

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

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

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 15, 2016**  
**PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2017**

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

**PRIVACY PROTECTED VERSION**

**SOME DATA IN THIS REPORT HAVE BEEN SUPPRESSED OR BLURRED TO PROTECT STUDENT PRIVACY.**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2015-16 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### **PART I**

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

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

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### **PART II**

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

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required *EDFacts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2015-16 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 15, 2016**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 9, 2017**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2015-16, 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 2015-16 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 2015-16 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2015-16 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2015-16		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: Indiana Department of Education		
Address: 115 West Washington, South Tower, Suite 600 Indianapolis, IN 46204		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Lee Ann Kwiatkowski		
Telephone: 317-234-6904		
Fax: 317-233-0218		
e-mail: lkwiatkowski@doe.in.gov		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Lee Ann Kwiatkowski		
		<u>Wednesday, May 10, 2017, 8:15:34 AM</u>
Signature _____		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2015-16**



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 09, 2017  
5PM EST**

**2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)**

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

**2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs**

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

**2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	41,093	S	49.5
4	37,446	S	53.4
5	34,009	S	58.0
6	22,494	S	47.2
7	14,829	S	33.3
8	15,287	S	34.2
High School	5,910	S	15.5
Total	171,068	S	47.8
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)**

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	40,898	S	58.9
4	37,231	S	59.2
5	33,907	S	54.5
6	22,449	S	54.7
7	14,738	S	51.4
8	15,172	S	44.1
High School	5,905	S	40.4
Total	170,300	S	55.0
<b>Comments:</b>			

**2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)**

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	18,905	S	67.0
4	18,058	S	67.6
5	16,157	S	69.4
6	8,920	S	59.5
7	4,881	S	50.3
8	5,068	S	50.4
High School	991	S	35
Total	72,980	S	64.0

**Comments:**

**2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)**

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	18,848	S	74.9
4	18,014	S	73.7
5	16,136	S	66.9
6	8,903	S	67.0
7	4,880	S	66.3
8	5,060	S	62.0
High School	975	S	59
Total	72,816	S	70.2

**Comments:**



**2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation**

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

**2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs**

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

<b>Special Services or Programs</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	58,162
Limited English proficient students	34,049
Students who are homeless	9,237
Migratory students	612
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	662
Asian	5,286
Black or African American	76,757
Hispanic or Latino	57,982
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	246
White	183,813
Two or more races	20,168
Total	344,914
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>
Age Birth through 2	0	0	0	0	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	63	5,291	19	0	5,373
K	5,583	39,106	683	0	45,372
1	5,700	40,107	793	3	46,603
2	5,441	39,634	808	6	45,889
3	5,358	40,101	794	19	46,272
4	4,180	37,038	688	18	41,924
5	3,390	33,359	557	43	37,349
6	1,953	22,280	398	71	24,702
7	1,312	15,144	298	104	16,858
8	1,393	15,229	230	211	17,063
9	557	6,428	71	274	7,330
10	512	6,217	26	287	7,042
11	498	5,927	24	218	6,667
12	326	4,942	7	98	5,373
Ungraded	0	83	0	17	100
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>36,266</b>	<b>310,886</b>	<b>5,396</b>	<b>1,369</b>	<b>353,917</b>
<b>Comments:</b>					

**2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services**

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

**2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services**

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

<b>TAS Instructional Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Mathematics	15,071
Reading/language arts	32,011
Science	958
Social studies	940
Vocational/career	365
Other instructional services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services**

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

<b>TAS Support Service</b>	<b># Students Served</b>
Health, dental, and eye care	578
Supporting guidance/advocacy	2,683
Other support services	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)**

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	364.95	
Paraprofessionals <sup>1</sup>	817.41	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) <sup>2</sup>	19.16	
Clerical support staff	8.07	
Administrators (non-clerical)	36.63	
<b>Comments:</b>		

**FAQs on staff information**

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
  - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
  - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
  - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
  - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
  - (6) Acting as a translator; or
  - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 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 been 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) (Sections 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>

<sup>1</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

<sup>2</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(e).

**2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs**

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals <sup>3</sup>	1,727.17	100.00
<b>Comments:</b>		

<sup>3</sup> Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

**2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A**

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2015 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

<b>Parental Involvement Reservation</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less</b>	<b>LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2015 (School Year 2015-16) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000</b>
Number of LEAs*	262	101
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	178,857	3,813,354
Sum of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations	56,175,602	186,582,495
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.32	2.04

\*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2015 Title I, Part A allocation.

**In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2015-16.**

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Indiana's Title I application mandates that 1% of the Title I allocation be used for parental involvement. This is applicable to all LEAs receiving at least \$500,000 in Title I funds. LEAs expend these dollars in a variety of ways to focus on parental support and increasing participation.

