

**Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE)
Assessment and Accountability in the Fifty States: 1999-2000**

INDIANA

*This profile was verified by the staff of the Indiana State Department of Education in May 2000.
All information is current as of that date.*

Index:

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

Performance Standards

Reporting Performance Data

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

State Assessment System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the assessment system as the context.*

The **Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP+)** was created in 1987 and administered for the first time in 1988. Changes as a result of legislation in 1995 required:

- A norm-referenced component that allows comparisons of Indiana student achievement with national norms
- A criterion-referenced component with a basic skills assessment of multiple choice questions and applied skills assessment containing short answer and essay questions and the solving of math problems. Passing scores in English and math are based exclusively on the criterion-referenced portion of the test, and these questions have been designed to match the state curriculum defined in English and math standards for grades 2, 5, 7 and 9.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state assessment system, including:*

- *Name of Assessment Instrument(s) or Program(s)*
Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP+)

- *Grade Levels and Subjects Tested*

Math and Language Arts in grades 3, 6, 8, and 10

Grades 3, 6, and 8 participate in assessments that include:

1. the single ISTEP+ **Basic Skills Assessment (NRT)**, including the norm-referenced and criterion-referenced tests, and the Test of Cognitive Skills
2. a single ISTEP+ **Applied Skills Assessment (CRT) Book**.

Grade 10 students participate in an assessment that includes:

1. separate CRT and NRT tests
2. Graduation Qualifying Exam (GQE) Basic Skills Assessment in E/LA and math (GQE retests at grades 11 and 12)

Assessments in grades 3, 6, and 8:

- Measure performance in math and English
- Consist of the components: (1 and 2 measure mastery of state academic standards)

1. basic skills assessment
2. applied skills assessment
3. norm-referenced component (CTBS-5)
4. academic abilities assessment (Test of Cognitive Skills, Second Edition)

Assessments in grade 10:

- Measure performance in math and English
- Consist of the components: (1 and 2 measure mastery of state academic standards)
- 1. ISTEP+ High School Qualifying Examination (GQE)
- 2. ISTEP+ norm-referenced assessment (CTBS-5 and Test of Cognitive Skills, Second Edition)

- *Norm or Criterion Referenced: Both*

- *Matrix or Census Testing: Census*

- *Item Types (including proportions if available via Internet or interview) such as: traditional or enhanced multiple choice, performance tasks, open-ended questions, portfolios, essays, etc.*

Multiple choice and short answer/essay, as well solving of arithmetic or math problems are included. The proportions are:

- Grade 3: Open response – 20%; multiple choice – 80%
- Grades 6, 8, and 10: Open response – 38%; multiple choice – 62%

- *Time of Testing (specific month(s) or testing window)*

1. ISTEP+: September 1999

2. GQE: September 1999 and March 2000 (retest)

- *High School Exit Exam (date of implementation and/or phase-in timeline)*

The state assessments in grade 10 measure performance in math and English and includes the ISTEP+ High School Qualifying Examination (GQE).

- *Other Assessments*

The state also has **voluntary** end-of-course assessments that address student performance on the state's "Core 40 curriculum" (college-bound curriculum) in the following subjects:

1. English
2. Algebra I and II
3. Geometry
4. Pre-Calculus
5. Biology
6. Earth Science
7. Chemistry
8. Physics.

Although social studies is also part of the Core 40 curriculum, assessments in this subject have not yet been developed. There has been discussion about making these assessments mandatory.

- *Transitional or Final Assessment System: Transitional (see changes below)*

3. *Who designed and produced the assessment(s) used by the state?*

The content of the test is based on the state standards. The items for the ISTEP+ were developed and produced by CTB-McGraw Hill as the contractor. Teachers review the items once developed to make sure that they are appropriate for the grade tested and are aligned with the specific state standard for which it is written. There is a Citizen's Review Committee to provide feedback with regard to any potential political or religious bias in the assessment questions. They determine whether or not the reading passages and other portions of the test are appropriate and do not offend specific groups of the state. In addition, the sensitivity review committee looks at the assessment for ethnic or gender bias while the content review committee makes recommendations about the general content and skills tested in the assessment.

4. *What are the state requirements for local assessment, including the types of assessments And their use in areas such as reporting and accountability, as well as Title I adequate yearly progress? What grade levels and subjects are tested?*

No such requirements exist in Indiana.

5. *Is the state assessment system aligned with the state standards? Are there plans for alignment, and if so, how will the assessment and standards become aligned?*

The state assessment is aligned to state standards, but the state works on a regular basis to maintain that alignment by introducing new items.

6. *What is the state's approach for ensuring alignment and what evidence of that alignment is provided?*

Achieve and other external groups have analyzed the ISTEP+ to determine its alignment with the state standards, along with the internal state teacher and content committees. Again, teachers review the items once developed to make sure that they are appropriate for the grade tested and are aligned with the specific state standard for which it is written.

7. *How is the data included in the state assessment system used?*

Along with performance reporting, aggregate ISTEP+ school results are used in the **Indiana School Incentive Awards (ISIA)** Program and **Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA)**. For descriptions of these programs, see the accountability section of the report.

8. *Are there changes planned for the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be Implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

The state is currently piloting a first grade reading assessment. For 1999-2000, the state is using a voluntary sample, and the pilot process will continue next year as well. This assessment, therefore, is still in the process of development.

In response to legislation in 1999, the state is also about to release an RFP to add social studies and science components to the ISTEP+, with the first administration of the science test in 2002 and the social studies test in 2003. It is envisioned that the testing will take place in grades 5, 7, and 9, with a phase in process over a number of years before full implementation; in the first year (2002) only science would be administered in one grade, then (2003) science and social studies in the same grade, and so forth. A pilot of the assessments will take place before the official administration.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of state assessment? Explain.*

The state has been working on coming into compliance with the IDEA by piloting an alternative assessment last year; it will be implemented no later than July 1, 2000. In addition, the class of 2000 will be the first that must meet the GQE standards either by passing the ISTEP+ at grade 10 or by fulfilling one of two other requirements (see student accountability). The results of these new requirements will be an issue for the state.

Inclusion Policies for Assessment

1. *What exclusions are made in the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP? Who makes the decision about exclusion of a particular child? Does the state collect*

data or in other ways monitor the number and types of students excluded? Does that vary by test?

