

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

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07

INDIANA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**

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

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended by the *No Child Left Behind Act* of 2001 (*NCLB*) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*
- Title X, Part C – *Education for Homeless Children and Youths*

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2006-07 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2006-07 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

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

		OMB Number: 1810-0614
		Expiration Date: 10/31/2010
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2006-07 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2006-07		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Indiana Department of Education		
Address: Room 229, State House Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Jeffery P. Zaring		
Telephone: 317-232-6622		
Fax: 317-232-6395		
e-mail: jzaring@doe.in.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Jeffery P. Zaring		
		Friday, March 7, 2008, 1:04:14 PM
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2006-07



PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. <http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/in2.html>.

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

Note: Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/in2.html .
--

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/in2.html .
--

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

Note: The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

1.1.4 Assessments in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/in2.html .
--

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.1.5 Academic Achievement Standards in Science

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Standards and Assessment System has been fully approved by USDOE. Please see June 28, 2006, letter from Assistant Secretary Henry Johnson. http://www.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/nclbfinalassess/in2.html .
--

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

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	647574	634607	98.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	1712	1668	97.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	7838	7694	98.2
Black, non-Hispanic	79299	76180	96.1
Hispanic	38316	36996	96.6
White, non-Hispanic	497990	490749	98.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	102994	99289	96.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	34297	33383	97.3
Economically disadvantaged students	246398	239192	97.1
Migratory students	1257	1257	100.0
Male	331746	324307	97.8
Female	315134	310300	98.5
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

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

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	27029	27.2
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66175	66.6
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6085	6.1
Total	99289	
Comments: Indiana does not have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level and modified achievement standards.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All students	646608	632984	97.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	1712	1668	97.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	7599	7411	97.5
Black, non-Hispanic	79253	76144	96.1
Hispanic	37700	36130	95.8
White, non-Hispanic	497935	490332	98.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	103015	99028	96.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	33367	32223	96.6
Economically disadvantaged students	245795	238213	96.9
Migratory students	1229	1229	100.0
Male	331266	323133	97.5
Female	314664	309851	98.5
Comments:			

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	26217	26.5
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	66726	67.4
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	6085	6.1
Total	99028	
Comments: Indiana does not have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level and Modified Achievement standards.		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's *NCLB* reading/language arts assessment.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77551	56232	72.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	146	73.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	1099	902	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9407	5078	54.0
Hispanic	5155	2949	57.2
White, non-Hispanic	58130	44787	77.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13197	6982	52.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4978	2906	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	33215	20397	61.4
Migratory students	171	63	36.8
Male	39425	28861	73.2
Female	38020	27308	71.8
Comments: All data verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77260	57547	74.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	198	150	75.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1057	868	82.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9373	5351	57.1
Hispanic	5059	2809	55.5
White, non-Hispanic	58027	45835	79.0
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13132	6512	49.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4834	2660	55.0
Economically disadvantaged students	33043	20750	62.8
Migratory students	168	61	36.3
Male	39227	28031	71.5
Female	37930	29455	77.7
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77784	58290	74.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	216	156	72.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	1016	865	85.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9164	5004	54.6
Hispanic	5102	3071	60.2
White, non-Hispanic	58940	46821	79.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13520	7357	54.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4821	2997	62.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32484	20666	63.6
Migratory students	166	79	47.6
Male	39427	30176	76.5
Female	38297	28083	73.3
Comments: DATA VERIFIED			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	77504	58391	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	217	155	71.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	979	836	85.4
Black, non-Hispanic	9147	5319	58.2
Hispanic	5026	2901	57.7
White, non-Hispanic	58797	46732	79.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13459	6398	47.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4697	2737	58.3
Economically disadvantaged students	32332	20499	63.4
Migratory students	165	67	40.6
Male	39215	28005	71.4
Female	38228	30357	79.4
Comments: Data Verified			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79243	60749	76.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	150	73.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	1002	900	89.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9505	5263	55.4
Hispanic	5023	3200	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	60501	49110	81.2
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13112	6865	52.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4783	3164	66.2
Economically disadvantaged students	32081	20766	64.7
Migratory students	160	84	52.5
Male	40515	30860	76.2
Female	38648	29844	77.2
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED²Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 5	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	78982	59505	75.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	204	144	70.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	968	811	83.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9463	5335	56.4
Hispanic	4903	2876	58.7
White, non-Hispanic	60445	48157	79.7
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	13063	5486	42.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4620	2759	59.7
Economically disadvantaged students	31913	19985	62.6
Migratory students	157	59	37.6
Male	40340	28462	70.6
Female	38564	30998	80.4
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED²Facts in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79572	63840	80.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	139	70.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	1005	906	90.2
Black, non-Hispanic	9937	6097	61.4
Hispanic	4834	3314	68.6
White, non-Hispanic	60653	51135	84.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12424	6044	48.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4422	3118	70.5
Economically disadvantaged students	31284	21593	69.0
Migratory students	200	111	55.5
Male	40911	32467	79.4
Female	38554	31301	81.2
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 6	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79371	56788	71.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	196	125	63.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	977	796	81.5
Black, non-Hispanic	9913	5173	52.2
Hispanic	4749	2551	53.7
White, non-Hispanic	60596	46112	76.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12365	4074	33.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4315	2397	55.6
Economically disadvantaged students	31164	17850	57.3
Migratory students	195	64	32.8
Male	40773	27095	66.5
Female	38491	29628	77.0
Comments: All data are verified			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.9 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	80249	62580	78.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	223	153	68.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	920	827	89.9
Black, non-Hispanic	9982	5485	55.0
Hispanic	4601	3055	66.4
White, non-Hispanic	61923	51079	82.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12341	5522	44.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	4151	2839	68.4
Economically disadvantaged students	30209	19664	65.1
Migratory students	175	87	49.7
Male	41303	31768	76.9
Female	38870	30769	79.2
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 7	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	79919	54871	68.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	224	114	50.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	702	80.1
Black, non-Hispanic	9955	4592	46.1
Hispanic	4446	2373	53.4
White, non-Hispanic	61818	45350	73.4
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12282	3456	28.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3943	2148	54.5
Economically disadvantaged students	29977	15943	53.2
Migratory students	169	52	30.8
Male	41074	25525	62.1
Female	38771	29311	75.6
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.11 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81319	57916	71.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	207	145	70.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	870	746	85.8
Black, non-Hispanic	9982	4320	43.3
Hispanic	4444	2435	54.8
White, non-Hispanic	63422	48696	76.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12422	4452	35.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3806	2224	58.4
Economically disadvantaged students	29699	16385	55.2
Migratory students	133	51	38.4
Male	41816	29717	71.1
Female	39425	28163	71.4
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