To assist parents with understanding academic performance, state standards, and the Title I program, LEAs offer trainings and materials, such as report cards and 'how to' brochures. Many Title I schools establish parent resource rooms or offices for parents to obtain resources and access their child's records through the use of computer stations. A common use of the parental involvement set-aside is for Parental Involvement Liaisons, Parent Coordinators, and Translators to support parent outreach and participation. These positions are designed to provide a home-school connection with Title I families, ensure families feel welcomed at school, encourage parents to become involved in the school, and implement and evaluate parental involvement activities, etc.

Here are examples from a few LEAs in Indiana:

Christel House Academy provided home visits to help encourage parental involvement in student remediation activities.

Community Schools of Frankfort offers a Community and Schools Together program - a monthly program where community members and parents learn more about their Title I schools. A monthly publication about the Title I schools is also mailed.

School City of Hammond offers a bookmobile community outreach program to help prevent reading loss. The Family and Community Engagement (FACE) program also helps to provide research based solutions to help children succeed inside and outside of the classroom.

School City of East Chicago distributes parent newsletters on a monthly basis as support tools for parents.

Mooresville Consolidated Schools utilizes social media to inform the parents of what is going on at their Title I school on a daily basis, as well as posting announcements and invitations to events happening on the school and district level. They also increase visibility in neighborhoods during the summer to offer books and activities to reduce reading loss.

**2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)**

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- | Population data of eligible migrant children
- | Academic data of eligible migrant students
- | Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- | School data
- | Project data
- | Personnel data

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the performance period.

**2.3.1 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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, 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 the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children 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 in the previous performance period (September 1, 2014 - August 31, 2015), youth who are working on a HSED 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. Children who were enrolled in school for at least one day, but dropped out of school during the performance period should be counted in the highest age/grade level attained during the performance period.
2. *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 HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

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 and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The data are accurate as reported.

**2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)**

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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have received MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance 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	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	276
K	138
1	141
2	112
3	139
4	104
5	89
6	113
7	105
8	105
9	134

10	106
11	101
12	39
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	237
Total	1,939

**Comments:** The IDOE has placed an increased focus on regional center support of ID&R this past year, including providing training on the creation of regional ID&R plans, and requiring migrant regional centers to have sufficient supports in place for ID&R as a condition of receiving Title I, Part C funds. Having a relatively stable ID&R team for the past four years has also contributed to our increase in numbers, as recruiters are more familiar with their areas each year, and families know and trust the recruiters and the Indiana MEP overall. Through recruiters' expert identification skills, stronger community relationships, and understanding of the program, we have seen an increase in the overall number of identified migrant students around the state.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The IDOE has placed an increased focus on regional center support of ID&R this past year, including providing training on the creation of regional ID&R plans, and requiring migrant regional centers to have sufficient supports in place for ID&R as a condition of receiving Title I, Part C funds. Having a relatively stable ID&R team for the past four years has also contributed to our increase in numbers, as recruiters are more familiar with their areas each year, and families know and trust the recruiters and the Indiana MEP overall. Through recruiters' expert identification skills, stronger community relationships, and understanding of the program, we have seen an increase in the overall number of identified migrant students around the state.

**2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	183

**Comments:** Indiana increased recruitment and services for birth to two. This resulted in an increase from last year.



**2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)**

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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the performance 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).
- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	165
K	87
1	84
2	75
3	95
4	64
5	64
6	68
7	70
8	63
9	83
10	59
11	57
12	4
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	149
Total	1,187
<b>Comments:</b> The Indiana Migrant Education Program worked collaboratively with our regional service centers to provide high-quality summer programming around the state. Each regional center supported and organized summer opportunities for preschool, K-12, OSY, and secondary credit accrual.	

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

<b>Comments:</b> The Indiana Migrant Education Program worked collaboratively with our regional service centers to provide high-quality summer programming around the state. Each regional center supported and organized summer opportunities for preschool, K-12, OSY, and secondary credit accrual. The increase in number of students served during the summer is due to an increase in the number of students identified overall, and due to the continued efforts placed on ensuring all eligible students in our state are identified and provided services.
---

**2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 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 performance period of September 1, 2015 through August 31, 2016. 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.

Do not include:

- ┆ Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	97
<b>Comments:</b> Indiana increased recruitment and services for birth to two. This resulted in an increase from last year.	

**2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System**

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
NGS	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>No</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>Yes</u>
Indiana uses the Migrant Information and Data Access System (MIDAS), a proprietary database, to compile and generate Category 1 and 2 child counts.	