Special Education: A special education student who does not receive instruction in English/language arts and mathematics that includes the content standards tested by ISTEP+ and who therefore is not expected ultimately to receive a high school diploma may be exempted from testing by the student's case conference committee. The exemption must be included in the student's IEP. A special education student who is exempt from ISTEP+ testing may be tested for diagnostic purposes. Students should be designated as testing for diagnostic purposes only in rare circumstances. ISTEP+ may be administered diagnostically only to students who are exempt from taking ISTEP+ (i.e., students who are not on track to receive a diploma). Examples of students who might be designated as taking the test only for diagnostic purposes are some special education students and some Limited-English Proficient (LEP) students.

Limited English Proficient (LEP): The State Board of Education provides that: a student is exempt from participation in the ISTEP program if the student qualifies as a student whose primary language is other than English, has limited proficiency in English and reads at least two years below grade level. Limited proficiency in English is evidenced by any of the following:

(A) The student does not understand, speak, read or write English, but may know a few isolated words or expressions.

(B) The student understands simple sentences in English, especially when they are spoken slowly, but speaks only isolated words and expressions.

(C) The student:

(i) speaks English with hesitancy;

(ii) understands English with difficulty;

(iii) converses in English, but only with effort and assistance;

(iv) understands only some parts of lessons;

(v) cannot understand and follow simple directions; and

(vi) cannot write sentences that do not contain errors in syntax and fact.

The building principal must document the exemption of a student from participation in the ISTEP program in the student's permanent educational record. However, a school corporation may administer the ISTEP test to any student exempt from the program for diagnostic purposes.

The Indiana Department of Education uses five levels to describe the English proficiency of students whose primary language is a language other than English. These five levels are:

- Level 1: The student does not speak, understand, read or write English but may know a few isolated words or expressions.
- Level 2: The student understands simple sentences in English, especially when spoken slowly, but does not speak, read or write English, except for isolated words or expressions.

- Level 3: The student communicates in English with hesitancy and difficulty. With effort and help, the student can carry on a conversation in English, read and understand at least parts of lessons, and follow simple directions.
- Level 4: The student speaks and understands English without apparent difficulty, reads two or more years below grade level and displays low academic achievement.
- Level 5: The student speaks, understands, reads and writes in English without difficulty and displays academic achievement comparable to English-speaking peers at the student's grade level.

In general, ISTEP+ testing does not produce useful results for students with Level 1, Level 2, or Level 3 proficiency. A student with Level 4 proficiency is likely to benefit from taking the test on a diagnostic basis. A student with Level 5 proficiency must participate in ISTEP+ testing. Decisions about participation in ISTEP+ testing are made by the school, but it is critical that a student's parents understand the nature, the level, and the consequences of the student's participation or lack of participation in the testing program. Regardless of a student's level of proficiency when the student enters an Indiana school, the student cannot graduate unless the student demonstrates attainment of the Indiana Academic Standards tested in the Graduation Qualifying Examination.

2. *What accommodations and/or modifications are made on the current state assessment for students with disabilities? LEP?*

An accommodation is acceptable on ISTEP+, including the GQE, if a student with disabilities uses the accommodation in testing situations that occur throughout the student's educational program. Testing accommodations generally fall into the following categories: presentation, response, setting, and scheduling. The Department of Education will provide technical assistance on accommodations to school corporations. Accommodations for testing conditions are determined by the case conference committee for a special education student and by the individual service plan for a student with disabilities who receives accommodations under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Accommodations that are used for classroom assessments in a particular subject area are generally appropriate for use during the ISTEP+ assessment of the same subject area.

Accommodations Permitted and Documented on the ISTEP+

Timing and Scheduling

- Student provided extended testing time for each test session (e.g., 50% more time, double time).

Response Format

- Student responds orally, answer sheet filled by another.
- Student signs responses to an interpreter.
- Student has access to a scribe to write out response for essay questions.
- Student has access to a calculator - but still must show his or her work for a given problem.

Presentation Format

- Student uses a Braille version of the assessment.
- Questions are signed to the student by an interpreter.*

- Student uses an Intelli-talk assistive technology device.
- Questions are read to the student.*
- Student is provided with additional examination examples.

* *Except test questions that measure Reading Comprehension which may not be read at any time.*

Accommodations prohibited during the ISTEP+

Timing and Scheduling

- Student is provided unlimited time to complete each test section. (Must select a time frame or limit and not let the assessment go on indefinitely if the student is not making progress.)

Response Format

- Student responds in a language other than English which is then transcribed into English for scoring purposes.

Presentation Format

- Language in the directions is reduced in complexity.
- Story problems in the mathematical assessment use language which is reduced in complexity.
- Student is provided color-coded prompts for mathematical problems.
- Assessment is provided in a language other than English.

Accommodations permitted but not documented on the ISTEP+

Timing and Scheduling

- Time of day for administration is altered.
- Student provided additional breaks as necessary.
- Test administered in several sessions.

Response Format

- Student is allowed to circle the answers to questions rather than “bubble” them; answers are bubbled in by another.
- Student is allowed to use a slant board to hold testing materials at correct angle.
- Student uses an answer sheet which has been enlarged (no extra time).
- Student uses word processor/electronic Braille writer (without access to spell check or grammar check).

Setting and Environment

- Student is provided special lighting conditions.
- Student is provided preferential seating.
- Student is given access to special furniture.
- Student is tested in small group setting.
- Student is tested individually.
- Student is given access to a visual magnification device.

Presentation Format

- Student is provided auditory amplification device and/or noise buffers.
- Student is provided pencil grip or specialized writing instrument.
- Student uses a large print version of the assessment.

- Student has directions signed (not the questions).
- Student has directions read to him or her.

(Criterion-referenced scores and norm-referenced scores will be reported)

3. *Does the state provide assessments in languages other than English? If so, describe. In what grades and subjects?*

A student whose primary language is a language other than English who intends to receive a diploma must take the ISTEP+. There are no plans to create an assessment in a language other than English. By statute, English is the official language of the state. The compulsory attendance law requires a school-aged student to attend either a public school or another school that is taught in the English language. ISTEP+ is a measure of a student's English achievement and a measure of a student's mathematics achievement using the English language. In order to meet the needs of students whose primary language is a language other than English, school corporations are to provide appropriate instruction to limited English proficient students to aid those students to reach their full academic level of achievement.