Grade 8	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	81005	55202	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	206	136	66.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	829	663	80.0
Black, non-Hispanic	9948	4357	43.8
Hispanic	4319	2090	48.4
White, non-Hispanic	63319	46396	73.3
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	12341	3423	27.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	3643	1809	49.7
Economically disadvantaged students	29503	15310	51.9
Migratory students	131	38	29.0
Male	41602	26460	63.6
Female	39328	28713	73.0
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED Facts in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	159583	108750	68.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	424	250	59.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1782	1485	83.3
Black, non-Hispanic	18203	6778	37.2
Hispanic	7837	3972	50.7
White, non-Hispanic	127180	93837	73.8
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22273	7191	32.3
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6422	3503	54.6
Economically disadvantaged students	50220	25133	50.1
Migratory students	252	91	36.1
Male	80910	55466	68.6
Female	78486	53224	67.8
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

High School	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	159621	110291	69.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	423	257	60.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	1724	1330	77.2
Black, non-Hispanic	18345	8027	43.8
Hispanic	7628	3752	49.2
White, non-Hispanic	127330	94335	74.1
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	22386	5762	25.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	6171	3027	49.1
Economically disadvantaged students	50281	25776	51.3
Migratory students	244	71	29.1
Male	80902	51473	63.6
Female	78539	58758	74.8
Comments: All data are verified.			

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

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

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	# That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
Schools	1826	949	52.0
Districts	294	232	78.9
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07
All Title I schools	782	468	59.8
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	198	80	40.4
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	584	388	66.4
Comments:			

Source – The table above is produced through *EDFacts*. The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

Note: New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07
284	223	78.5
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by *EDFacts* file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))¹
- Whether the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Title I School Improvement Grant Awards distribute funds to eligible school districts for the purpose of providing intensive assistance to schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I, section 1116 of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Recipients must use the funds to improve student achievement by supporting the implementation of research-based strategies and practices. Please see 1.4.8 for an expanded narrative regarding school improvement grants.

The Title I website features a number of templates, tools, and resources for both school and district improvement. http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/bulletin/2006-02/resource_book_contents.html and http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/improvement_corrective_action.html. Indiana's nationally recognized ASAP website at <http://www.doe.state.in.us> is an invaluable school improvement tool for all school districts and school community members. This Accountability System for Academic Progress website features comprehensive, user-friendly resources in the domains of: Academic Standards; Accountability; Accreditation; Best Practice; Professional Development; School Data; School Improvement Plan; and the State Profile.

School Support Teams - The SEA requested proposals for school support as well as schoolwide planning. This process resulted in the approval of two providers for the 2007-2008 school year. The SEA monitors ongoing progress of each school and provides professional development as appropriate to school support team providers. In 2007-2008 new school support teams are in place in 19 schools including 3 charter schools. The approved providers are RMC Research and B & D Consulting. Expected deliverables of the school support team are as follows:

- Review and analyze all facets of the school's operation including the design and operation of the instructional program;
- Collaborate with parents and staff around the design implementation and monitoring of a plan for improving student performance and meeting goals for improvement including adequate yearly progress;
- Evaluate the effectiveness of school instructional program and make findings and recommendations to the school and district including additional assistance that is needed in the district if appropriate; and
- Summarize support team activities in an interim status report and findings and recommendations in a final report to the school district and State.

TEAM Leadership Academy - Collaboration is underway with Title I and the Indiana Principal Leadership Academy to provide additional support to schools in improvement corrective action or restructuring. Indiana Principals Leadership Academy (IPLA) is a national model for the training of principals as leaders of instructors. Through Academy experiences and educational challenges, these leaders are empowered with effective behaviors and standards. Graduates of the IPLA set the pace for statewide educational improvement and reform, and are recognized as exemplary educational leaders in Indiana and throughout the country. The IPLA is committed to strengthening the leadership of administrators.

The goal of the "team leadership academy" is to establish knowledgeable groups within the schools that will lead others to improve student achievement. This initiative will include principals and teacher-leaders. Items included in the curriculum are: data analysis leadership training alignment of professional development best practice instruction examining curriculum looking at research related to subgroups culture and climate. Indiana is currently working with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center to develop the academy. The first cohort will begin during the 2008-2009 school year.