<b>Student Information System</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children are accounted for in the performance period. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, had a qualifying activity).
- Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- Children who – in the case of Category 2 – were serviced for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- Children who are eligible for a free appropriate public education (e.g., have not yet obtained a high school diploma or equivalent).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the COE interview, the child's date of birth is verified by the parent/guardian or youth according to standard practices of birth date verification including:

- o 1003 - baptismal or church certificate;
- o 1004 - birth certificate;
- o 1005 - entry in family Bible;
- o 1006 - hospital certificate;
- o 1007 - parent's affidavit;
- o 1008 - passport;
- o 1009 - physician's certificate;
- o 1010 - previously verified school records;
- o 1011 - State- issued ID;
- o 1012 - driver's license;
- o 1013 - immigration document;
- o 2382 - life insurance policy; or
- o 9999 - other.

Students are then entered in the data system and assigned one of the following grade levels:

P0, P1, P2, P3, P4, P5 - Children aged 0 to 5 who have not yet enrolled in school

PS-Children aged 3+ who are attending a preschool program

K-12 - Children who attend school, regardless of age.

In the summer, record the last grade in which the child enrolled, not their next grade level.

OS (out-of-school) - Youth up to age 21 who have dropped out of school without graduating or who have never attended school in the United States. Do not record the grade in which the child was last enrolled prior to dropping out.

Only students from grade P3 through OS are used for the Category I child count. The Indiana Quality Control Processes require COE reviewers to verify that the grade level is reasonable considering the age of the child (so that a two-year-old is not entered as a second grader, for example) and that no children are included on COEs who are older than 21. Students who turn 22 during a program year are exited from the program via an automatic routine in MIDAS and the regional recruiter and LOA assigned to that student are notified of the withdrawal. Students meeting all eligibility criteria and who reside for at least one day of the program year are included in the Category 1 child count. Students who have been exited from the program because of their age are not eligible for re-enrollment in a subsequent year.

Based upon the information specified in the EDFacts, MIDAS has specific stored procedures for each item in the CSPR. This information is supplied by the IDOE EDFacts Coordinator. Based upon the dates provided, the CSPR procedure runs in the following manner:

1. MIDAS pulls the list of students who had a COE within 3 years from the beginning of the reporting period, September 1 (per the specification)

a. MIDAS excludes each records flagged for deletion or for graduation in a prior term

b. MIDAS checks that the record is currently the active record (usually one per child but depending on overlapping summer and school sessions there is a possibility of two active records). Only children who have a completed and reviewed COEs within MIDAS are included in the child count. The Indiana COE contains all required data elements (including all eligibility criteria), and COEs must be reviewed for completion and accuracy before children are enrolled and/or included in the child count. No COE may be approved unless a qualifying activity approved by the State is listed.

IDOE conducts eligibility interviews on an ongoing basis year round with additional recruitment occurring during the summer months during the heaviest seasons for agricultural work. For any COE interview completed and approved during the reporting period, children are counted in the Category I child count based upon their residency in Indiana. On September 1 of each year, recruiters start the process to verify the residency of any families who had not moved out of Indiana or exited from the program and who have a COE completed within the previous 36 months. Verification of residency occurs via standard practices: Real Time (RT) school records for children enrolled in an Indiana public school, other school records as applicable, and phone calls and/or home visits for all children and youth not in school. Children meeting all eligibility criteria and with verified residency for at least one day are included in the Category I child count. Migrant children are associated with grants that provide services during the summer. If a summer project certifies that a child received services for at least one day, the child is included in the Category 2 Count.

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

The grade level of children who have not yet entered kindergarten is mapped to their age at the time of their latest COE or confirmation of residency (i.e., a two-year-old child is placed in grade P2). This grade level stays the same until it is manually updated the next time a child is confirmed to be in Indiana. Thus, the grade level for children under three years of age always equals their age the last time that child was confirmed to reside in Indiana.

For children who are scheduled to turn three during the performance period, LOA designee will run lists monthly and verify the residency and update the grade level

as necessary or withdraw the child if no longer residing in Indiana. Only children in grade level P3 or higher are included in the child count.

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every EDFacts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

Each reporting period, IDOE Recruiters, LEAs, and State Migrant employees enter accurate information into the MIDAS reporting system. During data transmission, the IDOE manually runs additional reports outside of what is required for the EDFacts in order to verify counts reported. In addition, all

information entered into MIDAS is verified with LOAs by IDOE Migrant staff.

<b>Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality</b>	<b>(Yes/No)</b>
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	Yes

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Yes, Indiana is uploading child counts to MSIX for 2015-2016 and comparing the MIDAS counts and the MSIX counts. In the cases where discrepancies are found, the issues are discussed with OME and MSIX to determine resolutions. Additionally, IDOE recruiters must verify every student is in MSIX when creating a COE. In the event of a discrepancy, additional documentation is requested to support the correction.