4. *Does the state provide alternative assessments for students with disabilities? If so, describe. For which students and in which subjects and at what ages?*

Although not for the 1999-2000 school year, effective no later than July 1, 2000, an alternative assessment must be provided and is currently in the final stages of development.

5. *Does the state have a goal for the inclusion of students with disabilities and/or LEP students on the statewide tests? Does the state use any strategies to encourage the inclusion of students with disabilities? LEP students?*

It is expected by the state that all Indiana students in Grades 3, 6, 8, and 10 who are receiving instruction in accordance with the Indiana Academic Standards tested by ISTEP+ and who plan to receive an Indiana diploma are required to participate fully in the ISTEP+ assessment program under standardized conditions.

6. *Are changes planned in the for the inclusion of SWD and LEP students in the state assessment system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

As of July 1, 2000, an alternative assessment will be implemented in the state; it is currently in the final stages of development.

Performance Standards

1. *How many and what performance levels has the state established for its assessments?*

ISTEP+ reports student criterion-referenced scores as scale scores. The scale begins with the lowest possible score at 300 and ends at about 800 as the high, depending on the grade level and subject tested.

Grade level	Subject	Passing Score	Highest Possible Score
• Grade 3	English/language arts	475	790
•	Math	479	720
• Grade 6	English/language arts	480	825
•	Math	479	740
• Grade 8	English/language arts	466	830
•	Math	486	820
• Grade 10	English/language arts	466	800
•	Math	486	720

2. *Has the state set acceptable levels or targets for schools, districts or the state on tests, drop-out rates or other measures (e.g. 70% of students in Maryland pass the MSPAP)?*

Indiana statute and State Board of Education rules require the establishment of **expected (predicted) performance levels** for each school relative to three measures established through ISTEP+ (ISTEP+ total battery scores, and proficiency scores in English/language arts and proficiency scores in mathematics), as well as attendance rates and graduation rates (for high schools). The legislation recognizes that much of the variation in student achievement--especially as measured by test scores--results from influences largely outside the control of schools, specifically socioeconomic status and cognitive abilities. Consequently, the procedure used to establish expected (predicted) performance levels is designed to assess achievement of schools relative to that in schools with similar student populations.

Since 1987, when the statute was passed, the Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) system has used a statistical technique (canonical correlation) to determine the influence of non-school factors on student achievement, and has then ranked schools on the basis of these non-school influences and grouped them into "leagues" of similar schools. The expected (predicted) performance level for each of the variables considered (the three ISTEP+ scores, plus student attendance rate and graduation rate) has been established as the level that is one standard deviation below the league mean. The logic of this approach is that performance of a school should at least be equal to the average performance of similar schools; the establishment of expected (predicted) performance levels at one standard deviation below the average was done to allow for data anomalies.

3. *How are these performance standards calculated? What data are included in the calculations, and at what proportions (e.g. assessment results 60%, dropout and attendance rates 40%). How are the calculations made? What is the final unit of analysis for reporting school and district achievement levels (e.g. performance index, grade, category)?*

The minimum expected (predicted) performance level in each of the areas for each school is based on the performance of schools with similar grade configuration serving students of

similar socioeconomic status and similar cognitive ability. Minimum expected (predicted) performance levels are established according to the following procedure:

1. Schools are grouped according to organizational structure: elementary, middle, or high school;
2. Schools in each of the three categories are ordinally ranked according to a contextual index calculated by using the free lunch participation rate and the average cognitive ability score of the students;
3. Schools are placed in leagues of 50 schools based on their position in the contextual index ranking. The 25 schools ranked above and the 25 schools ranked below a given school comprise that school's league;
4. The average performance is calculated for each league in each of the following areas: Language Arts, Mathematics, Total ISTEP, Attendance, and Graduation Rate; and
5. A school's accreditation-year performance in each of these areas is compared to the average performance of the 50 schools in the league. A school is determined to have met its minimum expected (predicted) performance when its performance is not critically (one standard deviation or more) below the average of its league of 50 schools.

4. *Are all students, schools and districts included in these performance calculations? If not, who is excluded?*

Only scores of students who are exempt from testing or have been tested for diagnostic purposes are excluded. For the criterion-referenced portion of the ISTEP+, all students who sit for the test (except those tested for diagnostic purposes) are included in the calculations. For the norm-referenced portion, all students, including those with accommodations that *do not have to be reported* are included; those with reported accommodations are not included.

5. *Are changes planned for the state performance standards (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the state reporting or accountability systems (Title I or in general)?*

The state is planning to increase the rigor of the state curriculum standards, which in turn will impact the performance cut-off levels in the state.

6. *What proportion of schools and/or districts fail to meet acceptable levels on performance targets?*

As announced in March of 2000, six schools, or 1.4 percent, were accorded probationary accreditation status with next review within one year. Schools receiving probationary accreditation status may receive technical assistance from the Indiana Department of Education to address deficiencies. Probationary accreditation is accorded when a school exhibits *less than expected student performance*, lacks compliance with legal standards, or is unsatisfactory in completing the required school improvement planning process.

Reporting Performance Data

1. *Describe the characteristics of the state performance data reporting system (by whom, what data, who is the audience) for each of the following levels:*

- *Student reports*

Individual student reports are generated by CTB-McGraw Hill and sent to school districts to be distributed. Students reports simply cover individual achievement on the ISTEP+ in math and English/language arts. The state of Indiana gets the aggregate achievement data from CTB-McGraw Hill as well.

- *School reports*

Schools are required to publish a report addressing specified performance benchmarks on or before September 15th of each year. These benchmarks include:

- Graduation Rate
- Attendance Rate
- **ISTEP+ Results**

Three different pieces of ISTEP+ information are reported. The first two measures are derived from the criterion-referenced component of ISTEP+:

1. the percentage of students meeting the ISTEP+ mathematics standard at each tested grade level; and
2. the percentage of students meeting the ISTEP+ English/language arts standard at each tested grade level.

These data measure student achievement in terms of curriculum that should have been taught in Indiana schools as per the Indiana "Proficiency Guides in Mathematics and English/Language Arts." The report also includes mean normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores from the nationally norm-referenced component of ISTEP+. Norm-referenced tests are designed to generate a normal distribution of results, and are not explicitly based on material that is supposed to be taught in Indiana classrooms at the tested grade levels. The "mean NCE" is a normalized statistic that allows comparisons from year to year. Since the criterion-referenced and nationally norm-referenced components of ISTEP+ are designed for different purposes and test different material, there is no necessary relationship between the two sets of scores.