The statewide system of support also includes schools undergoing schoolwide planning/implementation, curriculum mapping assistance for districts in corrective action, and support to CSR recipients as the grant concludes. Districts with schools planning and implementing restructuring receive additional technical assistance from the Title I office.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	7
Extension of the school year or school day	3
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	2
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	5
Replacement of the principal	1
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	1
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	8
Comments: Note: There were 18 schools in corrective action. The counts above are duplicate counts encompassing schools that selected more than one corrective action.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Restructuring Action	# of Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	4
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	9
Comments: Note: There were 9 schools implementing restructuring. The counts above are duplicate counts encompassing schools that incorporated more than 1 option.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

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

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district missed the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls](#) ([Get MS Excel Viewer](#))

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

Note: Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SEA, in partnership with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center (GLECC) is in its second year of providing intensive technical assistance to districts in improvement and corrective action under NCLB. Current and future assistance includes:

- ? Workshops on mapping and aligning the English language arts or mathematics curriculum;
- ? Workshops on requested topics by the districts: How to measure if a program or initiative is effective; Instructional practices with students with disabilities and students learning English;
- ? Assistance in writing and revising district improvement plans;
- ? Individual support teams for selected districts in corrective action to assist in modifying and implementing their district improvement plans; and
- ? Articulation of policies and procedures regarding the written and taught curriculum within a district.

Districts in corrective action must institute and implement a new curriculum based on State and local content and academic achievement standards that include appropriate scientifically research-based professional development for all relevant staff. In response to the challenge of providing districts with additional support in strengthening their instructional practices and closing the achievement gap in high-needs schools, the SEA is providing curriculum mapping coaches for districts in corrective action.

A curriculum mapping coaching team has been formed and is receiving intensive training in the critical components, aspects, and nuances of curriculum mapping as well as the mapping systems from which a district makes a selection. After the district has attended a three-day curriculum mapping workshop designed to provide initial exposure to the curriculum mapping concepts and model, a coach will be assigned to the district. Each curriculum mapping coach plays a critical role as a liaison between the district project coordinators and consultants to outline and execute an implementation and on-going action plan.

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

Note: The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

Corrective Action	# of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	9
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: 9 districts in Corrective Action for the 2006-2007 school year	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.6 Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

	Districts	Schools
Final AYP and identification determinations	04/04/07	04/04/07
Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable)	01/29/07	01/29/07
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	3	0
Schools	154	10
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete	04/04/07
---	----------

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.8 Section 1003(a) Funds

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2007-2008 Section 1003(a) funds were allocated to LEAs in September 2007. Funding determinations were made based solely on improvement status with schools in the highest levels of restructuring implementation receiving the largest grants. All schools in improvement, corrective action, and restructuring are receiving section 1003(a) dollars. Districts are required to submit the State's school improvement grant application prior to receiving funds. The application requires identification of school data over time and implementation of selected strategies that have the highest likelihood of impacting student achievement based on the data. A determination of goals and targets for expected outcomes is also required. The SEA will collect follow-up data on actual progress of each school receiving a grant.

Allowable Uses of Title I School Improvement Grant Funds Include:

Improving Instruction

? Increase time in school day spent on English language arts (ELA) and/or mathematics instruction

? Increase length of the school day or the number of days in school and use the increased time to focus on ELA and/or math

Improving opportunities for parental involvement

? Increase opportunities for parents to participate in the school

? Increase parental involvement in school governance

? Assist parents in knowing how to help their children academically at home

Providing choices for parents and students

? Increase opportunities for public school choice

? Increase opportunities for supplemental educational services for eligible students

? Provide transportation for supplemental educational services for eligible students

Implementation of required corrective action or restructuring

? Appoint one or more outside experts to advise the school on how to revise and strengthen the improvement plan it created while in school improvement status; and in addressing the specific issues underlying the school's continued inability to make AYP. Â§1116 (b)(7)(C); Â§200.42

? Institute a new curriculum grounded in scientifically based research and provide appropriate professional development to support its implementation

? Implement an alternative governance arrangement as allowable under NCLB and approved by the SEA.

? Curriculum mapping/alignment, curriculum audits, and surveys of enacted curriculum.

Professional development for school staff

? Use of coaches (literacy, math) to support school improvement in the area(s) not making adequate yearly progress

? Assistance in improving the written and taught curriculum and assessments

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

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

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

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

1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Schools
Title I schools <i>from which</i> students transferred for public school choice	125
Public Schools <i>to which</i> students transferred for public school choice	175
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	67745
Who applied to transfer	2897
Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions	2743

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	<u>Yes</u>
2. Transferred in the current school year, only	<u>Yes</u>
3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 2930440
Comments: Note: Box is not large enough to accommodate full amount of \$2,930,440.28. Amount spent from Title I: \$2,113,800.69	
Amount from other funding: \$816,639.59	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	16
Comments: 16 schools unable to provide choice, plus 4 schools participated in the SES pilot	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about public school choice:

- a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:*
 - Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
 - Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
 - Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.³
- b. *How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

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

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

	# Schools
Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services	69
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

FAQ about supplemental education services

How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"? States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services - Students

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

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	22074
Who applied for supplemental educational services	7408
Who received supplemental educational services	5682
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 7671262
Comments: Note: The box is not big enough to accommodate the full amount of \$7,677,761.91 Amount from Title I: \$7,671,261.91 Amount from Other Sources: \$6,500.00	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the *ESEA*) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	264069	244595	92.6	19474	7.4
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	38305	34505	90.1	3800	9.9
Low-poverty schools	39010	34797	89.2	4213	10.8
All elementary schools	157809	143487	90.9	14322	9.1
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	24841	23339	94.0	1503	6.1
Low-poverty schools	28377	27220	95.9	1156	4.1
All secondary schools	106260	101108	95.2	5153	4.8
<p>Comments: ED's Comment: The reported total number of core academic classes taught by HQT and the total number of core academic classes taught by non-HQT do not equal the sum of elementary and secondary data. There is a difference of 686 classes. Please verify that the percentage of core academic classes taught by HQT in high-poverty elementary schools is higher than in low-poverty elementary schools.</p> <p>Indiana's Resolution: Data has been updated; sum are off due to rounding.</p>					

