

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 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**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.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, 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 ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **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.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, 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 Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. 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 "2005-06 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 2005-2006 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).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

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>

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

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>

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

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>

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include 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.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	570365	98.40
American Indian or Alaska Native	1373	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6215	95.90
Black, non-Hispanic	61373	95.90
Hispanic	29618	98.30
White, non-Hispanic	455973	98.70
Students with Disabilities	91966	98.30
Limited English Proficient	16837	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	195388	93.40
Migrant	1035	100.00
Male	284410	98.10
Female	275332	98.80

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	570365	98.30
American Indian or Alaska Native	1373	100.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	6215	95.70
Black, non-Hispanic	61373	95.90
Hispanic	29618	96.90
White, non-Hispanic	455973	98.60
Students with Disabilities	91966	97.70
Limited English Proficient	16837	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	195388	93.10
Migrant	1035	100.00
Male	284410	97.80
Female	275332	98.80

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include 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.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	91966	98.30
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10545	100.00

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	91966	97.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	10545	100.00

Comments: Indiana does not have an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards.

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	76341	73.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	68.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	87.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9144	55.00
Hispanic	4439	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	58390	78.00
Students with Disabilities	12477	51.00
Limited English Proficient	2692	51.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30788	62.00
Migrant	145	43.00
Male	38599	74.00
Female	37678	72.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	76341	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	221	70.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	877	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9144	58.00
Hispanic	4439	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	58390	79.00
Students with Disabilities	12477	47.00
Limited English Proficient	2460	53.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30788	63.00
Migrant	135	48.00
Male	38599	71.00
Female	37678	78.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	77869	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	69.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	906	89.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9324	55.00
Hispanic	4407	62.00
White, non-Hispanic	60046	79.00
Students with Disabilities	12772	52.00
Limited English Proficient	2538	55.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30497	63.00
Migrant	116	47.00
Male	39775	76.00
Female	37990	74.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	77869	73.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	67.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	906	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9324	53.00
Hispanic	4407	55.00
White, non-Hispanic	60046	78.00
Students with Disabilities	12772	43.00
Limited English Proficient	2406	49.00
Economically Disadvantaged	30497	60.00
Migrant	112	46.00
Male	39775	69.00
Female	37990	78.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	77652	76.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	74.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	919	91.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9708	55.00
Hispanic	4260	67.00
White, non-Hispanic	59692	80.00
Students with Disabilities	12197	47.00
Limited English Proficient	2221	61.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29811	64.00
Migrant	161	49.00
Male	39809	75.00
Female	37758	77.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	77652	73.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	194	72.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	919	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9708	53.00
Hispanic	4260	57.00
White, non-Hispanic	59692	78.00
Students with Disabilities	12197	36.00
Limited English Proficient	2200	48.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29811	60.00
Migrant	160	35.00
Male	39809	68.00
Female	37758	79.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	78314	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	70.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	818	92.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9809	53.00
Hispanic	3991	67.00
White, non-Hispanic	60902	83.00
Students with Disabilities	11759	44.00
Limited English Proficient	1801	62.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29521	65.00
Migrant	144	51.00
Male	40246	78.00
Female	37981	78.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	78314	71.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	61.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	818	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	9809	47.00
Hispanic	3991	55.00
White, non-Hispanic	60902	76.00
Students with Disabilities	11759	30.00
Limited English Proficient	1774	44.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29521	56.00
Migrant	143	36.00
Male	40246	66.00
Female	37981	76.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	80863	76.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	73.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	92.00
Black, non-Hispanic	10189	52.00
Hispanic	3932	65.00
White, non-Hispanic	63418	81.00
Students with Disabilities	11900	39.00
Limited English Proficient	1545	60.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29762	62.00
Migrant	109	42.00
Male	41690	75.00
Female	39131	77.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	80863	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	193	63.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	770	81.00
Black, non-Hispanic	10189	45.00
Hispanic	3932	51.00
White, non-Hispanic	63418	73.00
Students with Disabilities	11900	23.00
Limited English Proficient	1525	41.00
Economically Disadvantaged	29762	52.00
Migrant	106	26.40
Male	41690	62.00
Female	39131	75.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	80514	72.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	66.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	808	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	10028	43.00
Hispanic	3652	58.00
White, non-Hispanic	63645	77.00
Students with Disabilities	11676	31.00
Limited English Proficient	1582	54.00
Economically Disadvantaged	28085	55.00
Migrant	134	46.00
Male	41352	71.00
Female	39056	72.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	80514	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	219	65.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	808	82.00
Black, non-Hispanic	10028	45.00
Hispanic	3652	53.00
White, non-Hispanic	63645	73.00
Students with Disabilities	11676	23.00
Limited English Proficient	1566	41.20
Economically Disadvantaged	28085	52.00
Migrant	134	36.00
Male	41352	63.00
Female	39056	73.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	78781	64.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	53.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	817	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8781	31.00
Hispanic	3185	47.00
White, non-Hispanic	63457	70.00
Students with Disabilities	10144	25.00
Limited English Proficient	1526	47.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21827	44.00
Migrant	89	29.00
Male	39898	66.00
Female	38804	63.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	78781	68.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	195	52.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	817	74.00
Black, non-Hispanic	8781	40.00
Hispanic	3185	46.00
White, non-Hispanic	63547	74.00
Students with Disabilities	10144	22.00
Limited English Proficient	1506	35.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21827	49.00
Migrant	88	26.00
Male	39898	62.00
Female	38806	73.00