- **Advanced Placement**

Advanced Placement Tests are taken by Grade 11 or Grade 12 students, and postsecondary credit is given to students who demonstrate acceptable levels of achievement on the tests. The minimum score for which credit will be awarded is three. A total of approximately 29 Advanced Placement Tests is available to be taken, and the state pays for tests in five subject areas for students who have successfully completed Advanced Placement courses. The performance report shows the percentage of Grade 11 and 12 students who participate in advanced placement testing, and the percentage of students with an average score of three or higher on the Advanced Placement Tests taken.

- **SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) Scores**

SAT scores are provided by the College Board. The scores that are reported are the composite (total) scores. The annual performance report also includes the percentage of students taking the test. The report includes a breakdown of SAT scores by student grade point average. PSAT data are reported by the College Board. The PSAT tends to be taken by students who are more certain about their plans for enrollment in postsecondary education than are those who take the SAT.

- ACT (American College Testing) Scores
- Percentage of Academic Honors Diplomas
- Percentage of Students Pursuing College Education
- **Percentage of Expulsions and Suspensions for Drugs, Weapons, or Alcohol**
The report includes the percentage of total out of school suspensions and expulsions that involve alcohol, drugs, or weapons. No data are reported for schools that had a total of fewer than five expulsions or suspensions.
- Student to Teacher ratio
- Percentage of Core 40 Diplomas

- *District reports*

District or “corporation” level reporting for 1999 included the following data:

- **Total Expenditure per Pupil 3 Year Average:** The data are the three-year average of total expenditures at the school corporation level.
- **Vocational APC per ADM X 100:** The duration and class time of particular vocational education programs can vary significantly. This measure is reported as the weighted vocational enrollment divided by ADM, with the result multiplied by 100.
- **Average Teacher Salary:** The data are from the DOE CE/CP (certified employees and certified positions report).
- **Percentage of Students in Special Education:** Special education enrollment is calculated as the number of special education students reported on a special December census divided by the total ADM.
- **At Risk: Limited English Proficient; Percentage of Students Eligible for Free Lunches; Test of Cognitive Skills:** There is no state definition of an "at-risk" student, but the term can be described as applying to any student who is at risk of not graduating from high school. A local school corporation has the authority to identify students who are at-risk and to create programs to meet the needs of these students. In the absence of comparable data on at-risk programs, other data that are statistically related to risk of low academic achievement are reported. These data are average cognitive ability, percentage of students on free lunch programs, and percentage of limited English proficient students (students whose proficiency is at level one, two, or three). Scores on the Test of Cognitive Skills are reported separately for each grade level tested through ISTEP+.
- **Gifted and Talented Education:** Data on the number of gifted and talented students are reported to the state by corporations that apply for gifted and talented grants from the Department of Education. The performance report indicates the number and percentage of students participating in gifted and talented programs, as reported on state grant applications. Criteria for identification of gifted and talented students differ among school

corporations, and some students are served by more than one program. The comparability of these numbers is limited.

- **Remediation Funding:** There is not a one-to-one correspondence between ISTEP+ scores and participation in remediation programs. As a part of the ISTEP+ remediation grant application, school corporations include the number of students whom the corporation expects to serve. These applications sometimes include only some of the remediation and preventive remediation programs offered by the school corporation. Data on the number of students who actually participate in remediation and preventive remediation programs are not collected. Two remediation measures are reported: 1) the total amount of state funds allocated to the school corporation on the basis of student performance on ISTEP+; and 2) the number and percentage of tests (mathematics or English/language arts) that generated state funding for remediation.
- **Expulsions and Suspensions:** The report indicates the number of suspensions and expulsions in the school corporation during the 1996-97 school year. In-school suspensions are not included in these numbers. The data for the number of suspensions/expulsions includes duplicate counts, meaning that if a single student is suspended five times during the school year, the report will count five separate suspensions.

- *State reports*

The **State Achievement Performance Report (SAPR)** was designed to provide members of the news media and others with information on both the criterion-referenced and norm-referenced tests. Information contained in the reports is organized by state, county, school corporation, and school.

On the SAPR, norm-referenced scores for Total Reading (Read), Total Language (Lang), Total Mathematics (Math), and Total Battery (Batt) are provided for each grade and are reported both as Median NCE and Median NP scores. The state report also includes criterion-referenced tested information on student achievement in reading, math and language at the four grades tested. It also lists the percentage and number of students at the following performance levels: 1) Above the standard, 2) Below the standard, 3) Undetermined, and 4) Total.

The Disaggregation Summary Report includes students in the following categories:

- All students tested, not including those taking the test for diagnostic purposes
- GenEd students who tested with and without accommodations (two categories)
- SpEd students who tested with and without accommodations (two categories)
- Number of students taking the test diagnostically.

- *Title I reports*

Title I program administrators in the districts receive the following reports for their Title I schools:

1. Title I School Performance Report, including:
 - The level attained for each ISTEP+ grade in the Title I school to determine AYP
 - The percentage of Level I's attained by the school to determine need for improvement
 - The percentage of Title I schools in the district not making AYP.

2. Title I Performance Data (compiled from the ISTEP+ School Proficiency Performance Summary):
 - Data are combined for the AYP review for schools with two or more ISTEP+ grade levels
 - All students included at each ISTEP+ grade level are included in determining AYP and the resulting school scores are used for the Title I AYP review.
3. Title I Criteria for Adequate Yearly Progress, and
4. Strategies to Support Continuous Progress for Title I Schools.

2. *How are the data distributed? When during the year (month or time period after assessment)? To whom (students, teachers, parents, the media, the community)?*

September testing results are released in January while the March retesting results are available from CTB-McGraw Hill in May. Districts are responsible for distribution to schools, and are also responsible for generating school-level reports, including data provided by the state on school performance. Additional descriptive data may also be added by the district. These data must be published in the local media by September 15th. Decisions about how student reports are sent home vary by district.

Schools receive league statements in October of each year, based on data from the previous academic year. For schools not currently in their accreditation year, expected (predicted) performance data are published for informational purposes only. The league statement provides data for schools to use in monitoring and focusing school improvement efforts in anticipation of the accreditation year.

3. *At what level(s) are data disaggregated (state, district and school levels)? For what groups are disaggregated data reported?*

The state collects and makes available but does not report data on gender, race, LEP status, migrant status, students with disabilities. The state does not collect disaggregated data by socio-economic status. Schools are encouraged to disaggregate data for the purposes for school improvement planning.