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

--

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

Note: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been

added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

- a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.
- b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]
- c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.
- e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.
- f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	66.0
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	14.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	20.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0

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

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	61.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	9.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	30.0
Other (please explain)	0.0
Total	100.0
Comments:	

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

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	48.0	18.2
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced price meals	
Secondary schools	34.5	13.9
Poverty metric used	Free and reduced price meals	
Comments:		

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

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

Note: Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Using Program** = Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program** = Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.
3. **Other Language** = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction** = Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI** = Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

# Using Program	Type of Program	Other Language	% Language of Instruction	
			English	OLOI
0	Dual language			
0	Two-way immersion			
21	Transitional bilingual	Spanish	90.0	10.0
0	Developmental bilingual			
0	Heritage language			
26	Sheltered English instruction			
30	Structured English immersion			
0	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)			
161	Content-based ESL			
103	Pull-out ESL			
	Other (explain)			

Comments: The 97 programs previously reported as "Other" have been added to Content Based ESL. Note: many LEAs offer more than one type of program.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	42068
Comments: The total number of Title III LEP students served, including those participating in a consortium, was 42,068 for school year 2006-07.	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group 648, category set A.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish	34060
German (Amish)	1290
Arabic	594
Korean	453
tie: Mandarin and Punjabi	446

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

Comments: Note: 5th place is a tie between Mandarin and Punjabi with 446 LEP students reported for each language.

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

1.6.3.1 Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

ALL LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	46911
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	46911
LEP/One Data Point	19320
<p>Comments: New comment: The number of Title III served students, including those participating in a consortium, in SY 2006-07 was 42,068 collected in Spring 2007 (before the test window ended). This number is slightly different than the number of Title III LEP students tested: 46,150. The difference is attributed to mobility, including the enrollment and testing of new students after the data collection.</p> <p>All enrolled LEP students were included in the Spring 2007 LAS Links test administration.</p>	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:

- **Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal** = Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point** = Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

Title III LEP Testing Status	#
Tested/State annual ELP	46150
Not tested/State annual ELP	0
Subtotal	46150
LEP/One Data Point	18883
Comments: All enrolled LEP students in Title III programs were included in the Spring 2007 LAS Links test administration.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2 Student English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

1.6.3.2.1 Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Y/N
Making progress	40.0	18448	67.0	Y
No progress		9143		
ELP attainment	12.0	5738	21.0	Y

Comments: New comment: The total number of all LEP tested was 46,911. The number of students in 1.6.3.2.2 making progress, no progress, and attainment is based on matched records for students that took the test in Spring 2006 and Spring 2007. Not all of the tested students had matched records. These unmatched students are the number of students with one data point.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.2.3 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress** = Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment** = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target** = AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y** = Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

	Target	Results		Met
	%	#	%	Yes/No
Making progress				
No progress				
ELP attainment				
Comments: This section is N/A.				

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does not count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" and "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

MFLEP	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.3 Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP) (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**1. Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**

- Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
- Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.

2. Total MFLEP = State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.**3. MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

	#
Total MFLEP	5762
MFLEP/AYP grades	3362
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED Facts file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.4.4 LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**1. LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do not include pre-K students.**2. LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).**3. LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but not in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

Grade	#
LEP K-2	16519
LEP HS/Non-AYP	3102
LEP other grades	0
Comments: LEP other grades is N/A.	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: N/A	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given at each grade used for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Grade	Language
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
HS	
Comments: N/A	

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language Version of State NCLB Mathematics Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: N/A		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.5.5 Native Language Version of State NCLB Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:

1. **# Tested** = Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient** = Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results** = Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results
Comments: N/A		

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

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

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
5762	0	5762

Comments: New comment: All 5,762 MFLEP students were reported as Year 1 because

according to Indiana's definition, students must attain Level 5 on LAS Links for two consecutive years before entering the monitoring period. Since SY 2006-07 was only the second year of LAS Links testing, no students are currently in Year Two of monitoring. This is a change from SY 2005-06 because the MFLEP data was collected differently.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3328	2582	77.6	746

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The # of MFLEP enrolled in AYP grades was 3,362. A slightly lesser # of 3,328 were assessed in math. The difference is attributed to student mobility, and incomplete or undetermined test results.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

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

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
3327	2442	73.4	885

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

Comments: The # of MFLEP enrolled in AYP grades was 3,362. A slightly lesser # of 3,327 were assessed in English/language arts. The difference is attributed to student mobility, and incomplete or undetermined test results.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

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

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees, who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	106
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	72
Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs	32
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment	29
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP	3
Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress	1
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP	0
Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP	0
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	2
Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	2
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08)	0
Comments: The total number of sub-grantees 106 = 95 LEAs and 11 consortia.	
In some cases sub-grantees did not have AYP so it was Non Applicable and AMAOs were calculated based only on AMAO I - making progress and AMAO II - attainment. The figures above do not include sub-grantees for which AYP was N/A. The descriptions below provide more information about the sub-grantees for which AYP was N/A:	
# subgrantees that met all three AMAOs = 72 (in addition to those 72, 7 consortia and 18 LEAs met AMAO I and II but AYP was N/A.)	
# of sub-grantees that met Making Progress and AYP = 75 (in addition to those 75, 8 consortia and 18 LEAs met Making Progress but AYP was N/A.)	
# of sub-grantees that met Attainment and AYP = 72 (in addition to those 72, 7 consortia and 18 LEAs met Attainment but AYP was N/A.)	
# met all three AMAOs(72) + # met two AMAOs (32) + # met one AMAO (1) + # met zero AMAOs (1) = 106.	

