.

(a) In General. The Governor of a State desiring to receive an allocation under section 14001(d) shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(b) Application. In such application, the Governor shall—

(1) include the assurances described in subsection (d);

(2) provide baseline data that demonstrates the State's current status in each of the areas described in such assurances; and

(3) describe how the State intends to use its allocation, including whether the State will use such allocation to meet maintenance of effort requirements under the ESEA and IDEA and, in such cases, what amount will be used to meet such requirements.

(c) Incentive Grant Application. The Governor of a State seeking a grant under section 14006 shall—

(1) submit an application for consideration;

(2) describe the status of the State's progress in each of the areas described in subsection (d), and the strategies the State is employing to help ensure that students in the subgroups described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II)) who

have not met the State's proficiency targets continue making progress toward meeting the State's student academic achievement standards;

(3) describe the achievement and graduation rates (as described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(vi) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)(C)(vi)) and as clarified in section 200.19(b)(1) of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations) of public elementary and secondary school students in the State, and the strategies the State is employing to help ensure that all subgroups of students identified in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2)) in the State continue making progress toward meeting the State's student academic achievement standards;

(4) describe how the State would use its grant funding to improve student academic achievement in the State, including how it will allocate the funds to give priority to high-need local educational agencies; and

(5) include a plan for evaluating the State's progress in closing achievement gaps.

(d) Assurances. An application under subsection (b) shall include the following assurances:

(1) Maintenance of effort.

(A) Elementary and secondary education. The State will, in each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, maintain State support for elementary and secondary education at least at the level of such support in fiscal year 2006.

(B) Higher education. The State will, in each of fiscal years 2009, 2010, and 2011, maintain State support for public institutions of higher education (not including support for capital projects or for research and development or tuition and fees paid by students) at least at the level of such support in fiscal year 2006.

(2) Achieving equity in teacher distribution. The State will take actions to improve teacher effectiveness and comply with section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(8)(C)) in order to address inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers between high- and low-poverty schools, and to ensure that low-income and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers.

(3) Improving collection and use of data. The State will establish a longitudinal data system that includes the elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act (20 U.S.C. 9871).

(4) Standards and assessments. The State—

(A) will enhance the quality of the academic assessments it administers pursuant to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)) through activities such as those described in section 6112(a) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 7301a(a));

(B) will comply with the requirements of paragraphs (3)(C)(ix) and (6) of section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)) and section 612(a)(16) of the IDEA (20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(16)) related to the inclusion of children with disabilities and limited English proficient students in State assessments, the development of valid and reliable assessments for those students, and the provision of accommodations that enable their participation in State assessments; and

(C) will take steps to improve State academic content standards and student academic achievement standards consistent with section 6401(e)(1)(A)(ii) of the America COMPETES Act.

(5) Supporting struggling schools. The State will ensure compliance with the requirements of section 1116(b)(7)(C)(iv) and section 1116(b)(8)(B) of the ESEA with respect to schools identified under such sections.

SEC. 14006. STATE INCENTIVE GRANTS.

(a) In General.

(1) Reservation. From the total amount reserved under section 14001(c) that is not used for section 14007, the Secretary may reserve up to 1 percent for technical assistance to States to assist them in meeting the objectives of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 14005(d).

(2) Remainder. Of the remaining funds, the Secretary shall, in fiscal year 2010, make grants to States that have made significant progress in meeting the objectives of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 14005(d).

(b) Basis for Grants. The Secretary shall determine which States receive grants under this section, and the amount of those grants, on the basis of information provided in State applications under section 14005 and such other criteria as the Secretary determines appropriate, which may include a State's need for assistance to help meet the objective of paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of section 14005(d).

(c) Subgrants to Local Educational Agencies. Each State receiving a grant under this section shall use at least 50 percent of the grant to provide local educational agencies in the State with subgrants based on their relative shares of funding under part A of title I of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.) for the most recent year.

SEC. 14007. INNOVATION FUND.

(a) In General.

(1) Eligible entities. For the purposes of this section, the term "eligible entity" means—

(A) a local educational agency; or

(B) a partnership between a nonprofit organization and—

(i) one or more local educational agencies; or

(ii) a consortium of schools.

(2) Program established. From the total amount reserved under section 14001(c), the Secretary may reserve up to $650,000,000 to establish an Innovation Fund, which shall consist of academic achievement awards that recognize eligible entities that meet the requirements described in subsection (b).

(3) Basis for awards. The Secretary shall make awards to eligible entities that have made significant gains in closing the achievement gap as described in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) to allow such eligible entities to expand their work and serve as models for best practices;

(B) to allow such eligible entities to work in partnership with the private sector and the philanthropic community; and

(C) to identify and document best practices that can be shared, and taken to scale based on demonstrated success.

(b) Eligibility. To be eligible for such an award, an eligible entity shall—

(1) have significantly closed the achievement gaps between groups of students described in section 1111(b)(2) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(2));

(2) have exceeded the State's annual measurable objectives consistent with such section 1111(b)(2) for 2 or more consecutive years or have demonstrated success in significantly increasing student academic achievement for all groups of students described in such section through another measure, such as measures described in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA;

(3) have made significant improvement in other areas, such as graduation rates or increased recruitment and placement of high-quality teachers and school leaders, as demonstrated with meaningful data; and

(4) demonstrate that they have established partnerships with the private sector, which may include philanthropic organizations, and that the private sector will provide matching funds in order to help bring results to scale.

(c) Special Rule. In the case of an eligible entity that includes a nonprofit organization, the eligible entity shall be considered to have met the eligibility requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), (3) of subsection (b) if such nonprofit organization has a record of meeting such requirements.