**2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes**

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initiated by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer (s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

In the space below, describe the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	104
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	57
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	49

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The Indiana Migrant Education Program (IN MEP) 2015-2016 re-interview intended to complete at least 50 re-interviews from the migrant student population in the state for the 2015-16 reporting period. The re-interview effort successfully completed 57 re-interviews, more than what is recommended by the Office of Migrant Education (OME). A total of 104 interviews were attempted, resulting in a 54.8 % response rate (57 out of 104). The non-response is attributed to the nature of migrant work, which involves a high rate of mobility. Despite the mobility factor, the non-response was not an issue, since the number of samples interviewed exceeded the target number.

The sample consisted of 50 children identified as the main sample and 54 additional children selected as the alternate sample. A total of 27 children from the main sample and 30 children from the alternate sample were interviewed. The following data shows the non-response results.

Number of interviews attempted - 104  
 Number of interviews completed - 57  
 Non-Responses Moved Away - 0  
 Non-Responses Not Found - 47  
 Non-Responses Declined Interview - 0  
 Total Non-Responses - 47

0 of the non-response children had moved away, while 47 were not found by the re-interview teams. None of the non-response declined to be interviewed.

The re-interview was conducted from November 9 - December 20, 2016. The sample was randomly selected from children reported in the 2015-16 school year by Indiana as eligible and for whom a new Certificate of Eligibility (COE) [prompted by a new qualifying arrival date] had been completed within the time frame.

Procedures	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)?	SY 2014-15
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

**FAQ on independent prospective reinterviews:**

- What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migrant children.

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sampling method used for the IN MEP 2015-16 re-interview was not stratified. Instead, a statewide random sampling procedure was used. The State Education Agency (SEA) provided a list of randomly selected children - 50 as the main sample and 54 as the alternate sample for re-interview. All the children in the sample were obtained from the total number of children in the state's database meeting the parameter as of the date the sample was drawn, October 28, 2016.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The sample selected for the IN MEP 2015-2016 re-interview was randomly selected from the state's migrant database. The IN MEP selected the sample, using the following process:

The sample size drawn for this study was a set of 50 children, plus an additional set of 54 alternates, totaling 104 children. The pool of children, ages 3-21, was randomly selected by the IN MEP from a sampling universe of children whose eligibility was newly determined during the current year (September 1, 2015 to August 31, 2016).

The data selected were children who appear newly eligible for the 2016 count at this time and who had a Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD) during the performance period. The universe of child names were each assigned a random number. The names were then ordered by the random number and every 15th was selected. The draw was used to select the first 50 children and the second 54 children to be used as replacements as needed.

The use of this sampling method guaranteed that every migrant child in the state had the same probability of being selected for this study's sample.

During the re-interview, the interview teams received sample lists divided by LOAs throughout the state. The lists included both main and alternate children. Re-interviewers were instructed to ensure that all the children in the main sample were interviewed first. They were asked to make up to three attempts before indicating in the re-interview form that they were unable to find the family.

When a sample was not found, the re-interviewer selected a name from the alternate sample list. Since all the children in the sample were randomly selected and organized by LOA, the re-interviewer was able to select an alternate from the same area.

<b>Obtaining Data From Families</b>	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Phone Interview</u>
Phone Interviews	
Both	
<b>Obtaining Data From Families</b>	
	<b>Yes/No</b>
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	<u>Yes</u>
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	<u>Yes</u>

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In the space below, refer to the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

As a result of the IN MEP's quality control and re-interview process, a total of 27 students were found to be ineligible. Twenty-one of these students were isolated to a single region.

In response to these findings, the following corrective action steps have been taken:

- In light of the errors that were discovered, IN MEP pulled an additional 10 COEs from a random sample from the region with widespread issues. No additional errors were found in the subsequent re-interviews.
- The employment of the individual recruiter responsible for the errors in question has been terminated by the LOA.
- The IN MEP will be increasing ID&R training on quality identification that will be focused on improving and refining interview strategies moving forward. The specific errors will be addressed in future training with the remaining statewide and regional ID&R staff. In addition, the replacement recruiter will be individually coached by statewide ID&R Specialists to ensure adequate training.
- Moving forward, the IN MEP will pull a random sampling as part of the re-interview process at various points earlier in the performance period to ensure a more immediate quality control process and actionable feedback.

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	<u>Yes</u>
---	------------

## 2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

### 2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42
K	38
1	36
2	33
3	33
4	29
5	21
6	39
7	26
8	30
9	32
10	23
11	20
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	62
Total	471

**Comments:** We clarified our PFS definition in our updated Service Delivery Plan in 2015, and we continue to provide additional training to data entry staff and administrators on how to identify PFS students. In addition, the total number of eligible migrant students in the state has recently increased, resulting in a potential for identification of more PFS students. These combined efforts have resulted in an increased number of PFS students identified.