Students who used special accommodations during testing will receive the scale scores for each content area within the criterion-referenced portion of the ISTEP+, and these are the only reliable scores for students with accommodations. Norm-referenced scores will also be reported to the students, but the reliability of these scores is uncertain, a fact which will be noted on the testing report and accommodated norm-referenced scores are not included in any aggregate reports.

5. *Does trend data exist from the state assessments (example: Texas State Assessment data is available from “1996-97 on”)?*

Trend data included in the state, corporation and school reports lists ISTEP+ information from 1996-97 to the present.

6. *How are the results of students with disabilities and limited English proficiency reported? Are they included in the aggregate scores reported to the public, or disaggregated by group?*

The criterion-referenced portion of the fall 1999 ISTEP+ and Spring GQE are reported by state, corporation and school by the following areas:

- All students tested, not including those taking the test for diagnostic purposes
- GenEd students who tested with and without accommodations (two categories)
- SpEd students who tested with and without accommodations (two categories)
- Number of students taking the test diagnostically.

7. *What are the state's requirements for the use of data in school and district improvement planning?*

Recommendations for accreditation are based, in part, on the school improvement plan results from a thorough self-study conducted by the individual school. The school improvement planning process organizes evaluation efforts, assesses school effectiveness, and mobilizes improvement, addressing issues such as curriculum and instruction. The plan must also monitor student progress through the use of assessment data.

8. *Are changes planned for performance reporting (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline? Are there implications for the accountability system (Title I or in general)?*

House Bill 1750 (Public Law 221), effective as of **July 1, 2001** and passed in 1999 has not yet been implemented but provides that a school may be accredited by meeting the criteria for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for Education or a national or regional accreditation agency rather than under performance based accreditation and adds additional benchmarks and indicators of performance to the school corporation annual performance report. It also establishes a school accountability program for targeted and continuous school improvement and requires each school and school corporation to develop an annual strategic and continuous school improvement plan. Specific to performance levels for schools, HB 1750 requires the Indiana state board of education to develop *categories of school improvement* and place each school in a category.

9. What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of performance standards and reporting? Explain.

No issues were reported.

State Accountability System (1999-2000 school year)

1. *Provide a brief overview and history of the accountability system as the context.*

The state's Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) System focuses on legal standards, the school improvement planning process and expected performance on the ISTEP+, as well as

attendance and graduation rates to assign schools either full or probationary accreditation. This system will, however, change as a result of House Bill 1750 (Public Law 221) effective July 1, 2001.

2. *What are the characteristics of the state accountability system? Organize the response into the following subsections:*

- *Student Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

Students must demonstrate *mastery of the skills* assessed by the GQE in order to receive a high school diploma. A student not passing the GQE in grade 10 will have two opportunities to do so during both grades 11 and 12. Students may also continue to sit for the test after the 12th grade as “adult learners.”

A student does not have to pass the GQE but master the skills assessed and can demonstrate mastery in two other ways.:

1. By completing all directed and elective Core 40 curriculum courses with a C or better, or
2. By demonstrating Grade 9 skills through other assessments or classroom work and meeting other criteria.

Specifically, if students neither achieve a passing score on ISTEP+ nor meet these Core 40 requirements, the law further provides that the student may be eligible to graduate if the student does all of the following:

- (1) takes the graduation examination in each subject area in which the student did not receive a passing score at least one time every school year after the school year in which the student first takes the graduation examination.
- (2) completes remediation opportunities provided to the student by the student’s school.
- (3) maintains a school attendance rate of at least ninety-five percent (95%) with excused absences not counting against the student’s attendance.
- (4) maintains at least a “C” average or the equivalent in the courses comprising the credits required for graduation by rule of the board.
- (5) obtains a written recommendation from a teacher of the student in each subject area in which the student has not received passing score. The recommendation must:
 - (A) be concurred in by the principal of the student’s school; and
 - (B) be supported by documentation that the student has attained the academic standard in the subject area based upon:
 - i. Tests other than the graduation examination; or
 - ii. Classroom work.
- (6) otherwise satisfies all state and local graduation requirements.

- *School Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

The state uses the **Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA)** system to monitor schools. All public schools in Indiana, as well as those non-public schools voluntarily seeking accreditation, follow this system. Non-public schools may become accredited under the Freeway System in which schools are allowed to waive specific state-selected regulations in favor of the presentation of annual information. The State Board of Education determines a school's accreditation status based on recommendations from the Indiana Department of Education and/or an on-site review panel.

Recommendations for accreditation are based on:

- compliance with legal standards;
- development of a school improvement plan; and
- meeting expected (predicted) performance levels of student achievement.

1. **Legal standards** consist of those Indiana statutes and rules that apply to each school for purposes of accreditation. IC 20-1-1.2 denotes seven areas of legal standards to be addressed:

- health and safety requirements;
- minimum time requirements for school activities;
- staff-student ratio requirements;
- curriculum requirements;
- development and implementation of a staff evaluation plan;
- development and implementation of a beginning teacher internship program; and
- completion of a school improvement plan.

2. The **school improvement plan** results from a thorough self-study conducted by the individual school. The school improvement planning process organizes evaluation efforts, assesses school effectiveness, and mobilizes improvement by addressing issues in areas such as the following:

- administrative instructional leadership;
- curriculum;
- instruction;
- student progress;
- program evaluation;
- professional development of instructional staff;
- evaluation of school personnel;
- school climate; and
- parent and community involvement.

3. IC 20-1-1.2 requires establishment of **expected (predicted) performance levels** for each school in each of the following areas:

- Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP+) total battery scores;
- language arts proficiency scores;
- mathematics proficiency scores;
- attendance rates; and
- graduation rates for high schools.

Levels of Accreditation

As one result of the Performance-Based Accreditation (PBA) process, participating schools are accorded either:

1. full accreditation status or
2. probationary accreditation status.

Moreover, schools accorded full accreditation status may be accredited for either a five-year time period, or for a shorter time period (often two years). The final accreditation determination is

made by the State Board of Education. The accreditation year proceeds from July 1 to June 30 of any given school year.