SEC. 14008. STATE REPORTS.

For each year of the program under this title, a State receiving funds under this title shall submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, that describes—

(1) the uses of funds provided under this title within the State;

(2) how the State distributed the funds it received under this title;

(3) the number of jobs that the Governor estimates were saved or created with funds the State received under this title;

(4) tax increases that the Governor estimates were averted because of the availability of funds from this title;

(5) the State's progress in reducing inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, in implementing a State longitudinal data system, and in developing and implementing valid and reliable assessments for limited English proficient students and children with disabilities;

(6) the tuition and fee increases for in-State students imposed by public institutions of higher education in the State during the period of availability of funds under this title, and a description of any actions taken by the State to limit those increases;

(7) the extent to which public institutions of higher education maintained, increased, or decreased enrollment of in-State students, including students eligible for Pell Grants or other need-based financial assistance; and

(8) a description of each modernization, renovation and repair project funded, which shall include the amounts awarded and project costs.

SEC. 14009. EVALUATION.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct evaluations of the programs under sections 14006 and 14007 which shall include, but not be limited to, the criteria used for the awards made, the States selected for awards, award amounts, how each State used the award received, and the impact of this funding on the progress made toward closing achievement gaps.

SEC. 14010. SECRETARY'S REPORT TO CONGRESS.

The Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate, not less than 6 months following the submission of State reports, that evaluates the information provided in the State reports under section 14008 and the information required by section 14005(b)(3) including State-by-State information.

SEC. 14011. PROHIBITION ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN ASSISTANCE.

No recipient of funds under this title shall use such funds to provide financial assistance to students to attend private elementary or secondary schools, unless such funds are used to provide special education and related services to children with disabilities, as authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

SEC. 14012. FISCAL RELIEF.

(a) In General. For the purpose of relieving fiscal burdens on States and local educational agencies that have experienced a precipitous decline in financial resources, the Secretary of Education may waive or modify any requirement of this title relating to maintaining fiscal effort.

(b) Duration. A waiver or modification under this section shall be for any of fiscal year 2009, fiscal year 2010, or fiscal year 2011, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) Criteria. The Secretary shall not grant a waiver or modification under this section unless the Secretary determines that the State receiving such waiver or modification will not provide for elementary, secondary, and public higher education, for the fiscal year under consideration, a smaller percentage of the total revenues available to the State than the percentage provided for such purpose in the preceding fiscal year.

(d) Maintenance of Effort. Upon prior approval from the Secretary, a State or local educational agency that receives funds under this title may treat any portion of such funds that is used for elementary, secondary, or postsecondary education as non-Federal funds for the purpose of any requirement to maintain fiscal effort under any other program, including part C of the

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), administered by the Secretary.

(e) Subsequent Level of Effort. Notwithstanding (d), the level of effort required by a State or local educational agency for the following fiscal year shall not be reduced.

SEC. 14013. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this title, as used in this title—

(1) the terms "elementary education" and "secondary education" have the meaning given such terms under State law;

(2) the term "high-need local educational agency" means a local educational agency—

(A) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or

(B) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the agency are from families with incomes below the poverty line;

(3) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given such term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001);

(4) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Education;

(5) the term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; and

(6) any other term used that is defined in section 9101 of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 7801) shall have the meaning given the term in such section.

Appendix D

OTHER APPLICABLE STATUTES

This appendix contains the following statutes that are referenced in this application (in alphabetical order):

- America COMPETES Act 6401(e)(2)(D)
- 34 CFR 99.31(b)
- 34 CFR 200.11(c)
- 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i)
- ESEA 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II)
- ESEA 1111(b)(3)
- ESEA 111(b)(8)(C)
- ESEA 1111(h)(1)
- ESEA 6112(a)
- 101(a) of the Higher Education Act

America COMPETES Act 6401(e)(2)(D)

REQUIRED ELEMENTS OF A STATEWIDE P-16 EDUCATION DATA SYSTEM- The State shall ensure the statewide P-16 education data system includes the following elements:

(i) PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 12 EDUCATION AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION- With respect to preschool through grade 12 education and postsecondary education--

(I) a unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system;

(II) student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information;

(III) student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P-16 education programs;

(IV) the capacity to communicate with higher education data systems; and

(V) a State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability.

(ii) PRESCHOOL THROUGH GRADE 12 EDUCATION-- With respect to preschool through grade 12 education--

(I) yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b));

(II) information on students not tested by grade and subject;

(III) a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students;

(IV) student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned; and

(V) student-level college readiness test scores.

(iii) POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION- With respect to postsecondary education, data that provide--

(I) information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework; and

(II) other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.

34 CFR 99.31(b)

(b) Paragraph (a) of this section does not forbid an educational agency or institution from disclosing, nor does it require an educational agency or institution to disclose, personally identifiable information from the education records of a student to any parties

§ 200.11 Participation in NAEP.

(c) Report cards. Each State and LEA must report on its annual State and LEA report card, respectively, the most recent available academic achievement results in grades four and eight on the State's NAEP reading and mathematics assessments under paragraph (a) of this section. The report cards must include--

(1) The percentage of students at each achievement level reported on the NAEP in the aggregate and, for State report cards, disaggregated for each subgroup described in Sec. 200.13(b)(7)(ii); and

(2) The participation rates for students with disabilities and for limited English proficient students.

34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i)

Sec. 200.19 Other academic indicators.