#### FAQ on priority for services:

*Who is classified as having "priority for service?"* Migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

**2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	58
K	69
1	63
2	57
3	78
4	49
5	34
6	53
7	46
8	37
9	52
10	29
11	33
12	12
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	89
Total	759

**Comments:** The department placed a focus on utilizing assessment data from the sending state in order to determine if a student was LEP. In addition, programs utilized language assessments, like those used in other MEP programs, to determine whether a student was limited English proficient. In addition, Indiana is identifying and providing services to more students than ever before, allowing the opportunity to identify more LEP students.



**2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	3
K	3
1	4
2	4
3	11
4	8
5	7
6	9
7	4
8	4
9	5
10	1
11	7
12	1
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	71
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2016 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	120
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	126
K	50
1	53
2	52
3	52
4	45
5	38
6	57
7	52
8	59
9	72
10	45
11	57
12	5
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	174
Total	1,057
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2015-16 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year</b>
Age Birth through 2	36
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	17
1	16
2	18
3	21
4	9
5	13
6	15
7	17
8	18
9	18
10	7
11	14
12	3
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>318</b>

**Comments:** The previous director incorrectly submitted this information to include children who not only had a QAD within the regular school year but also a residency or enrollment date. This incorrectly included children in this count who did not have an educational disruption but rather were still present during the new performance period. The data submitted this year is using the correct logic of only children with a QAD during the regular school year.

**2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Referrals During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	96
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	105
K	27
1	26
2	24
3	28
4	18
5	19
6	25
7	22
8	27
9	26
10	32
11	30
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	83
Total	595

**Comments:** All of the regional centers became more developed this year and were able to provide additional resources and services. This increase in capacity influenced an increase in the number of referrals. An increased focus on the needs of OSY students also led to this increase.

**2.3.2.8 Academic Status**

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

**2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	S
8	S
9	S
10	S
11	4
12	S
Ungraded	S
Total	8
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQ on Dropouts:**

*How is "drop outs" defined?* The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2015-16 reporting period should be classified NOT as "drop-outs" but as "out-of-school youth."

**2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)**

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g., GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	S
<b>Comments:</b> While migrant students work on obtaining high school credit while they are in Indiana, we did not have any students obtain a high school equivalency diploma or GED during this performance period.	

### 2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to eligible migrant children during the performance period.

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

#### FAQ on Services:

*What are services?* Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

#### 2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42
K	36
1	36
2	33
3	33
4	28
5	20
6	38
7	24
8	29
9	32
10	23
11	19
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	59
Total	459

**Comments:** We clarified our PFS definition in our updated Service Delivery Plan in 2015, and we continue to provide additional training to data entry staff and administrators on how to identify PFS students. In addition, the total number of eligible migrant students in the state has recently increased, resulting in a potential for identification of more PFS students. These combined efforts have resulted in an increased number of PFS students identified.

**2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	16
1	12
2	16
3	13
4	11
5	12
6	13
7	15
8	11
9	12
10	7
11	8
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	38
Total	198

**Comments:** We clarified our PFS definition in our updated Service Delivery Plan, and we continue to provide additional training to data entry staff and administrators on how to identify PFS students. In addition, the total number of eligible migrant students in the state has recently increased, resulting in a potential for identification of more PFS students. These combined efforts have resulted in an increased number of PFS students identified.

**2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Served During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	162
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	259
K	132
1	135
2	110
3	134
4	103
5	89
6	111
7	104
8	103
9	133
10	103
11	97
12	37
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	231
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,043</b>

**Comments:** Indiana has experienced an overall increase in the number of migrant students identified in the state the last few years. As a department our mission is to provide high quality educational and supportive services to 100% of all eligible migrant students in the state. Through our recruitment efforts by designated recruiters, capacity and awareness-building at local schools and school corporations, and in collaboration with our migrant regional service centers, the Indiana migrant program was able to provide services to the large majority of students in the state during the 2015-16 performance period. As we continue to refine and improve our program, we hope to see an annual increase in numbers and services provided.



**2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Priority for Services During the Performance Period</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	42
K	38
1	36
2	33
3	33
4	29
5	21
6	39
7	26
8	30
9	32
10	23
11	20
12	7
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	62
Total	471
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Instructional Service During the Performance Period</b>
Age Birth through 2	18
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	141
K	111
1	104
2	92
3	109
4	83
5	71
6	99
7	86
8	84
9	118
10	84
11	78
12	23
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	158
Total	1,459

**Comments:** Indiana has experienced an overall increase in the number of migrant students identified in the state over the past few years. As a department our mission is to provide high quality educational and supportive services to 100% of all eligible migrant students in the state. Through our recruitment efforts by designated recruiters, capacity and awareness building at local schools and school corporations, and with collaboration with our migrant regional service centers, the Indiana migrant program was able to provide services to the large majority of students in the state during the 2015-16 performance period, accounting for these increases. As we continue to refine and improve our program, we hope to see an annual increase in numbers and services provided.