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

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>Yes</u>
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

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

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
13146	3243	6

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

Comments:

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

Note: This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

Subgrant award cycle			
Annual	<u>Yes</u>	Multi-year	<u>No</u>
Type of subgrant awarded			
Competitive	<u>No</u>	Formula	<u>Yes</u>

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	1613
Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. <u>Or</u> number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement.	375
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	1000

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

Comments:

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students (formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

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

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	94	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	93	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	72	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	60	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	69	
Other (Explain in comment box)	28	
Participant Information	# Subgrantees	# Participants
PD provided to content classroom teachers	93	12960
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	87	1077
PD provided to principals	88	1097
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	77	566
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	82	2311
PD provided to community-based organization personnel	30	738
Total		18749

Comments: 28 Other = 1 Rtl; 6 K-12 ESL conf.; 1 Basic Spanish and Culture classes;

1 Working with newcomer refugees; 1 State reqs for serving LEPs; 2 Ruby Payne; 1 Cultural competency; 1 Handouts; 1 SIOP; 2 Reading intervention training; 1 Parental Involvement; 1 Integrating Language and Content Instruction for ELLs; 1 Integrating Technology into the classroom to help LEP students; 1 Diversity and Intervention areas; 2 differentiation in the classroom; 1 Compliance with legal standards;

1 Mathematics partnership literacy workshops; 1 School Wide programs;

1 Classroom instruction for ELLs (Smart7,Writer's Workshop,Reality Spanish,Sheltered Instruction); 1 ELL issues

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

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

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

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

Example: State received SY 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/\$\$ Distribution
07/03/06	09/01/06	44
Comments:		

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

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

The SEA has an internal processing timeline of two business weeks for each LEA grant application from the date it is submitted to the SEA. Funds are distributed to LEAs upon grant approval. The SEA can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to LEAs by encouraging LEAs to submit their grant applications on the due date. Further, the SEA can shorten the process by maximizing the number of SEA staff reviewing applications.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments:	

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

1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	76.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	67.3
Asian or Pacific Islander	84.1
Black, non-Hispanic	58.5
Hispanic	63.5
White, non-Hispanic	79.6
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	54.8
Limited English proficient	61.5
Economically disadvantaged	60.1
Migratory students	61.5
Male	73.0
Female	80.2

Comments: The disparity is reflective of going from a cohort survival rate to a graduation cohort rate that tracks individual students throughout their high school years. This was enacted by the Indiana General Assembly and may be viewed here <http://www.in.gov/legislative/ic/code/title20/ar26/ch13.html>.

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

FAQs on graduation rates:

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

1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	2.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	3.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.7
Black, non-Hispanic	5.0
Hispanic	4.8
White, non-Hispanic	2.5
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	3.5
Limited English proficient	3.7
Economically disadvantaged	3.5
Migratory students	5.3
Male	3.4
Female	2.4
Comments:	

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

FAQ on dropout rates:

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

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	317	317
LEAs with subgrants	14	14
Total	331	331
Comments:		

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

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

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	273
K	253	463
1	310	686
2	276	604
3	271	610
4	213	586
5	197	518
6	179	396
7	175	375
8	205	338
9	198	287
10	166	182
11	102	165
12	88	133
Ungraded	0	0
Total	2633	5616

Comments: Data on 3-5 year olds is not available for non-subgrantee districts for this data collection. Due to the late publication of the CSPR requested information, we were unable to adjust our electronic data collection system in a time frame that was compatible for the current collection. Unfortunately, we are also unable to survey the schools as this information does not directly impact what type of services they offer- as a result, they do not track the information unless we request them to do so at USDE's request. The system has been changed for the current school year to reflect the requested information.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

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

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	0	1594
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	0	3413
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	0	61
Hotels/Motels	0	243
Total	0	5311

Comments: This information is not available time for districts without subgrants. Due to the late publication of the CSPR requested information, we were unable to adjust our electronic data collection system in a time frame that was compatible for the current collection. Unfortunately, we are also unable to survey the schools as this information does not directly impact what type of services they offer- as a result, they do not track the information unless we request them to do so at USDE's request. The system has been changed for the current school year to reflect the requested information. There are also 305 children who were identified as homeless, but the type of housing is not documented or unknown.

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

Note: This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

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

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	273
K	424
1	623
2	569
3	554
4	533
5	492
6	342
7	325
8	285
9	268
10	164
11	148
12	112
Ungraded	0
Total	5112
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	72
Migratory children/youth	39
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	394
Limit English proficient students	339
Comments:	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

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

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
1. Tutoring or other instructional support	14
2. Expedited evaluations	11
3. Staff professional development and awareness	13
4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
5. Transportation	14
6. Early childhood programs	10
7. Assistance with participation in school programs	12
8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	13
9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	11
10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children	14
11. Coordination between schools and agencies	14
12. Counseling	11
13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence	13
14. Clothing to meet a school requirement	13
15. School supplies	13
16. Referral to other programs and services	13
17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance	13
18. Other (optional)	1
19. Other (optional)	1
20. Other (optional)	0
Comments: Other includes non-school time meals (evening meals); and computer classes (not related to the school)	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

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

	# Subgrantees Reporting
1. Eligibility for homeless services	4
2. School Selection	4
3. Transportation	4
4. School records	5
5. Immunizations	4
6. Other medical records	4
7. Other Barriers	3
Comments:	