(b) High schools--(1) Graduation rate. Consistent with paragraphs (b)(4) and (b)(5) of this section regarding reporting and determining AYP, respectively, each State must calculate a graduation rate, defined as follows, for all public high schools in the State:

(i)(A) A State must calculate a ``four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate," defined as the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for that graduating class.

(B) For those high schools that start after grade nine, the cohort must be calculated based on the earliest high school grade.

ESEA 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II)

(C) DEFINITION- Adequate yearly progress' shall be defined by the State in a manner that—

(v) includes separate measurable annual objectives for continuous and substantial improvement for each of the following:

(II) The achievement of--

(aa) economically disadvantaged students;

(bb) students from major racial and ethnic groups;

(cc) students with disabilities; and

(dd) students with limited English proficiency;

except that disaggregation of data under subclause

(II) shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student;

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENTS-

(A) IN GENERAL- Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State educational agency, in consultation with local educational agencies, has implemented a set of high-quality, yearly student academic assessments that include, at a minimum, academic assessments in mathematics, reading or language arts, and science that will be used as the primary means of determining the yearly performance of the State and of each local educational agency and school in the State in enabling all children to meet the State's challenging student academic achievement standards, except that no State shall be required to meet the requirements of this part relating to science assessments until the beginning of the 2007-2008 school year.

(B) USE OF ASSESSMENTS- Each State educational agency may incorporate the data from the assessments under this paragraph into a State-developed longitudinal data system that links student test scores, length of enrollment, and graduation records over time.

(C) REQUIREMENTS- Such assessments shall--

(i) be the same academic assessments used to measure the achievement of all children;

(ii) be aligned with the State's challenging academic content and student academic achievement standards, and provide coherent information about student attainment of such standards;

(iii) be used for purposes for which such assessments are valid and reliable, and be consistent with relevant, nationally recognized professional and technical standards;

(iv) be used only if the State educational agency provides to the Secretary evidence from the test publisher or other relevant sources that the assessments used are of adequate technical quality for each purpose required under this Act and are consistent with the requirements of this section, and such evidence is made public by the Secretary upon request;

(v)(I) except as otherwise provided for grades 3 through 8 under clause vii, measure the proficiency of students in, at a minimum, mathematics and reading or language arts, and be administered not less than once during--

(aa) grades 3 through 5;

(bb) grades 6 through 9; and

(cc) grades 10 through 12;

(II) beginning not later than school year 2007-2008, measure the proficiency of all students in science and be administered not less than one time during--

(aa) grades 3 through 5;

(bb) grades 6 through 9; and

(cc) grades 10 through 12;

(vi) involve multiple up-to-date measures of student academic achievement, including measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding;

(vii) beginning not later than school year 2005-2006, measure the achievement of students against the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards in each of grades 3 through 8 in, at a minimum, mathematics, and reading or language arts, except that the Secretary may provide the State 1 additional year if the State demonstrates that exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster or a precipitous and unforeseen decline in the financial resources of the State, prevented full implementation of the academic assessments by that deadline and that the State will complete implementation within the additional 1-year period;

(viii) at the discretion of the State, measure the proficiency of students in academic subjects not described in clauses (v), (vi), (vii) in which the State has adopted challenging academic content and academic achievement standards;

(ix) provide for—

(I) the participation in such assessments of all students;

(II) the reasonable adaptations and accommodations for students with disabilities (as defined under section 602(3) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) necessary to measure the academic achievement of such students relative to State academic content and State student academic achievement standards; and

(III) the inclusion of limited English proficient students, who shall be assessed in a valid and reliable manner and provided reasonable accommodations on assessments administered to such students under this paragraph, including, to the extent practicable, assessments in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data on what such students know and can do in academic content areas, until such students have achieved English language proficiency as determined under paragraph (7);

(x) notwithstanding subclause (III), the academic assessment (using tests written in English) of reading or language arts of any student who has attended school in the United States (not including Puerto Rico) for three or more consecutive school years, except that if the local educational agency determines, on a case-by-case individual basis, that academic assessments in another language or form would likely yield more accurate and reliable information on what such student knows and can do, the local educational agency may make a determination to assess such student in the appropriate language other than English for a period that does not exceed two additional consecutive years, provided that such student has not yet reached a level of English language proficiency sufficient to yield valid and reliable information on what such student knows and can do on tests (written in English) of reading or language arts;

(xi) include students who have attended schools in a local educational agency for a full academic year but have not attended a single school for a full academic year, except that the performance of students who have attended more than 1 school in the local educational agency in any academic year shall be used only in determining the progress of the local educational agency;

(xii) produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports, consistent with clause (iii) that allow parents, teachers, and principals to understand and address the specific academic needs of students, and include information regarding achievement on academic assessments aligned with State academic achievement standards, and that are provided to parents, teachers, and principals, as soon as is practicably possible after the assessment is given, in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language that parents can understand;

(xiii) enable results to be disaggregated within each State, local educational agency, and school by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities as compared to nondisabled students, and by economically disadvantaged students as compared to students who are not economically disadvantaged, except that, in the case of a local educational agency or a school, such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student;

(xiv) be consistent with widely accepted professional testing standards, objectively measure academic achievement, knowledge, and skills, and be tests that do not evaluate or assess personal or family beliefs and attitudes, or publicly disclose personally identifiable information; and

(xv) enable itemized score analyses to be produced and reported, consistent with clause (iii), to local educational agencies and schools, so that parents, teachers, principals, and administrators can interpret and address the specific academic needs of students as indicated by the students' achievement on assessment items.