**2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period**

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	1	1	////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	78	72	////////////////////////////////////
K	80	74	////////////////////////////////////
1	78	72	////////////////////////////////////
2	65	63	////////////////////////////////////
3	82	75	////////////////////////////////////
4	66	62	////////////////////////////////////
5	50	47	////////////////////////////////////
6	64	59	////////////////////////////////////
7	54	52	////////////////////////////////////
8	38	36	////////////////////////////////////
9	45	39	14
10	27	24	5
11	22	21	6
12	5	5	3
Ungraded	0	0	0
Out-of-school	30	27	5
Total	785	729	33

**Comments:** Indiana has identified a need to improve its math curriculum in order to deliver a greater quantity and quality of math instructional services. Our evaluation identified this need and our migrant regional centers and SEA are developing a plan to improve in this area.

**FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:**

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

### 2.3.5.3.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	162	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	259	1
K	132	0
1	135	3
2	110	2
3	134	1
4	103	1
5	89	2
6	111	8
7	103	2
8	103	4
9	133	16
10	101	7
11	96	13
12	37	3
Ungraded	0	0
Out-of-school	231	3
Total	2,039	66

**Comments:** Indiana has experienced an overall increase in the number of migrant students identified in the state over the past few years. As a department, our mission is to provide high quality educational and supportive services to 100% of all eligible migrant students in the state. Through our recruitment efforts by designated recruiters, capacity and awareness building at local schools and school corporations, and with collaboration with our migrant regional service centers, the Indiana migrant program was able to provide services to the large majority of students in the state during the 2015-16 performance period, resulting in the increases in support services rendered to these grade levels. As we continue to refine and improve our program, we hope to see an annual increase in numbers and services provided.

#### FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

### 2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

#### 2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	335
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	1,806
<b>Comments:</b> Due to increased identification efforts and a greater awareness in Indiana schools, more identified migrant students enrolled in Indiana schools and were also identified while attending schools.	

#### 2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
<b>Comments:</b> MEP funds are not consolidated in Indiana.	

### 2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

#### 2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	0	0
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	7	2,079

**Comments:** The 2015-16 performance period was the third year having regional centers fully operational and school year grants to individual districts were eliminated as those responsibilities and work transferred to the migrant regional centers. This consolidation resulted in a decrease of students being served by more than one project during the performance period, and thus duplicated in this count, causing the number of migrant children served in the projects to decrease. However, a higher number of students were served by our year-round programs overall during the 2015-16 performance period.

#### FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

**2.3.8 MEP Personnel Data**

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

**2.3.8.1 MEP State Director**

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the performance period (e.g., September 1 through August 31).

<b>State Director FTE</b>	0.25
<b>Comments:</b>	

**FAQs on the MEP State director**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated for the State director?* Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for the State director in your State for the performance period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the performance period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.
- b. *Who is the State director?* The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.



**2.3.8.2 MEP Staff**

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do **not** include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term		Performance Period
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE	Headcount
Teachers	116	12.41	78	47.97	194
Counselors	2	2.00	2	1.00	4
Non-qualified paraprofessionals	8	0.92	1	0.20	9
Qualified paraprofessionals	40	10.17	18	9.35	58
Recruiters	8	8.00	7	6.65	15
Records transfer staff	7	4.47	5	3.40	12
Administrators	17	12.35	17	12.17	34

**Comments:** The Indiana Migrant Education Program placed an emphasis on ensuring that high quality staff were hired to provide services to all migrant students. Through increased awareness in our migrant regional centers, high quality staff has been able to create a program that provides appropriate support to eligible migrant students. Due to this, the number of certified teachers hired by the program increased.

**Note:** The Headcount value displayed represents the greatest whole number submitted in file specification N/X065 for the corresponding Job Classification. For example, an ESS submitted value of 9.8 will be represented in your CSPR as 9.

**FAQs on MEP staff:**

- a. *How is the FTE calculated?* The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:
  1. To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
  2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a teacher?* A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.
- c. *Who is a counselor?* A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional?* An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.
- e. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 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) of ESEA).
- f. *Who is a recruiter?* A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.
- g. *Who is a record transfer staffer?* An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.
- h. *Who is an administrator?* A professional staff member, including the project director or regional director. The SEA MEP Director should not be included.