Comments: Change in population

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	1867	921	49.30

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	293	213	72.70

Comments:

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	775	424	54.70

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	282	203	72.00

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

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.

To be eligible, a district must have one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action. Criteria designed to give priority to the lowest-achieving schools demonstrating the greatest need for funds are used to rank need and allocate resources. The list of schools identified for improvement and the rubric used to rank and allocate funds for 2006-2007 are posted at <http://www.doe.state.in.us/TitleI/welcome.html>. Also available on this site is a Consultant List/Database which lists onsite technical assistance providers with diverse experience and expertise.

Districts with schools planning and implementing restructuring receive individual technical assistance from the Title I office biannually.

A resource list for technical assistance is available on the Title I website. Highly-qualified experts are available to provide technical assistance specific to the identified content or population needs of districts and schools. Information on this list is accessible to all school districts and schools, allows them to be good consumers, and provides them an opportunity to find providers that most closely match their needs.

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

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.

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. Focusing on people, the Academy provides innovative and uncompromising quality services for educational leaders to improve school communities. The goals of the Academy are to identify and select principals who have demonstrated a potential for professional self-growth and to develop that potential through an intensive and exciting program, to create a self-perpetuating cadre of school administrators to serve as facilitators/trainers for other administrators and teachers, to create an excitement for continuous growth of Academy graduates, to ensure school effectiveness by developing leaders of instructors as well as managerial technicians, and to strengthen leadership skills through exposure to and in-depth application of such administration themes as leadership styles, school culture, school improvement, and communication.

Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) provides technical assistance that supports the implementation of the core components of CSR designs and includes: curriculum and instructional practices; parent and community involvement; and the creation of a supportive school and district environment. In addition, schools receive technical assistance to monitor checkpoints for impact on student achievement and implementation of the plan within the CSR school. The assistance includes data analysis for student performance, implementation of research-based strategies, and continuous job-embedded professional development. This technical assistance aligns with the support provided to schools identified for school improvement and eligible for Reading First so that high poverty schools in need of improvement will have available to them the resources and technical assistance necessary for continuous improvement.

IDOE is providing school support teams to districts and schools in improvement, corrective action and restructuring through the Indiana Student Achievement Institute and Learning Point Associates.

The American Student Achievement Institute, known in Indiana as the Indiana Student Achievement Institute teams engage teachers, students, parents, and the community in analyzing data, reviewing instructional practices, implementing and monitoring student performance and improvement goals, and evaluating effectiveness of efforts.

Learning Point Associates (LPA) is a nonprofit education organization with more than twenty years of experience working with teachers and administrators. Their services and expertise are grounded in research-based strategies targeted to the specific needs of schools and districts.

School support teams are charged with fulfilling the the following requirements:

1. Review and analyze all facets of the school's operation, including the design and operation of the instructional program, and assist in developing recommendations for improving student performance;
 2. 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;
 3. Evaluate the effectiveness of school personnel, including identifying outstanding teachers and principals, and make findings and recommendations to the school, LEA, and, where appropriate, to the SEA;
 4. Make recommendations concerning additional assistance that is needed in the district.
-

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Title I office is partnering with the Great Lakes East Comprehensive Assistance Center to support districts identified for improvement, specifically corrective action. This assistance consists of the following:

- Review of implementation of corrective action in other states
- Provide templates and resources for writing improvement plans
- Review of LEA Improvement Plans
- Provide technical assistance to districts to revise and implement improvement plans
- Meetings with districts in corrective action to discuss and monitor implementation of corrective action regarding the institution of a new curriculum grounded in scientifically based research and appropriate professional development
- Oversee and monitor implementation of corrective action sanctions
- Curriculum audits, mapping and aligning the curriculum, surveying the enacted or taught curriculum
- Development and implementation of a three-tiered support system for districts in improvement and corrective action

1.4.5 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	76
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	98
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	2137
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	37958
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	40
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	4022
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	13994
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	261084	239785	91.80
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	36408	32302	88.70
Low-Poverty Schools	35217	31688	90.00
All Elementary Schools	138460	125597	90.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	29564	26944	91.10
Low-Poverty Schools	29051	27281	93.90
All Secondary Schools	119916	112221	93.60
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or 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.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded 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]

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].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or 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 if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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.