(D) DEFERRAL- A State may defer the commencement, or suspend the administration, but not cease the development, of the assessments described in this paragraph, that were not required prior to the date of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, for 1 year for each year for which the amount appropriated for grants under section 6113(a)(2) is less than—

(i) $370,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(ii) $380,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(iii) $390,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(iv) $400,000,000 for fiscal years 2005 through 2007.

ESEA 1111(b)(8)(C)

(8) REQUIREMENT- Each State plan shall describe—

(C) the specific steps the State educational agency will take to ensure that both schoolwide programs and targeted assistance schools provide instruction by highly qualified instructional staff as required by sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), including steps that the State educational agency will take to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers, and the measures that the State educational agency will use to evaluate and publicly report the progress of the State educational agency with respect to such steps;

ANNUAL STATE REPORT CARD-

(A) IN GENERAL- Not later than the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year, unless the State has received a 1-year extension pursuant to subsection (c)(1), a State that receives assistance under this part shall prepare and disseminate an annual State report card.

(B) IMPLEMENTATION- The State report card shall be—

(i) concise; and

(ii) presented in an understandable and uniform format and, to the extent practicable, provided in a language that the parents can understand.

(C) REQUIRED INFORMATION- The State shall include in its annual State report card—

(i) information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments described in subsection (b)(3) (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student);

(ii) information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each group of students described in subsection (b)(2)(C)(v) and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments required under this part;

(iii) the percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the same categories and subject to the same exception described in clause (i));

(iv) the most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for which assessments under this section are required;

(v) aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards;

(vi) graduation rates for secondary school students consistent with subsection (b)(2)(C)(vi);

(vii) information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116; and

(viii) the professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which, for the purpose of this clause, means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

(D) OPTIONAL INFORMATION- The State may include in its annual State report card such other information as the State believes will best provide parents, students, and other members of the public with information regarding the progress of each of the State's public elementary schools and public secondary schools. Such information may include information regarding—

(i) school attendance rates;

(ii) average class size in each grade;

(iii) academic achievement and gains in English proficiency of limited English proficient students;

(iv) the incidence of school violence, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, student suspensions, and student expulsions;

(v) the extent and type of parental involvement in the schools;

(vi) the percentage of students completing advanced placement courses, and the rate of passing of advanced placement tests; and

(vii) a clear and concise description of the State's accountability system, including a description of the criteria by which the State evaluates school performance, and the criteria that the State has established, consistent with subsection (b)(2), to determine the status of schools regarding school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

GRANTS FOR ENHANCED ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS.

(a) GRANT PROGRAM AUTHORIZED- From funds made available to carry out this subpart, the Secretary shall award, on a competitive basis, grants to State educational agencies that have submitted an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the requirements of this section will be met, for the following:

(1) To enable States (or consortia of States) to collaborate with institutions of higher education, other research institutions, or other organizations to improve the quality, validity, and reliability of State academic assessments beyond the requirements for such assessments described in section 1111(b)(3).

(2) To measure student academic achievement using multiple measures of student academic achievement from multiple sources.

(3) To chart student progress over time.

(4) To evaluate student academic achievement through the development of comprehensive academic assessment instruments, such as performance and technology-based academic assessments.

101(a) of the Higher Education Act

SEC. 101. GENERAL DEFINITION OF INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION- For purposes of this Act, other than title IV, the term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution in any State that--

(1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond secondary education;

(3) provides an educational program for which the institution awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a 2-year program that is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association, or if not so accredited, is an institution that has been granted preaccreditation status by such an agency or association that has been recognized by the Secretary for the granting of preaccreditation status, and the Secretary has determined that there is satisfactory assurance that the institution will meet the accreditation standards of such an agency or association within a reasonable time.

Appendix E

Excerpt from the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria

Please note that the following is an *excerpt* from the Notice of Final Requirements, Definitions, and Approval Criteria. For the full Notice, please refer to the Federal Register or to the U.S. Department of Education State Fiscal Stabilization webpage at www.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization.

Final Requirements:

The Secretary establishes the following requirements for the Stabilization program. We may apply these requirements in any year in which this program is in effect.

I. Assurance Indicators and Descriptors: In general, a State must collect and publicly report (as defined in this notice) data and other information for the following indicators and descriptors regarding the assurances that the State has provided in order to receive funds under the Stabilization program.

(a) Achieving equity in teacher distribution. A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the extent to which students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers; steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers; on how teacher and principal performance is evaluated; and the distribution of performance evaluation ratings or levels among teachers and principals. Specifically, a State must--

Indicator (a)(1). Confirm, for the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified consistent with section 9101(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA);

Indicator (a)(2). Confirm whether the State's Teacher Equity Plan (as part of the State's Highly Qualified Teacher Plan) fully reflects the steps the State is currently taking to ensure that students from low-income families and minority students are not taught at higher rates than other students by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers (as required in section 1111(b)(8)(C) of the ESEA).

Descriptor (a)(1). Describe, for each local educational agency (LEA) in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding teacher development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal;

Indicator (a)(3). Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion;

Indicator (a)(4). Provide, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level;

Indicator (a)(5). Indicate, for each LEA in the State whose teachers receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, whether the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of teachers rated at each performance rating or level are publicly reported for each school in the LEA;

Descriptor (a)(2). Describe, for each LEA in the State, the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals and the use of results from those systems in decisions regarding principal development, compensation, promotion, retention, and removal;

Indicator (a)(6). Indicate, for each LEA in the State, whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of principals include student achievement outcomes or student growth data as an evaluation criterion; and

Indicator (a)(7). Provide, for each LEA in the State whose principals receive performance ratings or levels through an evaluation system, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of principals rated at each performance rating or level.