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

Note: This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

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

1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	440	228
4	427	234
5	364	200
6	272	136
7	247	89
8	227	87
High School	276	110
Comments:		

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	447	227
4	430	237
5	371	198
6	267	160
7	250	117
8	231	76
High School	276	89
Comments:		

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

Note: This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	357
K	170
1	184
2	153
3	172
4	171
5	154
6	192
7	181
8	205
9	198
10	164
11	171
12	141
Ungraded	59
Out-of-school	822
Total	3494
Comments: Decline in count due to fewer families migrating to Indiana. Concerns about immigration resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. An article in the Washington Post dated 12/03/07 details the impact of immigration concerns on farmworkers and how throughout the US crops often rotted in the fields since migrant workers were not there to pick the crops.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 seems to be the result of a combination of factors. There are tremendous concerns regarding immigration and the impact on migrant families. This concern resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. Discussions with farmworkers confirmed the fears that exist among all those that engage in farm labor. These fears exist regardless of an individual's legal status. There were numerous cases of crops that needed to be harvested, yet there were no workers to do the harvesting. An article in the December 10, 2007 Washington Post details the impact of immigration concerns on farmworkers and how throughout the US crops often rot in the fields since migrant workers were not there to pick the crops. Initially it was believed that the immigration concerns would have a minor impact on the number of eligible migrant students identified; however, it has become exceedingly clear that immigration concerns had a MAJOR impact. This concern related to immigration laws and enforcement practices frequently kept families from migrating. This resulted in single male farmworkers coming to Indiana and leaving children and spouses at home.

Other factors that contributed to the decrease in students are the hiring practices of growers and agricultural conditions that lowered the need for migrant farmworkers.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

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

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	332
K	128
1	158
2	123
3	147
4	142
5	140
6	158
7	152
8	180
9	174
10	151
11	152
12	112
Ungraded	29
Out-of-school	703
Total	2981
Comments: Decline in count due to fewer families migrating to Indiana. Concerns about immigration resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families.	

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The significant decrease from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 seems to be the result of a combination of factors. There are tremendous concerns regarding immigration and the impact on migrant families. This concern resulted in adult males traveling alone rather than with families. Discussions with farmworkers confirmed the fears that exist among all those that engage in farm labor. These fears exist regardless of an individual's legal status. There were numerous cases of crops that needed to be harvested, yet there were no workers to do the harvesting. An article in the December 10, 2007 Washington Post details the impact of immigration concerns on farmworkers and how throughout the US crops often rot in the fields since migrant workers were not there to pick the crops. Initially it was believed that the immigration concerns would have a minor impact on the number of eligible migrant students identified; however, it has become exceedingly clear that immigration concerns had a MAJOR impact. This concern related to immigration laws and enforcement practices frequently kept families from migrating. This resulted in single male farmworkers coming to Indiana and leaving children and spouses at home.

Other factors that contributed to the decrease in students are the hiring practices of growers and agricultural conditions that lowered the need for migrant farmworkers.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEStar was the system used to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for 2006-07 and for previous reporting periods. It is the intent to continue using COEStar for future reporting.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana collects Family, Student, and Eligibility data based on the "Sample Certificate of Eligibility" suggested by OME. The family/student data collected includes: name, birth date, birthplace, gender, race, parents and/or guardian names, unique ID number, current residence and home base information. The eligibility data collected includes: QAD, residency date, qualifying activity, from and to move, and who moved (child on own, with parent, or guardian). In addition, Indiana collects data regarding school and program enrollment that includes the school term, school year, enrollment and withdrawal dates, and instructional as well as supportive services.

Recruiters interview families and individuals in person or in rare instances via telephone to gather the information needed to complete a COE and determine eligibility. In addition, work questionnaires are distributed to all schools for families to complete in order to gather preliminary information. Recruiters then contact the family to determine eligibility. The toll free number for the Migrant Education Hotline is actively promoted. Families call our field office, located in Kokomo, where information is gathered to determine eligibility. Recruitment takes place throughout the year.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Recruiters input the COE data on laptop computers using the COEStar system. The electronic COE is then transmitted via modem to the Kokomo field office for review. Once the data are verified it is then sent to the Indianapolis Office. The Data Entry Specialist enrolls each identified migrant child (whether or not they are receiving educational services) in regular (R) and/or summer (S) term according to residency dates and current school calendar year. The Records Administrator and the Data Entry Specialist update records according to information provided by recruiters and/or by school personnel. COEStar Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) scans COEStar databases, locates eligible COEs for the federal reporting period, extracts and tabulates the data into reports for child count purposes.

Families homebased in Indiana are contacted at least once per reporting period. A new COE is generated to reflect any new move, to update student information or to document that the children were residents of Indiana for at least one day of the reporting period. In addition, LEA staff updates student information as needed throughout the year. The data are organized through the COEStar system.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Data for both category 1 and category 2 were collected and maintained using the COEStar system.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

If any of the following dates are within the current reporting, the child is considered a resident and eligible to be counted. Age is tested as a primary criterion, as is the test of the three years from the last qualifying move and residency in the state. They must pass those tests before any others are considered.

1. Qualifying Arrival Date
2. Residency Date
3. Enrollment Date
4. Instructional/Supportive Service Program Start Date

Since COEStar keeps an electronic copy of the official state Certificate of Eligibility, all pertinent dates are available and checked at the time the counts are performed. Even though the COEStar system performs numerous edit checks on data as it is entered, the Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) performs a complete set of tests on all data used during the counting process in case rogue data slips into the system.