During the five-year accreditation cycle, Indiana schools, the Indiana Department of Education, and the Indiana State Board of Education have various responsibilities:

- The Department of Education gathers information to establish a school's compliance with legal standards
- The school completes a written school improvement plan and submits it to the department by June 30 of the accreditation year.
- Prior to June 30 of the accreditation year, the department gathers performance data for each school in the following areas:
 1. student attendance rate;
 2. for high schools, graduation rate;
 3. Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress (ISTEP) battery results;
 4. ISTEP+ mathematics proficiency scores; and
 5. ISTEP+ language arts proficiency scores.

For schools that have met all accreditation standards--expected (predicted) performance levels, legal requirements, and satisfactory completion of school improvement plan--the department determines, with rare exceptions, that a recommendation will be made to the State Board of Education for full accreditation for a five-year period. (Exceptions may occur when evidence has been acquired that the school's ISTEP+ test scores have been influenced by unethical testing practices).

For schools determined initially not to have met all accreditation requirements, the department conducts a preliminary visitation. This visitation provides an opportunity for key school and central office administrators to meet with PBA staff to discuss information about compliance with legal standards, completion of the school improvement plan, or expected (predicted) performance. This step enables school officials to account for data errors or other anomalies reflected in the school's performance indicators. Based on information gained during the preliminary visitation, the department may recommend that a school be accorded full accreditation status with the next review in five or fewer years or that an on-site review be conducted if more information is needed to make a recommendation regarding accreditation to the State Board of Education.

During the time period from January through February immediately following the accreditation year, the department, with assistance from trained practitioners, carries out on-site reviews as necessary. The on-site review panel may recommend that a school be accorded full accreditation status with next review in five or fewer years or probationary accreditation status.

In March, the department makes recommendations regarding accreditation status to the Indiana State Board of Education. The State Board determines the following:

- the accreditation status of the school;
- if applicable, recommendations for improvement of the school including goals and strategies for technical assistance; and
- the school's next review date.

If a school or school corporation is accorded probationary accreditation status, the governing body of the school corporation may appeal that determination to the Indiana State Board of Education as provided in IC 4-21.5-3. The department provides technical assistance for schools with probationary accreditation as well as schools accorded full accreditation with next review in fewer than five years. The department conducts annual reviews for all schools receiving technical assistance until each school reaches five-year full accreditation status.

If a school is accorded probationary accreditation status, that school and its governing body shall, within one year, develop a plan to raise that school's accreditation level to full accreditation status. The school has up to three years to raise its accreditation level to five-year full accreditation status. If a school holding probationary accreditation fails to make progress in any of the three years or if, after three years of probationary accreditation status, the school still fails to meet accreditation requirements, the state board shall accord probationary accreditation status to the school corporation.

If a school corporation accorded probationary accreditation status does not raise the level of accreditation of each of its schools that are on probationary accreditation status to full accreditation status within one year of the school corporation's having been accorded probationary status, the department shall submit recommendations to the Indiana General Assembly concerning the operation and administration of the school corporation and the schools within that school corporation.

The department may conduct an evaluation of a school that has been awarded full accreditation status if the department verifies prior to the school's next review date, that:

- the school is not in substantial compliance with legal standards required for accreditation; or
- the school has, for two (2) consecutive years, failed to meet one or more of the predicted performance levels for student achievement.

The state board shall revoke the accreditation status of a non-public school accorded probationary accreditation status if that school:

- fails to make progress in any of the three (3) years the school in probationary accreditation status; or
- fails to achieve full accreditation status at the end of the three (3) year period.

If the accreditation status of a non-public school is revoked, the school may seek accreditation again during the school year in which the school normally would have been reviewed had the school been accorded full accreditation status rather than probationary accreditation status.

The **Indiana School Incentive Awards** program annually rewards schools showing improvements over the past year in attendance and academic performance as measured by higher scores on ISTEP+, Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress+. The awards emphasize long-term, sustained improvement and steady growth to achieve better academic performance and better schools. Each school competes only against its own performance averages over the

previous three years. The awards program, created in 1987 as part of the A-Plus Program, is a special incentive to reward schools where students performed better than ever and topped their own schools' previous ISTEP+ scores and attendance records.

Title 511 IAC 6.1-8 allows schools the opportunity to earn a monetary or nonmonetary award based on the following criteria:

- **Monetary Awards:** A school will receive a monetary incentive award if the school has demonstrated an improvement this year over the average of their last three years in two or more of the following areas: student attendance rates, mathematics proficiency scores, language arts proficiency scores, and ISTEP+ total battery scores.
- **Nonmonetary Awards:** A school will receive a nonmonetary incentive award if the school has demonstrated an improvement this year over the average of their last three years in only one of the following areas: student attendance rates, mathematics proficiency scores, language arts proficiency scores, and ISTEP+ total battery scores.
- **Spending of Award Monies:** In accordance with public law, the incentive money a school receives may be expended for any educational purpose for that school (not the corporation) except athletics; salaries or salary bonuses for school personnel.

Schools receiving a monetary incentive award should select a committee of faculty, staff, parents, students, and community representatives to decide how best to use award money to benefit the school's educational program.

The awards go to individual schools that improve in at least two of four areas as specified by law: (1) total battery score on ISTEP+, (2) language arts scores on ISTEP+, (3) mathematics scores on ISTEP+, and (4) attendance rates.

- Schools showing improvement in only one area are designated for non-monetary awards.
- Schools that rank in the top 25 percent in all four areas, whether or not they are able to show improvement, are designated in a separate program as **Four Star Schools**.

The cash awards go to the individual schools under a law specifying that each may use the money for any educational purpose except for athletics or for teacher salaries or bonuses.

The General Assembly appropriated a total of \$3,201,900 for School Incentive Awards in each year of the current biennium. The program was created as part of the A-Plus Program in 1988, when the General Assembly provided \$10 million for each of its first two years. The amount of a school's award is figured on a two-tier basis. In the first tier, 40 percent of the total Incentive Awards appropriation from the General Assembly is divided among eligible schools on a per pupil basis. The degree of improvement is not considered in this tier to avoid penalizing schools that already are above average and have little room to improve. In the second tier, 60 percent of the total is awarded on the basis of a school's improvements in each of the four areas.

To be designated as a **Four Star School**, a school must not only meet all levels of expected performance under the state's Performance-Based Accreditation system, but it also must be rated in the top 25 percent in each of four specific areas: (1) total battery performance on ISTEP+ (Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus), (2) language arts proficiency scores on ISTEP+, (3) mathematics proficiency scores on ISTEP+, and (4) attendance rates.