(b) Improving collection and use of data. A State must collect and publicly report information on the elements of its statewide longitudinal data system, on whether teachers receive data on student growth in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, and on whether teachers receive reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement. Specifically, a State must--

Indicator (b)(1). Indicate which of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act are included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system; and

Indicator (b)(2). Indicate whether the State provides student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs.

Indicator (b)(3). Indicate whether the State provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments.

(c) Standards and assessments. A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on whether students are provided high-quality State assessments; whether students with disabilities and limited English proficient students are included in State assessment systems; whether the State makes information available regarding student academic performance in the State compared to the academic performance of students in other States; and the extent to which students graduate from high school in four years with a regular high school diploma and continue on to pursue a college education. Specifically, a State must--

Indicator (c)(1). Confirm the approval status, as determined by the Department, of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA with respect to reading/language arts, mathematics, and science assessments;

Indicator (c)(2). Confirm whether the State has developed and implemented valid and reliable alternate assessments for students with disabilities that are approved by the Department;

Indicator (c)(3). Confirm whether the State's alternate assessments for students with disabilities, if approved by the Department, are based on grade-level, modified, or alternate academic achievement standards;

Indicator (c)(4). Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides students with disabilities to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments;

Indicator (c)(5). Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students with disabilities who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments;

Indicator (c)(6). Indicate whether the State has completed, within the last two years, an analysis of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the accommodations it provides limited English proficient students to ensure their meaningful participation in State assessments;

Indicator (c)(7). Confirm whether the State provides native language versions of State assessments for limited English proficient students that are approved by the Department;

Indicator (c)(8). Confirm the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of limited English proficient students who are included in State reading/language arts and mathematics assessments;

Indicator (c)(9). Confirm that the State's annual State Report Card (under section 1111(h)(1) of the ESEA) contains the most recent available State reading and mathematics National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) results as required by 34 CFR 200.11(c);

Indicator (c)(10). Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of students who graduate from high school using a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as required by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i);

Indicator (c)(11). Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i), the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who enroll in an institution of higher education (IHE) (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended (HEA)) within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma; and

Indicator (c)(12). Provide, for the State, for each LEA in the State, for each high school in the State and, at each of these levels, by student subgroup (consistent with section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA), of the students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1)(i) who enroll in a public IHE (as defined in section 101(a) of the HEA) in the State within 16 months of receiving a regular high school diploma, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment in the IHE.

(d) Supporting struggling schools. A State must collect and publicly report data and other information on the progress of certain groups of schools in the State on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics; on the extent to which reforms to improve student academic achievement are implemented in the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the State; and on the extent to which charter schools are operating in the State. Specifically, a State must--

Indicator (d)(1). Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on the State assessments in reading/language arts and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress (as defined in this notice) on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year;

Indicator (d)(2). Provide, for the State, the average statewide school gain in the "all students" category and the average statewide school gain for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA) on State assessments in mathematics and for the State and for each LEA in the State, the number and percentage (including numerator and denominator) of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year;

Descriptor (d)(1). Provide the definition of "persistently lowest-achieving schools" (consistent with the requirements for defining this term set forth in this notice) that the State uses to identify such schools;

Indicator (d)(3). Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools;

Indicator (d)(4). Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed (as defined in this notice) in the last year;

Indicator (d)(5). Provide, for the State, the number and identity of the schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools;

Indicator (d)(6). Provide, for the State, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, the number and identity of those schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed in the last year;

Indicator (d)(7). Provide, for the State and, if applicable, for each LEA in the State, the number of charter schools that are currently permitted to operate under State law;

Indicator (d)(8). Confirm, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number of charter schools currently operating;

Indicator (d)(9). Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts in the last year;

Indicator (d)(10). Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and percentage of charter schools that have made progress on State assessments in mathematics in the last year;

Indicator (d)(11). Provide, for the State and for each LEA in the State that operates charter schools, the number and identity of charter schools that have closed (including schools that were not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years; and

Indicator (d)(12). Indicate, for each charter school that has closed (including a school that was not reauthorized to operate) within each of the last five years, whether the closure of the school was for financial, enrollment, academic, or other reasons.

II. State Plans: A State receiving funds under the Stabilization program must develop and submit to the Department a comprehensive plan that includes the following information.

(a) Indicator and descriptor requirements. Except as discussed in paragraphs (c) and (d) of this section, the State must collect and publicly report the data or other information required by an assurance indicator or descriptor. To this end, the State must describe, for each assurance indicator or descriptor--

(1) The State's current ability to fully collect the required data or other information at least annually;

(2) The State's ability to fully publicly report the required data or other information, at least annually through September 30, 2011;

(3) If the State is not currently able to fully collect, at least annually, the data or other information required by the indicator or descriptor--

(i) The State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully collect the data or information, including—

(A) The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;

(B) The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone; and

(C) Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;

(ii) The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and

(iii) The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds; and

(4) If the State is not able to fully publicly report, at least annually through September 30, 2011, the data or other information required by the indicator or descriptor--

(i) The State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to fully publicly report the data or information, including--

(A) The milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means;

(B) The date by which the State expects to reach each milestone; and

(C) Any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011, including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy;

(ii) The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and

(iii) The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(b) Data or other information. If the State is currently able to fully collect and publicly report the data or other information required by the indicator or descriptor, the State must provide the most recent data or information with its plan and publicly report that plan.

(c) Requirements for indicators in reform area (b) (improving collection and use of data).