Since COEStar keeps a copy of the actual COE, calculation of eligibility is relatively simple. The QAD listed on the COE is tested for being in the eligible range; residency on the COE is verified to be in the state for which the report is being run; age of each child is tested (using the date of birth) to determine if they can (1) continue to be counted for funding and (2) be counted for services. Additional checks are run to be certain that children are not entered in the database multiple times (even though COEStar data searches and synchronization virtually eliminate this possibility).

All children counted for services may not be counted for funding since 0-2 years old can be counted for services. This is actually a single calculation and each child's record is marked to indicate their age and age category (0-2, 3-21, >21) when selected.

By virtue of completing a COE, the state is verifying that the children listed on the COE are eligible in compliance with laws and regulations, just like using paper COEs. Each COE has the qualifying activity noted.

COEStar does not allow COEs to be physically deleted after they are added to the system to maintain an audit track, but it does provide means to disqualify COEs determined to be ineligible.

COEs are tested to ensure that the Current Residence State is in our state (Indiana). In order for a child to qualify, he/she must reside in our state regardless of the destination noted in the eligibility section of the COE indicating moving from one location to another. In addition, residency is verified through home visits, and/or telephone interviews, and/or program attendance records, and/or other agencies with which we coordinate services.

Performance Reporter (a feature of COEStar) selects all COEs from the COE database that show eligibility for part or all of the performance report period. According to the current law, COEs with a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) on or after September 1, 2003 and on or before August 31, 2007 are selected. A COE with a QAD of September 1, 2003 is eligible for one day during this period. All eligible children associated with those COEs are selected.

Selected COEs are sorted to obtain an unduplicated list of participants between the ages of 3 and 21 years inclusive. This process uses the COEStar Student ID number as well as the Migrant Student Directory (MSD) ID number. Therefore, if a student is identified in more than one location, but assigned the same MSD number, (s)he will not be counted twice. Normally, since Indiana recruiters use COEStar, students identified in more than one school district will be individually identified. There are a limited number of cases where mobile students move around the state and are assigned different numbers (less than 1%). In those cases SEA staff locates these and either consolidates the records or consolidates the MSD number for the child. We also have several reports to aid in the

location of possible duplicates, but the personal nature of the Indiana program with the population served is extremely effective by itself.

The unique list of students is tabulated to produce the Counts of Migrant Children Eligible for Funding Purposes for the Performance Report. If a child's record has one or more records with an educational encounter or enrollment marked as an intersession or Summer participant, they are counted one time in the Summer/Intersession Count or Participants Eligible for Funding Purposes and one time in the Twelve Month Count of Students Eligible for Funding Purposes. If there is no enrollment type noted on the record or the type is anything other than an Intersession or Summer Program indicator, the participant is counted one time in the Twelve Month Count of Students Eligible for Funding Purposes.

To ensure that students are counted only once, recruiters, the Migrant Field Coordinator and Migrant Field Clerk cross check each child on a COE with the COEStar database. As COEs are generated, recruiters search the database for an existing COEStar Student ID. If the child is already in the database the existing ID is used, otherwise COEStar generates a new ID. During the COE review process the Migrant Field Coordinator and Migrant Field Clerk again cross check the COEStar database. If a new ID is generated for a child who is already in COEStar, then the new ID is deleted and the existing is used for the new COE.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The category 2 count was generated using the same system as the category 1 count. Records with a summer (S) term according to residency dates and current school year calendar are selected. In addition, summer enrollment records are checked to determine that the child was still within the three-year eligibility period when services began. COEStar Performance Reporter basic rule is that any child counted must be between 3 and 21 years old inclusive in all cases. 1) This is based on date of birth calculation during the basic data selection. 2) Indiana, as a procedure, does not enter children in summer school until the regular school term has ended.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All recruiters participate in an intensive two week initial training. The recruiter locates and interviews migrant families. After conducting the interview and determining eligibility, the information is inputted and/or updated and saved into the laptop using the COEStar system. At the end of the work day the recruiter recalls all COEs done that day and reviews them for completeness and accuracy. COEs are then transmitted via modem to the Kokomo field office.

The Migrant Field Coordinator reviews each COE against the existing database. If a COE already exists for a particular child, the previous COE is compared with the latest COE to prevent duplication. Each COE can be marked as verified and locked; and invalid COEs can be marked ineligible and locked to prevent changes. Duplicate COEs are marked as deleted at this time; thus, disqualifying the duplicate COE.

The Migrant Field Coordinator examines and researches all COEs for completeness and accuracy. If there is a question or doubt, the recruiter who completed that COE is contacted for clarification. On occasion a second visit or telephone call is made to verify information with the family.

After review/verification, COEs are sent to the Records Administrator at our main office (Indianapolis) via modem. The Records Administrator reviews and verifies the information for each child. The Records Administrator and the Migrant Field Coordinator communicate daily regarding any discrepancies on the COE. Once the Records Administrator has reviewed the COE, students are enrolled by the Data Entry Specialist as eligible migrant students with a regular (R) or a summer (S) term code.