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 English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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	34.00
b) 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	6.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) 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)	30.00
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	4.00
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	15.00
d) Other (please explain)	0.00

Comments: This information are estimates based upon the best information available.

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	46.30	16.30
Poverty Metric Used	Eligibility for free and reduced-price meals.	
Secondary Schools	33.10	12.20
Poverty Metric Used	Eligibility for free and reduced-price meals.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	100.00

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	Yes
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	Yes
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	Yes

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The State has developed K-12 ELP Standards and they have been fully approved and adopted by the Indiana State Board of Education. The September 1, 2003 Consolidated Application submission described the process of linking of the ELP Standards to Indiana's English/LA, mathematics, and science. This submission also addressed how the ELP Standards address K-12 in the five domains.

The January 31, 2005 Consolidated Application submission addressed the distribution of ELP Standards to school corporations and their implementation of the ELP Standards. Since then, the SEA provided school corporations with several opportunities for further technical assistance on implementing the ELP Standards including inservices and sessions at the annual K-12 ESL Conference. The SEA will continue to provide that technical assistance to LEAs as requested. Also, the SEA evaluates the implementation of ELP Standards during on-site monitoring visits to LEAs.

The State has linked the ELP Standards to the academic content and achievement standards. The Indiana Academic Standards define what all Indiana students, including students for whom English is a second language, are expected to know and be able to do in the academic content areas. The English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are designed to guide limited English proficient (LEP) students through the process of English acquisition in a manner that is linked to the Indiana Academic Standards. This linking ensures that LEP students develop proficiency in the English language while simultaneously developing the academic concepts and skills contained in the Indiana Academic Standards. The ELP Standards provide all teachers with information they can use to ensure that English language development is occurring appropriately for all students, including LEP students who enter Indiana schools.

The ELP Standards provide a foundation for LEP students by identifying grade appropriate performance indicators linked to the Indiana Academic Standards for English/LA, Mathematics, and Science. Because the indicators within the ELP Standards integrate skills used in the Indiana Academic Standards, LEP students are exposed to the Indiana Academic Standards as they progress through the proficiency levels 1 through 5. The ELP Standards are written in such a way that skills and concepts apply across the content areas.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

Indiana's ELP Standards were linked to the State academic content standards during the development process through internal collaboration at the SEA, development and review by LEA representatives, an external review conducted by WestEd, and an online public review. This intensive process, lasting from November 2002 through September 2003, ensured linking/alignment of the Indiana ELP Standards to the State academic content standards.

Indiana Academic Standards define what all Indiana students, including students for whom English is a second language, are expected to know and be able to do in the academic content areas. The English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards are designed to guide limited English proficient (LEP) students through the process of English acquisition in a manner that is linked to the Indiana Academic Standards. This linking ensures that LEP students develop proficiency in the English language while simultaneously developing the academic concepts and skills contained in the Indiana Academic Standards. The ELP Standards provide all teachers with information they can use to ensure that English language development is occurring appropriately for all students, including LEP students who enter Indiana schools.

The ELP Standards provide a foundation for LEP students by identifying grade appropriate performance indicators linked to the Indiana Academic Standards for English/LA, Mathematics, and Science. Because the indicators within the ELP Standards integrate skills used in the Indiana Academic Standards, LEP students are exposed to the Indiana Academic Standards as they progress through the proficiency levels 1 through 5. The ELP Standards are written in such a way that skills and concepts apply across the content areas.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:

- An independent alignment study No
- Other evidence of alignment Yes

2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:

1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12;
2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension;
3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards;
4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)

STATE RESPONSE

After a Request for Proposals (RFP), a formal review and test selection process, in Winter 2005, the State's new ELP assessment, LAS Links, was implemented statewide for all LEP students in grades K-12 in Spring 2006. The next statewide administration will occur in Spring 2007. This English language proficiency assessment is NCLB compliant and has been adopted and implemented in several other states. The LAS Links English proficiency assessment includes all LEP students K-12 with grade cluster assessments for K-1, 2-3, 4-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The SEA ensured that all LEP students in grades K-12 were assessed by maintaining strong written and oral communications with both the test publisher sending test materials and LEAs receiving test materials. Furthermore, a series of pre-test workshops were conducted around the state by the SEA and test publisher in January 2006 prior to test implementation to ensure that all LEAs were aware that students in grades K-12 must be included.