(1) With respect to Indicator (b)(1), the State must develop and implement a statewide longitudinal data system that includes each of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act. To this end, the State must, in its plan--

(i) Indicate which of the 12 elements are currently included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system; and

(ii) If the State's statewide longitudinal data system does not currently include all 12 elements, describe--

(A) The State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, a statewide longitudinal data system that fully includes all 12 elements, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing such a system, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing such a system by September 30, 2011 (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);

(B) The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing such a system; and

(C) The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement such a system, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(2) With respect to Indicator (b)(2), the State must provide student growth data on their students to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs. To this end, the State must--

(i) Indicate whether the State provides teachers with such data; and

(ii) If the State does not provide teachers with such data, describe--

(A) The State's process and timeline for developing and implementing, as soon as possible but no later than September 30, 2011, the means to provide teachers with such data, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means by September 30, 2011 (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);

(B) The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and

(C) The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(3) With respect to Indicator (b)(3), the State must—

(i) Indicate whether it provides teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects with reports of individual teacher impact on student achievement on those assessments; and

(ii) If the State does not provide those teachers with such reports, describe--

(A) The State's process and timeline for developing and implementing the means to provide those teachers with such reports, including the milestones that the State establishes toward developing and implementing those means, the date by which the State expects to reach each milestone, and any obstacles that may prevent the State from developing and implementing those means (including but not limited to requirements and prohibitions of State law and policy);

(B) The nature and frequency of reports that the State will provide to the public regarding its progress in developing and implementing those means; and

(C) The amount of funds the State is using or will use to develop and implement those means, and whether the funds are or will be Federal, State, or local funds.

(d) Requirements for Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12). With respect to Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), the State is required to, at a minimum, possess the ability to collect and publicly report the data. As a result, the requirements of paragraph (a) of this section apply to these indicators, at a minimum, with respect to the State's development of the means to collect and to publicly report the data. Accordingly--

(1) If, for either of these indicators, a State will develop but not implement the means to collect and publicly report the data (i.e., the State will not collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011, the State--

(i) Must submit a plan with respect to the indicator that addresses the requirements of paragraph (a) only with respect to the State's development of the means to collect and to publicly report the data, and not the State's implementation of those means; and

(ii) If submitting a plan in this manner, must include in its plan a description of the evidence it will provide to the Department of Education, by September 30, 2011, to demonstrate that it has developed the means to collect and publicly report that data.

(2) If, however, for either of these indicators, a State will develop and implement those means (i.e., the State will collect and publicly report the data) by September 30, 2011, the State must submit a plan with respect to the indicator that fully addresses the requirements of paragraph (a).

(e) General requirements. The State must describe--

(1) The agency or agencies in the State responsible for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, including the institutional infrastructure and capacity of the agency or agencies as they relate to each of those tasks;

(2) The agency or agencies, institutions, or organizations, if any, providing technical assistance or other support in the development, execution, and oversight of the plan, and the nature of such technical assistance or other support;

(3) The overall budget for the development, execution, and oversight of the plan;

(4) The processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and other information; and

(5) The processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

Final Definitions:

The Secretary establishes the following definitions for Stabilization program terms not defined in the ARRA (or, by reference, in the ESEA or the HEA). We may apply these definitions in any year in which this program is in effect.

For the purposes of this program, publicly report means that the data or information required for an indicator or descriptor are made available to anyone with access to an Internet connection without having to submit a request to the entity that maintains the data and information in order to access that data and information. Therefore, States are required to maintain a public website that provides the data and information that are responsive to the indicator and descriptor requirements. If a State does not currently provide the required data or information, it must provide on this website its plan with respect to the indicator or descriptor and its reports on its progress in implementing that plan.

With respect to the requirement that a State collect and publicly report on the extent to which students in high- and low-poverty schools in the State have access to highly qualified teachers, highest-poverty school means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the highest quartile of schools (at the State and LEA levels, respectively) using a measure of poverty determined by the State. Similarly, lowest-poverty school means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the lowest quartile of schools (at the State and LEA levels, respectively) using a measure of poverty determined by the State.

With respect to the requirements that a State indicate whether the systems used to evaluate the performance of teachers and principals include student achievement outcomes as an evaluation criterion, student achievement outcomes means outcomes including, at a minimum, one of the following: student performance on summative assessments, or on assessments predictive of student performance on summative assessments, in terms of absolute performance, gains, or growth; student grades; and rates at which students are on track to graduate from high school with a regular high school diploma.

With respect to the requirements that a State indicate whether teacher and principal evaluation systems include student growth data as an evaluation criterion and whether the State provides such data to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, student growth means the change in achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time. For grades in which the State administers summative assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics, student growth data must be based on a student's score on the State's assessment under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

With respect to the requirement that a State collect and publicly report the number of high-school graduates who enrolled in a public IHE in the State who complete at least one year's worth of college credit (applicable to a degree) within two years of enrollment, college credit (applicable to a degree) is used as that term is defined by the IHE granting such credit.

With respect to the requirements that a State collect and publicly report the numbers and percentages of certain groups of schools that have made progress on State assessments in reading/language arts and in mathematics in the last year, school that has made progress means a school whose gains on the assessment, in the "all students" category and for each student subgroup (as under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v) of the ESEA), are equal to or greater than the average statewide school gains in the State on that assessment, in the "all students" category and for each student subgroup, except that if the average statewide school gains in the State on that assessment are equal to or less than zero, the gains of the school must be greater than zero.