The effectiveness of recruitment procedures and efforts are revised yearly. Field staff completes a "Filed Staff Evaluation Form" at the end of each season. With this toll we measure the effectiveness of all aspects of recruitment. These forms are reviewed and suggestions are taken into account when planning the next season. All LEA staff with responsibilities for student record keeping are trained. Materials and procedures are provided at the beginning of each session. The recruiters are closely supervised and participate in weekly meetings to resolve any recruitment concerns that might exist. All of the built in check points ensure accuracy of eligibility determinations.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Indiana Migrant Education Program (IMEP) implemented the re-interview process during June of 2007 for program year 2005-06. The sampling plan provides for a random sample of Certificates of Eligibility (COEs) to be pulled from a universe consisting of 100% of the COEs corresponding to 100% of the students listed as qualified for the IMEP during the 2005-06 program year. In order to ensure geographic equity within the sample, the universe of COEs was divided into three subgroups made up of the northern, central, and southern counties of Indiana. A computerized list of 100% of the COEs that were created during the 2005-06 program year, in alphabetical order according to the last name of the eligible student, was created for each geographical region. From each of these lists, every tenth COE was selected for re-interview, resulting in an initial list of re-interview candidates consisting of 212 COEs from the northern counties, 52 from the central counties and 86 from the southern counties. As a result of the fact that most COEs contain information on multiple eligible students, each time a name was selected from the list, and the corresponding COE pulled, all of the students on that COE were counted towards the original sampling. Additionally, every student listed on a COE for which a re-interview was successfully conducted was towards the goal of a final sample size of 369 students that was suggested by the Office of Migrant Education. With a goal of 123 re-interviews per geographic region, the original samplings pulled for each region contained an ample number of students to account for the possibility that some migrant families would not be available for re-interview. In the case that a family was not available for re-interview the reviewers noted the reason for the failure to re-interview and proceeded to the subsequent COE in the sampling for their region. The final sampling of successful re-interviews consisted of 64 COEs, representing 161 students, from the northern counties; and 37 COEs, representing 110 students, from the central counties; and 38 COEs, representing 110 students, from the southern counties. These 381 students represent 64, 37, and 38 families

respectively, that were available for re-interview. The remainder of the original list of possible candidates were not re-interviewed for one of two reasons: 1) they were not available for re-interview, or 2) the targeted number of re-interviews (369) provided by the Office of Migrant Education was met before a re-interview was attempted.

There were a total of 381 students samples of which eight students were determined to be ineligible. These eight students represent three families. Each of the three families was found, upon re-interview, to have never worked, or moved with the intent to work, in a qualifying activity. The eight students found to be ineligible upon re-interview were immediately removed from the list of students eligible for the IMEP. Those eight names were subsequently added to the list of students identified as ineligible. With the sample of 381 students and eight found to be ineligible the defect rate of 2% resulted.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The previously described process is followed throughout the year. In addition, reports are generated periodically by the Migrant Field Consultant and the Records Administrator to ensure accuracy. Local projects submit a "Weekly Enrollment List." That information is compared with the COE and with reports generated by the Records Administrator. The Migrant Field Consultant supervises all identification and recruitment activities. There are three Migrant Field Coordinators in the Kokomo office and one in the Indianapolis office. The Consultant and the four Coordinators recruit as needed. In addition each field Coordinator focuses on specific areas. One Coordinator processes and reviews all COEs, the other three focus on recruitment and perform recruitment support activities, including computer information updates, and researching recruitment leads and overseeing the work of the intermittent recruitment staff.

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

Re-interviews were conducted face-to-face in person in nearly all cases. There were only three that were done via the telephone after making home visits and finding adults not at home at the time. Information card tags were left on the doors to let the families know that the Indiana Migrant Education Program had visited and would be returning or telephoning. The format of the interviews was based on the standard COE and done independently of the original interviews. The original COE was checked after the re-interview was completed to confirm information. Those conducting the re-interviews were well trained in eligibility and were assigned to areas of the state that they had not previously worked. This eliminated the possibility of those conducting re-interviewers encountering families they had previously interviewed.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

COEStar and the associated Performance Reporter are very accurate and dependable; however, all numbers are double and triple checked against other sources which include LEA applications, LEA "End of Project Report", LEA "pre-site Visit Information Sheet", and ongoing communication with LEAs through inservices, informal visits, site visits, as well as information shared and gathered from interagency coordination, including sharing reports and pertinent information, multi-agency projects (Consolidated Outreach Project), conferences and meetings. In addition, reports are run throughout the year to monitor child counts as part of the quality control process.

Additionally, during the month of October the Migrant Field Consultant, the Migrant Field Coordinators and the intermittent staff will review every COE once again. Staff will screen for missing information, correctness of dates such as Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) and school district arrival date (residency), qualifying move information, birth dates for eligibility, qualifying activity and school identification code. In November, the data are analyzed once more to identify any remaining duplications that might exist. Then corrections or deletions are made as the individual case merits. The State Director and SEA staff then review the data, comparing it to the previous year, expectations for the current year, and other sources in order to assess the reasonableness of the count.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The average defect rate in eligibility determinations for State administered Migrant Education Programs across the US is approximately. The IMEP, as a result of the re-interview process, found a 2% defect rate. This relatively low defect rate is believed to be a result of high quality training and supervision provided to the individuals who are responsible for identifying and recruiting for the IMEP. Among the COEs of the eight students, representing three families, there were not commonalities, that is to say that there was evidence of a gap in the training or supervision provided to those who conducted the original interviews, nor was there any evidence that the eligibility determinations were falsified. The eight students who were determined to be ineligible upon re-interview were immediately removed from the IMEP list of eligible migrant students. The IMEP will continue to implement its intensive identification and recruitment training and maintain the high level of quality control. The results of the re-interview process will be discussed as part of the two week intensive training in order to emphasize the tremendous importance of careful and accurate interview techniques.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

There are no concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based. There is a concern regarding the significant decline in the number of eligible migrant students in Indiana. Much research and inquiry of other programs serving the migrant population has resulted in the conclusion that there are several factors contributing to this decline. This concern was addressed in sections 1.10.1.1 and 1.10.2.1 of this report.

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

Note: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.