- *District Accountability/Rewards and Sanctions*

When schools enrolling at least 95% of the district's students achieve full accreditation status, the SBE will award the school corporation full accreditation status as well. On the other hand, once identified as having only probationary accreditation, a school has three years to improve. If, after those three years, a school has not improved to the point that it has full accreditation status, then the school corporation is brought down to the probationary level with the school. If after a fourth year the district has still not been able to bring the school up to full accreditation, then the Department of Education will make recommendations to the state legislature regarding the administration of that school corporation as well as **all** of the schools within its jurisdiction. No district in the state has ever gotten to this point, and so the requirements or guidelines for the specific recommendations have not been outlined.

3. *What methods of measuring progress are used in the state accountability system?*

Recommendations for accreditation are based on schools meeting specific requirements in three areas. The predicted performance levels vary depending on the year and the student population of a school. The three areas include:

- compliance with legal standards;
- development of a school improvement plan; and
- meeting expected (predicted) performance levels of student achievement.

4. *Are all students included in calculating the measures of progress? If not, who is excluded (probe on inclusion of SWD and LEP students)?*

Only scores of students who are exempt from testing are excluded. For the criterion-referenced portion of the ISTEP+, all students who sit for the test are included in the calculations. For the norm-referenced portion, all students, including those with accommodations that *do not have to be reported* are included; those with reported accommodations are not included.

5. *How do the general state accountability system and the system of accountability for Title I schools compare? Are they the same, or different? How?*

There are two different systems in the state for Title I and non-Title I schools.

6. *Are subgroup performance results used as an indicator in the calculation of state accountability measures? If so, how? To identify schools or districts in need of improvement? For recognition and rewards?*

Subgroup performance is not included in the calculation of predicted performance levels.

7. *Are charter and/or non-public schools included in the accountability system? If so, how?*

Non-public schools may voluntarily go through the accreditation process under the Freeway System in which schools are allowed to waive specific state-selected regulations in favor of the presentation of annual information.. The state does not have any charter schools.

8. *Are changes planned for the state accountability system (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

House Bill 1750, which will be effective as of July 1, 2001 makes the following changes and additions to the accountability system:

- Provides that a school may be accredited under PBA or by implementing a quality focused approach. An example of this would include the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for Education or a national or regional accreditation agency.
- Adds additional benchmarks and indicators of performance to the school corporation annual performance report.
- Establishes a school accountability program for targeted and continuous school improvement.
- Requires each school and school corporation to develop a three-year strategic and continuous school improvement plan, with annual review and revision.
- Requires a school to develop a professional development program as a part of the school's plan.
- Requires the department of education to use ISTEP scores, performance indicators developed by the education roundtable, and a school corporation's annual performance report to assess the improvement of each school in the school corporation.
- Requires the Indiana state board of education to develop categories of school improvement and place each school in a category.
- Provides a series of interventions for schools that do not show improvement based on the number of years that improvement is not demonstrated.
- Provides for creation of a system of recognition and financial awards for schools that demonstrate improvement.
- Repeals a statute under the performance based accreditation law that requires the development of a level of expected performance for each school in light of the school's socioeconomic factors.

9. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of accountability? Explain.*

The state has moved from very prescriptive assistance to a more general sense of support and allowing schools to make more decisions on their own with regard to school improvement and planning. The state now plays more of a facilitative/consulting role with schools.

Identifying and Assisting Low Performing Schools and Districts

1. *How are schools and districts identified as low performing? Using what criteria? Do the identification processes and/or criteria differ for Title I and non-Title I schools?*

See above for criteria and accreditation process.

2. *Does the district or the state decide whether a school is low performing? If the district is involved in the process, how much discretion do they have?*

The determination is made by the state through the accreditation process.

3. *What types of assistance are provided to these schools and districts by the state?*

Technical assistance includes both financial (technical assistance funds) and expert support and analysis. State officials work with schools on how to improve student performance in a variety of ways to address the needs of the school; the assistance depends largely on what the schools identify as their greatest needs or on the issues that arise through the state process of facilitation. Professional development is a large part of this support as well.

4. *Who provides the state assistance?*

The service providers include state department staff, specifically the Division of Performance-Based Accreditation. The state does not have a large cadre of outside consultants who provide support. Educational Service Centers also provide professional development.

5. *Does support to Title I and all low performing schools and districts differ? Is support generally provided for all schools and districts, or are services specifically designed to help those that are low performing?*

Yes, support does differ between Title I and non-Title I schools (see Title I section). Support is also provided to all schools and districts regardless of performance, but priority is given to assisting low-performing schools.

6. *Has the state established a set of criteria and/or a process for getting schools and districts out of low performing status? If so, what do they include?*

If the accreditation status of a non-public school is revoked, the school may seek accreditation again during the school year in which the school normally would have been reviewed had the school been accorded full accreditation status rather than probationary accreditation status.

7. *Once a school or district is identified as low performing, what types of plans must it prepare? Who are they submitted to once completed? How do they differ from other planning documents?*

The SDE is required to provide technical assistance for schools with less than full accreditation status; this assistance is developed based on specific needs of the school. If a school is accorded probationary accreditation status, that school and its governing body must develop a plan within one year to raise that school's accreditation level to full accreditation status.

8. *Are changes planned for the state system of identifying and assisting low performing schools or districts (proposed or enacted and to be implemented)? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

The state will be working to implement the new system as outlined in House Bill 1750 (*see changes to accountability system above*). As the new system is developed, the SDE staff will have a clearer sense of the changes for schools and districts that are low performing.

Title I and Adequate Yearly Progress

1. *What criteria are included in the definition of adequate yearly progress for schools and districts under Title I?*

ISTEP+ data from the School Proficiency Performance Summary in English and math are used as the basis for determining adequate yearly progress. For each grade level assessed on ISTEP+ within a Title I school, the appropriate level of school performance is determined for each of these three categories:

- Percentage of students meeting the English/language arts standard
- Percentage of students meeting the Math standard
- Percentage of students meeting both standards.

2. *What are the definitions of adequate yearly progress for the following:*

Both a targeted and a schoolwide program school have made adequate yearly progress if two-thirds of the areas are at Level II or higher:

- $\geq 66\%$ of students meet the performance standards for English/language arts
- $\geq 66\%$ of students meet the performance standards for math;
- $\geq 60\%$ of students meet the performance standards for both subjects; or
- Schools that do not have the percentage of students meeting standards specified for Level II may still be determined as making AYP if the school achieved an increase of 5% the percentages points of students who meet the performance standards in the three areas during the previous school year.