With respect to the requirements that a State collect and publicly report data and information on the persistently lowest-achieving schools that are Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, persistently lowest-achieving schools means, as determined by the State—

(a)(1) A Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(2) A secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that--

(i) Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or

(ii) Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years.

(b) To identify the lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both--

(i) The academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State's assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and

(ii) The school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the "all students" group.

With respect to the requirements that a State collect and publicly report, of the persistently lowest-achieving schools, the number and identity of schools that have been turned around, restarted, closed, or transformed through one of the following in the last year—

(a) Turnaround model. (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--

(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;

(ii) Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,

(A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and

(B) Select new staff;

(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;

(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;

(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new "turnaround office" in the LEA or SEA, hire a "turnaround leader" who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;

(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;

(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;

(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

(2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as—

(i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or

(ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).

(b) Restart model. A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides "whole-school operation" services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) School closure. School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) Transformation model. A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

(1) Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;

(B) Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--

(1) Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high-school graduations rates; and

(2) Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;

(C) Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;

(D) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school's comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and

(E) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers' and school leaders' effectiveness, such as--

(A) Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;

(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or

(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher's seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and "vertically aligned" from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and

(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--

(A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;

(B) Implementing a schoolwide "response-to-intervention" model;

(C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;

(D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and

(E) In secondary schools--

(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;

(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;

(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or

(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--

(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students' social, emotional, and health needs;

(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;

(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or

(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--

(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and

(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--

(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or

(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

If a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.

With respect to the requirement that schools using a turnaround model or a transformation model have increased learning time, increased learning time means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, including English, reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; civics and government; economics; arts; history; and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.[13]

Final Approval Criteria:

[13] Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. "The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School." Child Development. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in school and out of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.)

The Secretary establishes the following criteria for approving the plan of a State receiving funds under the Stabilization program. We may apply one or more of these criteria in any year in which this program is in effect.

(a) Quality of the State plan. Except as described in paragraph (b), in determining the quality of the plan submitted by a State, we consider the following:

(1) Whether the plan clearly and accurately describes the State's abilities to collect and to publicly report the data or other information required by an assurance indicator and descriptor; and

(2) If the State is not currently able to fully collect and publicly report the data or information required by an indicator or descriptor--

(i) Whether the timeline and process for developing and implementing the means to fully collect and publicly report the data or information are reasonable and sufficient to comply with the requirement;

(ii) Whether any obstacles identified by the State as preventing it from developing and implementing the means to fully collect and publicly report the data or information by September 30, 2011 are sufficient to justify a delay in complying with the requirement; and

(iii) Whether the reports that the State will provide to the public will be appropriately accessible and will sufficiently indicate the State's progress in developing and implementing the means to comply with the requirement.

(b) Quality of the State plan with respect to indicators in reform area (b) (improving collection and use of data). In determining the quality of the plan submitted by a State as it relates to the indicators in reform area (b), we consider the following:

(1) Whether the plan clearly and accurately describes the State's ability to meet the plan requirement for the indicator (i.e., in the case of Indicator (b)(1), the requirement to develop and implement a statewide longitudinal data system that includes each of the 12 elements described in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of the America COMPETES Act; and in the case of Indicator (b)(2), the requirement to provide student growth data on their students to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs); and

(2) If the State does not currently meet the plan requirement for the indicator--

(i) Whether the timeline and process for developing and implementing the means to meet the requirement are reasonable and sufficient to comply with the requirement;

(ii) Excluding Indicator (b)(3), whether any obstacles identified by the State as preventing it from developing and implementing the means to meet the requirement by September 30, 2011 are sufficient to justify a delay in complying with the requirement; and

(iii) Whether the reports that the State will provide to the public will be appropriately accessible and will sufficiently indicate the State's progress in developing and implementing the means to comply with the requirement.

(c) Adequacy of the State plan. In determining the adequacy of the plan submitted by a State, we consider the following:

(1) Whether the institutional infrastructure and capacity of the agency or agencies responsible for the development, implementation, and oversight of the plan, together with any technical assistance or other support provided by other agencies, institutions, or organizations, are adequate to comply with the indicator and descriptor requirements individually and as a whole;

(2) Whether the funds the State is using or will use are adequate to comply with the indicator and descriptor requirements both individually and as a whole;

(3) Whether the processes the State employs to review and verify the required data and information are adequate to ensure that the data and information are accurate and of high quality; and

(4) Whether the processes the State employs are adequate to ensure that, where applicable, the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students.

Executive Order 12866:

Under Executive Order 12866, the Secretary must determine whether this regulatory action is "significant" and therefore subject to the requirements of the Executive Order and subject to review by OMB. Section 3(f) of Executive Order 12866 defines a "significant regulatory action" as an action likely to result in a rule that may (1) have an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more, or adversely affect a sector of the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local or tribal governments, or communities in a material way (also referred to as an "economically significant" rule); (2) create serious inconsistency or otherwise interfere with an action taken or planned by another agency; (3) materially alter the budgetary impacts of entitlement grants, user fees, or loan programs or the rights and obligations of recipients thereof; or (4) raise novel legal or policy issues arising out of legal mandates, the President's priorities, or the principles set forth in the Executive Order. Pursuant to the Executive Order, it has been determined that this regulatory action will have an annual effect on the economy of more than $100 million because the amount of government transfers provided through SFSF will exceed that amount. Therefore, this action is "economically significant" and subject to OMB review under section 3(f)(1) of the Executive Order.

The costs of this regulatory action have been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866. Under the terms of the Order, the Department has assessed the costs and benefits of this regulatory action.