The LAS Links English proficiency assessment addresses the five domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension) at all grade clusters. This is apparent in the test construction which was analyzed during the test selection process. Each test domain includes the following sections:

Listening - Listen for Information, Listen in the Classroom, Listen and Comprehend

Speaking - Speak in Words, Speak in Sentences, Make Conversation, Tell a Story

Reading - Analyze Words, Read Words, Read for Understanding

Writing - Use Conventions, Write About, Write Why, Write in Detail

Comprehension is embedded into the Listen and Comprehend and Read for Understanding sections.

The LAS Links English proficiency assessment is based on ELP standards. During the test selection process, the test content was reviewed for linking/alignment to Indiana's ELP Standards. Data provided indicates that the technical quality of the instrument is good and content coverage studies from the vendor indicate strong alignment. The coverage of ELP standards across the language domains ranges from 60-66%. Future work may be done to further align the assessment with Indiana's ELP Standards.

The LAS Links Technical Report details the validity and reliability of the instrument. We look forward to the Spring 2007 test administration to evaluate student performance compared to the Spring 2006 administration. This data will be used to further assess validity and reliability.

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Spanish	29527	81.50
2. German (Amish)	967	2.70
3. Arabic	440	1.20
4. Korean	422	1.20
5. Japanese	361	1.00
6. Mandarin	355	1.00
7. Russian	351	1.00
8. Vietnamese	265	0.70
9. Gujarati	157	0.40
10. Urdu	128	0.40

Comments: The remaining 3235 LEP students (8.9%) in Indiana are native speakers of one of the other 222 languages represented in the State.

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = 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
- **# of immigrant subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
10310	3105	6

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

In SY 2004-05, six (6) LEAs received funds for a significant influx of immigrant students. These LEAs represented a combination of large urban communities as well as sub-urban communities with well established, but growing populations of LEP and immigrant students. In SY 2005-06, only one of the LEA recipients from SY 2004-05 continued to meet the criteria to receive funds for a significant influx of immigrant students. In SY 2005-06, six (6) LEAs received these funds. The LEA recipients represented a combination of large urban communities with well established, but growing populations of LEP and immigrant students as well as sub-urban communities with smaller, but rapidly growing populations. Although the predominant native language continued to be Spanish, LEAs served immigrant students with a range of native languages and educational backgrounds.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred since the March 6, 2006 Consolidated State Performance Report submission to the definition of Proficient below:

A student is defined as "Proficient" in attaining English when a variety of indicators have been achieved. A student's ability to demonstrate competence in the domains of speaking, listening, reading, writing and comprehension in English is incorporated into the definition along with attainment of set cut scores on the State approved instruments to assess English proficiency.

All domains are weighted equally in determining proficiency, and students must demonstrate full ability in all domains.

Also integral to the definition of Proficient is a student's ability to display academic achievement at grade level comparable to native English speaking peers. Finally, Proficiency in English is defined when a student has maintained this level of linguistic and academic ability during the two year monitoring period required by NCLB.

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3).

Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred to the definition of making progress since the March 6, 2006 Consolidated State Performance Report submission.

A description of the English proficiency levels is included in Part B - Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1. Making progress in English language proficiency may occur within a level of English proficiency as well as from one level to another. Growth within a level of English proficiency is monitored at the LEA level. Many districts identify sub-levels within Indiana's standard levels of proficiency 1-5. For example, at the local level the student may be referred to as "low level 3" or "high level 3." Incorporating sub-levels into Indiana's levels of English proficiency would not be consistent with the newly developed English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards, which maintain the State accepted five levels. In either case, making progress in English proficiency is determined by multiple sources including improvement in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension as measured by student performance on an English language proficiency assessment, class assignments, teacher observations, and overall academic achievement.

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

No changes have occurred to the definition of cohort since the March 6, 2006 Consolidated State Performance Report submission.

The cohort has been defined as the K-12 group of LEP students enrolled during school year 2002-03. The LEP students' progression of English acquisition has been charted over a seven year continuum to identify the % or # of students making progress and attaining proficiency. Factors influencing these percentages include: average length of time for students to move from one level to the next; level of prior formal schooling; proficiency level upon entry; and age/grade; and data on transitioned students (length of time in program, proficiency level upon entry, etc).