**2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
  - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
  - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
  - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
  - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
  - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
  - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

**2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1**

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

**2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention		
Juvenile corrections	4	135
Adult corrections		
Other		
Total	4	////////////////////

**Comments:** The state agency in Indiana was previously reported under Juvenile Detention. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The state agency is being reported under Juvenile Corrections.

**FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:**

*How is average length of stay calculated?* The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

**2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	
Juvenile corrections	4
Adult corrections	
Other	
Total	4

**Comments:** The state agency in Indiana was previously reported under Juvenile Detention. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The state agency is being reported under Juvenile Corrections.

**2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1**

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			1,079		
Total Long Term Students Served			777		

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			442		
LEP Students			0		

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			4		
Asian			2		
Black or African American			354		
Hispanic or Latino			79		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			1		
White			540		
Two or more races			99		
Total			1,079		

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male			921		
Female			158		
Total			1,079		

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			0		
7			0		
8			0		
9			0		
10			0		
11			0		
12			3		
13			22		
14			87		
15			225		
16			292		
17			423		
18			27		
19			0		
20			0		
21			0		
Total			1,079		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

**Comments:** The state agency in Indiana was previously reported under Juvenile Detention. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The state agency is being reported under Juvenile Corrections.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count?* An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 1**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 1 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	No	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			1,079		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Data collection is allowed in some cases after exit. However, the growing challenges of capacity and lack of funding to track student outcomes continue to limit the state agency from accessing student records. Due to lack of information, field 2.4.1.3.1 is being reported as "No".

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

**2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit					327					
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma					124					
Obtained high school diploma					13					
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program					854					
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					328					
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					S					
Obtained employment					S					

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Data collection is allowed in some cases after exit. However, the growing challenges of capacity and lack of funding to track student outcomes continue to limit the state agency from accessing student records. Indiana Department of Correction has not been able to fully track data after exit.

**2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1**

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

**2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			43		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			11		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			156		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			315		
<b>Comments:</b> The state agency in Indiana was previously reported under Juvenile Detention. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The state agency is being reported under Juvenile Corrections.					

**FAQ on long-term students:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1**

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Adult Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			20		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			48		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			123		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			334		
<b>Comments:</b> The state agency in Indiana was previously reported under Juvenile Detention. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The state agency is being reported under Juvenile Corrections.					

**2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

**2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs		
Neglected programs		
Juvenile detention	36	92
Juvenile corrections		
Other		
Total	36	////////////////////

**Comments:** The local educational agencies in Indiana were previously reported under Juvenile Corrections. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The local educational agencies are being reported under Juvenile Detention.

**FAQ on average length of stay:**

*How is average length of stay calculated?* The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

**2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	
Neglected programs	
Juvenile detention	36
Juvenile corrections	
Other	
Total	36

**Comments:** The local educational agencies in Indiana were previously reported under Juvenile Corrections. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The local educational agencies are being reported under Juvenile Detention.



**2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2**

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served			5,946		
Total Long Term Students Served			1,148		

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )			1,386		
LEP Students			97		

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native			7		
Asian			26		
Black or African American			1,423		
Hispanic or Latino			326		
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			2		
White			3,782		
Two or more races			380		
Total			5,946		

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male			4,136		
Female			1,810		
Total			5,946		

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5			0		
6			3		
7			6		
8			16		
9			21		
10			27		
11			74		
12			179		
13			449		
14			721		
15			1,205		
16			1,472		
17			1,529		
18			224		
19			19		
20			1		
21			0		
Total			5,946		

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The local educational agencies in Indiana were previously reported under Juvenile Corrections. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The local educational agencies are being reported under Juvenile Detention.

**FAQ on Unduplicated Count:**

*What is an unduplicated count?* An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016.

**2.4.2.3.1 Transition Services in Subpart 2**

In the first row of the table below indicate whether programs/facilities receiving Subpart 2 funds within the State are legally permitted to track student outcomes after leaving the program or facility by entering Yes or No. In the second row, provide the unduplicated count of students receiving transition services that specifically target planning for further schooling and/or employment. If not, provide more information in the comment field.

Transition Services	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Are facilities in your state permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit ? (Yes or No)	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A
Number of students receiving transition services that address further schooling and/or employment.			2,227		

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Data collection is allowed in some cases after exit. However, the growing challenges of capacity and lack of funding to track student outcomes continue to limit the facilities from accessing student records.

**FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:**

If only some, but not all, facilities in the State are legally permitted to collect data on student outcomes after exit, enter 'yes' for the first question and provide a comment indicating why some facilities are unable to collect these data.