*The state is also currently reviewing the following option: A **district** would not make AYP if 50% or more of the schools in the district are so identified. Although the state is moving to a new accountability system for non-Title I schools, this definition will be in place for at least 2000-2001, but may change to become aligned with the new legislation.*

3. *What is the process for identifying those schools and districts that are not making adequate yearly progress under Title I? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools? If the districts play a role, does the state provide guidance on local criteria?*

To determine if a Title I school has made AYP toward the state goal of all children achieving at the proficient or advanced levels, the SDE reviews the ISTEP+ assessment data for each grade level tested in that school. However, schools and districts are provided with the data to make the initial calculations to determine if AYP has been reached. Mirroring that process, the state also performs these calculations and officially notifies the schools as to their AYP and school improvement status. Based on percentages in each area, school results are classified in: 1) Language Arts, 2) Math, and 3) both Language Arts and Math.

Level III: Advanced Achievement

80% or more of the school's students met the performance standards in English/language arts and/or math; 75% or more of the students met the performance standards in both areas.

Level II: Adequate Yearly Progress

Between 66% and 79% of students meet the performance standards for English/language arts and math, or between 60% and 74% of students meet the performance standards for **both** English/language arts and math; or Schools that do not have the percentage of students meeting standards specified for Level II may still be determined as making AYP if the school achieved an increase of 5% or greater difference over the percentages of students who meet the performance standards in the three areas during the previous school year.

Level I: Warning or School Improvement Level

Schools are deemed to be at a partially proficient level if the percentages of students passing English/language arts, passing math and passing both are below the standards set for Level II (<66%) and the difference over the previous year's percentage is less than 5%; or Les than 60% of students meet the performance standards for **both** English/language arts and math and there is less than a 5% difference since the previous year.

After reviewing each area of performance, the percentage or ratio of Level I's attained by the Title I school is calculated to determine the school's improvement status.

4. *What are the criteria and processes for identifying schools and districts in need of improvement under Title I? What plans must be prepared? How can a school or district get out of Program Improvement? Does the district or the state make this determination for schools?*

Schools are "flagged" or "alerted" for school improvement if two-thirds (66%) of the areas are at Level 1. When a school has not demonstrated adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years, this school is then identified for school improvement. Under this system, Indiana Title I schools will be placed in their first year of school improvement during the 1999-2000 school year, based on fall 1998 and 1999 ISTEP+ data. Once a school enters their first year of school improvement, they must demonstrate adequate yearly progress for two out of three years.

Districts in the state are identified as in need of improvement if 50% or more of the schools in the district are so identified. However, districts are also responsible to a large degree for working with schools that are low performing and help them to improve performance. The state does not require specific plans to be developed, and allows districts to work with schools as they deem appropriate.

5. *What types of assistance are provided to those in need of improvement under Title I?*

The 1999-2000 **Title I Statewide System of Support** provides technical assistance to Indiana's Title I schools. In total for this year, there are 14 Title I initiatives funded through the SDE, including:

- Support to eight schoolwide programs in their first year of planning in the form of an overview meeting, planning team meetings, leadership seminars, on-site technical assistance and a notebook system to document the planning process
- On-site technical assistance to schoolwide programs in their second and third years of planning and implementation
- Support to targeted assistance schools through planning team meetings, leadership seminars and on-site technical assistance
- Support for targeted assistance schools in their first year of implementation through workshops on 1) monitoring plan implementation, 2) monitoring student performance-based assessments, 3) aligning instruction with standards, and 4) modeling best practices
- Evaluation of School Reform and Continuous Improvement Initiatives
- A Paraeducator Academy Pilot that provides two-year professional development experience to four Title I schools that use non-certified staff as instructional assistants
- Data-driven decision-making workshops
- Evaluation of school reform in a full-service Title I School
- Fall Administrative Workshops for principals and other administrators with Title I programs in their schools
- Regional networking support for Title I program administrators
- CSRD technical assistance; and
- A superintendent's conference on Title I.

6. *Who provides the assistance?*

The Division of Compensatory Education within the Indiana State Department of Education facilitates services provided by multiple "school support partnerships" including:

1. Consultants to the SDE from KJ Learning Partners, Inc.
2. The School Improvement Partnership (an internal SDE coalition)
3. The Division for School Improvement
4. The Indiana Principals Leadership Academy
5. Consultants from Dynamic Transitions
6. Division of Performance Based Accreditation
7. Division of Special Education
8. Indiana University Southeast, and
9. Center for Evaluation at the University of Indiana at Bloomington.

These credentialed education specialists provide knowledge of research-based practices, Title I law and school reform.

7. *Have waivers played a role in this process?*

Waiver were not identified as having played a role in Indiana Title I.

8. *Are there future plans for the state system for schools or districts receiving Title I funding (proposed or enacted and to be implemented) or for the definition of adequate yearly progress? If so, what do these plans include? Why are these changes being made and what is the timeline?*

The state is planning to use the guidance from House Bill 1750/Public Law 221 to review adequate yearly progress in the state. The specifics of this law may require some changes and the Title I Office wished to become aligned with the new accountability system in Indiana, the process for AYP for 2000-2001 has already started to move ahead.

9. *Is there alignment between Title I and non-Title I systems for adequate yearly progress?*

No, the systems are not in alignment for 1999-2000 (see Title I question #8 and accountability sections).

10. *What have been the major issues and challenges in the area of Title I? Explain.*

Two issues were addressed. First, the department has been working with rural schools in the state to help provide capacity in some of the areas of the state with limited support. Second, the state has been working very hard with schools to help them understand data and how it can be used to improve planning and student achievement, and the state has seen slow but steady gains in this area across the state.

Contact Information

Assessment

Wes Bruce
Director
Division of School Assessment
Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798
(317) 232-9060, Fax: 233-6940
wbruce@doe.state.in.us

Accountability

Mary Mickelson
Director, Division of Performance Based Accreditation
Indiana Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798
(317) 232-9060, Fax: 233-6940
mmickels@doe.state.in.us

Title I

Judy Wesley

Assistant Director

Division of Comprehensive Education

Indiana Department of Education

Room 229, State House

Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798

(317) 232-0540, Fax: 233-6502

jwesley@doe.state.in.us