In assessing the potential costs and benefits--both quantitative and qualitative--of these requirements, the Department has determined that the benefits of the requirements exceed the costs. The Department also has determined that this regulatory action does not unduly interfere with State, local, and tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

Need for Federal Regulatory Action:

These requirements, definitions, and approval criteria are needed to implement the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program in a manner that the Secretary believes will best enable the program to achieve its objectives of supporting meaningful education reforms in the States while helping to stabilize State and local budgets and minimize reductions in education and other essential services. In particular, the requirements, definitions, and approval criteria included in this notice are necessary to advance the four key educational reforms listed in the ARRA, particularly by ensuring better reporting and more public availability of information on the progress of implementation in each of the four reform areas. The requirement for each State to establish a longitudinal data system that includes the elements specified in the America COMPETES Act will have an especially significant impact on the availability of data that can be used in developing and improving programs; targeting services; developing better linkages between preschool, elementary and secondary schools, and postsecondary systems, agencies, and institutions; and holding schools, LEAs, and institutions accountable for their performance. Establishment of such a system by each participating State is also required under the ARRA.

Further, the requirement for each State to provide student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects, in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, reflects a need to ensure that teachers have better data on how well they are educating their students and that school and LEA leaders have valuable information that they can use in developing and providing professional development opportunities, assigning teachers, and implementing compensation and other human capital policies.

The definitions included in this notice are necessary to give clearer meaning to some of the terms used in the descriptions of the requirements and approval criteria. The approval criteria themselves are needed in order to provide for a clear and objective set of standards that the Secretary will use in ensuring that each State, before receiving the remainder of its Stabilization program allocation, has in place a plan for collecting and publicly reporting the required data and meeting the other requirements in this notice.

Regulatory Alternatives Considered:

A likely alternative to promulgation of the types of requirements, definitions, and approval criteria in this notice would be for the Secretary to release the remaining Stabilization program funds without establishing specific reporting or other requirements. Under such a scenario, participating States would still be required to meet the statutory requirements (that is, to take actions to improve teacher effectiveness and the equitable distribution of highly qualified teachers, establish statewide longitudinal data systems that include the elements specified in the America COMPETES Act, enhance the quality of their standards and assessments, ensure the inclusion of students with disabilities and limited English proficient students in their assessments, and take steps to improve consistently low-performing schools), but there would be no assurance of consistent and complete reporting of States' progress and no uniform mechanism for measuring and comparing States' performance. Additionally, the need for teachers to obtain better information on their students' educational progress would likely be unfulfilled.

Summary of Costs and Benefits:

The Department has analyzed the costs of complying with these final requirements. Some of the costs will be minimal and others more significant. As an example of a requirement that will result in minimal burden and cost, States are currently required to report annually, through EDFacts (the Department's centralized data collection and warehousing system), for the State as a whole and for each LEA, the number and percentage of core academic courses taught, in the highest-poverty and lowest-poverty schools, by teachers who are highly qualified. Indicator (a)(1) requires that they confirm the data they have reported, which should not be a time-consuming responsibility. As a second example, the requirement to confirm the approval status of the State's assessment system under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA, as determined by the Department, should also require minimal effort.

Appendix F

APPLICATION CHECKLIST and SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Please use the following checklist to ensure that your application is complete:

PART 1: State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet

- ❑ Is all of the requested information included on the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?
- ❑ **SIGNAURE REQUIRED** – Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED** – Has the Chief State School Officer signed the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund Phase II Application Cover Sheet?

PART 2: Maintenance-of-Effort Information

- ❑ Has the State provided all data as requested?
- ❑ Is any of the data reported different from the State's most current Phase I application?
- ❑ Has the State included attachments responding to Part 2A(3)(a) and Part 2A(3)(b)?
- ❑ **SIGNATURE REQUIRED** – Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed the other Assurances and Certifications?
- ❑ If applicable, has the State indicated whether the MOE waiver request has already been submitted or whether it is included with this application package?

PART 3A: Assurance Indicators and Descriptors

- ❑ Has the State responded appropriately to all indicators and descriptors?

PART 3B: Data Collection and Public Reporting Plan

- ❑ For each assurance indicator or descriptor under education reform areas (a), (c), and (d), for which the State is not able to fully collect or publicly report annually the required data or information (as indicated in Part 3A), has the State provided a plan for developing and implementing, as soon as possible, but no later than September 30, 2011, that includes all plan elements detailed in Part 3B?
- ❑ Has the State completed the Plan Element Verification table as applicable?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(1), has the State completed the America COMPETES Plan Element Verification table as applicable?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(2), has the State ensured that the plan meets the requirements described in Part 3B?
- ❑ For Indicator (b)(3), has the State ensured that the plan meets the requirements described in Part 3B?
- ❑ For Indicators (c)(11) and (c)(12), has the State completed the Plan Element Verification table as applicable?

PART 3C: General Requirements

- ❑ In an attachment, has the State described the processes employed to review and verify the required data and other information for the indicators and descriptors?
- ❑ In an attachment, has the State described the processes the State employs to ensure that, consistent with 34 CFR 99.31(b), the required data and other information are not made publicly available in a manner that personally identifies students, where applicable.

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

Please submit your application to the Department as follows:

1. E-mail an electronic version of your application in .PDF (Portable Document) format to phaseIIapplication@ed.gov and

2. Mail the original and two copies of your application by express mail service through the U.S. Postal Service or through a commercial carrier to the following address:

Dr. Joseph C. Conaty

Director, Academic Improvement and Teacher Quality Programs

Office of Elementary and Secondary Education

U.S. Department of Education

400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Room 3E314

Washington, D.C. 20202