**2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit**

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit						2,026				
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned a GED	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Obtained high school diploma					57	9				
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Earned high school course credits	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Enrolled in a GED program					1,768	85				
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education					199	33				
Enrolled in job training courses/programs					23	S				
Obtained employment					13	S				
Obtained employment					145	97				

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

**Comments:** Data collection is allowed in some cases after exit. However, the growing challenges of capacity and lack of funding to track student outcomes continue to limit the facilities from accessing student records. LEAs in Indiana provided a limited amount of data to document exited outcomes.

**2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2**

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

**2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2**

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2015, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			67		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			307		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			417		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			195		

**Comments:** The local educational agencies in Indiana were previously reported under Juvenile Corrections. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The local educational agencies are being reported under Juvenile Detention.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

*Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required?* No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

**2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2**

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

<b>Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)</b>	<b>At-Risk Programs</b>	<b>Neglected Programs</b>	<b>Juvenile Detention</b>	<b>Juvenile Corrections</b>	<b>Other Programs</b>
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams			43		
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			298		
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			374		
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams			204		

**Comments:** The local educational agencies in Indiana were previously reported under Juvenile Corrections. This correction is being made in this CSPR Part II collection. The local educational agencies are being reported under Juvenile Detention.

**FAQ on long-term:**

*What is long-term?* Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2015, through June 30, 2016.

*Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required?* No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

**2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)**

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

**2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds**

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

<b>Purpose</b>	<b># LEAs</b>
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	8
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	27
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	27
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	13
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	10
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	1
<b>Comments:</b>	

**2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives**

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2015-2016

For the FY15 Rural and Low Income allocation, 45 school corporations in Indiana applied for and received funds. Indiana's RLIS Goal One states that by 2016, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics. Of the 45 school corporations which participated in the FY15 RLIS grant, 23 out of 45 showed an increase from the previous year in their English Language Arts scores on the ISTEP test. On the mathematics ISTEP, 26 out of 45 school corporations showed an increase in scores.

Goal Two states that school dropout rates will decrease by 1/2% during the life of the RLIS program. The dropout rate decreased for 27 of the 45 school corporations for FY 15 LEAs when compared to the previous year. Five school corporations maintained 0 dropouts in 2015.

Goal Three of Indiana's RLIS program states that each RLIS school corporation will execute a professional development plan that provides scientifically based professional development for all instructional staff. Indiana State Board Rule 511 IAC 6.2 requires all schools in Indiana to have a Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan in which professional development is required. See Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan at <http://www.doe.in.gov/asap/sip2.html>.

**2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**

**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2015-16?	<u>No</u>
Comments: N/A	

**2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	7
Comments: N/A	

**2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers**

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	7	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		7

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2015 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	507,604.00	
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))		
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))		
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))		
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		507,604.00
Total	507,604.00	507,604.00
Comments: N/A		

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*

**2.11 GRADUATION RATES**<sup>4</sup>

This section collects graduation rates.

**2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort 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 **current school year** (SY 2015-16). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

**Note:** States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	76,038	S	86.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	212	S	83
Asian or Pacific Islander	1,540	S	89
<i>Asian</i>	1,493	S	89
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	47	S	81
Black or African American	9,278	S	73.8
Hispanic or Latino	6,599	S	82.7
White	55,546	S	89.5
Two or more races	2,863	S	85
Children with disabilities ( <i>IDEA</i> )	9,000	S	72.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,349	S	71
Economically disadvantaged students	27,076	S	85.0

**FAQs on graduation rates:**

*What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate?* For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

<sup>4</sup> The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.



## 2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

Per the *ESSA* FAQs located at the following link, *EDFacts* files C106, C107, C109, C111, and C130 (DGs 778 and 779) are no longer required: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/faq/essa-faqs.pdf>.

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.1 and 2.12.3. All other states should follow the instructions in sections 2.12.2 and 2.12.4. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

### 2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

#### 2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools <sup>5</sup> under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate goal or target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>5</sup> The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

## 2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

### 2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the school met the graduation rate target for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's Accountability Plan
- | Status for SY 2016-17 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)<sup>6</sup>
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>6</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

**2.12.3 List of Districts for ESEA Flexibility States****2.12.3.1 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses**

Instructions for States that identified school districts with State-specific statuses under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District name
- | District NCES ID code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the 95 percent participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- | Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) in accordance with the State's approved *ESEA* flexibility request
- | State-specific status for SY 2016-17 (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN034 List of Identified Districts with State Specific Statuses. The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN034 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

## 2.12.4 List of Districts for All Other States

### 2.12.4.1 List of Districts Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified school districts for improvement or corrective action<sup>7</sup> under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2016-17: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those districts.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- | Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- | Whether the district 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 2016-17 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action)
- | Whether the district received Title I funds.

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN035 "List of Districts Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN035 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

**Comments:**

<sup>7</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.