These factors are not cohort characteristics. In developing the projected percentages of the AMAOs, LEA representatives assisted in identifying factors that would influence the rate at which making progress and attainment would occur for students entering at each level of English proficiency. The AMAO projected percentages for each year reflect a total of progress made and proficiency attained for all LEP students (Level 1-4).

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 71.40	# 25853	% 43.20	# 9346	% 30.70	# 11116	% 16.40	# 3559

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	71.40	9346	43.20
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		8748	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	30.70	3559	16.40
TOTAL		21653	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? Yes No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information	
	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	87
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	No

Comments: Data incomplete due to difficulties in performing a conclusive data match between SY 04-05 and SY 05-06. In SY 04-05, multiple state-approved English language proficiency assessments were used by LEAs; in SY 05-06 Indiana adopted a single ELP assessment first administered Spring 06. Unlike new assessment, prior instruments did not employ student test number(STN) for student identification/tracking purposes. Initial attempts to match data proved troublesome. It's expected that this is a one-time transitional issue remedied for future reporting by maintaining one standard ELP assessment and using STNs. Note: Data matching issues also affect sections 1.6.8 and 1.6.9. Understanding importance of providing complete 2005-06 data and implications for matching 2007 data, IDOE will post a secure site in Jan/Feb 2007 for 2005-06 LEA ELP data clean up. IDOE will re-enter 2005-06 data for sections 1.6.8, 1.6.9 and 1.6.10.

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	302	71.10
4	331	75.20
5	305	67.50
6	221	63.70
7	230	57.10
8	155	51.50
H.S.	214	49.10

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	316	74.40
4	339	77.00
5	347	76.80
6	257	74.10
7	288	71.50
8	188	62.50
H.S.	246	56.40

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	0

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

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.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. 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.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	89.90
American Indian or Alaska Native	79.90
Asian or Pacific Islander	95.20
Black, non-Hispanic	86.00
Hispanic	82.90
White, non-Hispanic	90.70
Students with Disabilities	84.80
Limited English Proficient	89.80
Economically Disadvantaged	83.90
Migrant	92.00
Male	88.30
Female	91.60
Comments:	
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.	

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," 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.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	2.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	5.20
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.20
Black, non-Hispanic	3.30
Hispanic	4.40
White, non-Hispanic	2.30
Students with Disabilities	3.80
Limited English Proficient	2.70
Economically Disadvantaged	2.70
Migrant	4.00
Male	2.90
Female	2.10

Comments: Longitudinal student data system allows for more accurate reporting.
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Provide the following information for homeless children and youth in your State for the 2005-2006 school year (as defined by your State). To complete this form, compile data for LEAs with and without subgrants.

1.9.1 DATA FROM ALL LEAs WITH AND WITHOUT MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH PROGRAM

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

The school year is defined as July 1 through June 30 (IC 20-18-2-17).

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	321	321
LEAs with Subgrants	14	14

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	259	284
1	466	456
2	440	429
3	410	400
4	357	339
5	333	323
6	304	300
7	300	289
8	283	279
9	209	211
10	181	180
11	148	144
12	111	112

Comments: This data was collected using the state's HMIS system. For the time period affected by this report, 44% of the available shelter beds in the state were participating in the HMIS. Additional information was collected using school reports.

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth		
Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.		
Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	2050	2010
Doubled-up	1175	1168
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	<n
Hotels/Motels	163	161
Unknown	406	400
Comments:		
* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.		

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS**1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants**

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	284
1	456
2	429
3	400
4	339
5	323
6	300
7	289
8	279
9	211
10	180
11	144
12	112

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

83

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

204

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

12

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	321
English Language Learners (ELL)	171
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	42

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	14
Expedited evaluations	12
Staff professional development and awareness	12
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	14
Transportation	13
Early childhood programs	13
Assistance with participation in school programs	12
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	14
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	13
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	13
Coordination between schools and agencies	14
Counseling	11
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	12
Clothing to meet a school requirement	13
School supplies	14
Referral to other programs and services	13
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	12
Other (optional)	1
Comments: Other: Computer Training	

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	1
Transportation	2
School records	3
Immunizations or other medical records	3
Other enrollment issues	4
Comments:	

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Head Start waiting list	1

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	313	179
Grade 4	Yes	233	124
Grade 5	Yes	243	147
Grade 6	Yes	184	84
Grade 7	Yes	165	65
Grade 8	Yes	151	60
Grade 9	Yes	106	45
Grade 10	Yes	90	36
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	313	177
Grade 4	Yes	233	122
Grade 5	Yes	243	143
Grade 6	Yes	184	103
Grade 7	Yes	165	85
Grade 8	Yes	151	67
Grade 9	Yes	106	35
Grade 10	Yes	90	20
Grade 11	N/A		
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.