

INDIANA TITLE III BIENNIAL REPORT -- REVISIONS

DUE: DECEMBER 8, 2004

2. Critical synthesis of data reported by subgrantees.

2.1 Synthesis of data and summary of student progress toward meeting AMAOs.

Provide a statement of whether the State met or did not meet annual measurable achievement objectives (making progress, attaining English proficiency and making AYP), for the 2003-04 year including an explanation of how Indiana determined that it met the 3 AMAOs.

STATE RESPONSE:

The State of Indiana met the AMAO indicators of making progress and attaining proficiency for all LEAs. The AMAO performance targets for SY 2003-04 were compared to Title III LEA performance data for 2003-04 to make this determination. All Title III LEAs met or exceeded the performance targets. The State of Indiana did not meet the AMAO indicator for meeting AYP for the Title III served LEP subgroup. 19 out of the 63, or less than 20%, Title III LEAs failed this indicator. This was determined by reviewing the Indiana Annual State Report Card at: <http://www.doe.state.in.us/asap/pdf/2003IndianaAnnual.pdf>. This report identifies LEAs that failed to meet AYP for various subgroups. Title III LEAs failing to meet AYP for the LEP subgroup were identified from this report.

2.2 Tables 2.2a and 2.2b State-level aggregated data for the percentage and number of LEP students by cohort that met the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs).

Clarify data included in table 2.2a (number and percentage of students making progress in learning English). The 3rd column provides a total number of 9,796 students K-12. The 4th column provides a total number of 30,851 students K-12. Data included under element 3, states that 16,446 students were served in Title III programs for 2002-03 school year and 19,447 for 2003-04 school year. Why is the data included in element 2 different from data included in element 3? Does the information submitted provide State-level aggregated data for the number and percentage of Title III served students?

STATE RESPONSE:

On Table 2.2a related to students making progress in learning English, column 3 (# students for AMAO target) provides data on Title III served students only totaling 9,796 students. Column 4 (# students for performance data) provides a State aggregate totaling 30,851. According to the Review Guide, a State aggregate is requested for performance data.

2.3 Tables 2.3a - 2.3d Percentage of Title III students by grade level or grade span that met AYP in reading/language arts and math on native language assessments State offers achievement tests in reading/language arts and math in students' native language.

Table 2.3a: Data for the 2003-04 school year is not available. The test was administered in September 2004, and the results will not be available until the end of the current year or the beginning of 2005.

Clarify LEP Title III served students data for table 2.3a. Indiana's data shows 2,705 students who participated in the mathematics State achievement assessment. The number of Title III served students for 2002-03 school year is listed as 16,446. Specify any variations in data such as first year LEP students and former LEP classified students being monitored for two consecutive years. For States that exercised the LEP flexibilities under Title I, Part A, e.g., for excluding first year LEP students from reading/language arts assessments and/or including former LEP students in the LEP subgroup, please indicate if this affected AMAO attainment.

STATE RESPONSE:

Table 2.3a includes data from the Mathematics section of the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) academic assessment. ISTEP+ was only administered at grades 3,6,8, and 10 in the 2002-03 school year so only a fraction of the total 16,446 K-12 Title III served LEP students were tested. The number of Title III served LEP students scoring at a passing rate in the tested grades was 2,705.

Table 2.3b: Data for the 2003-04 school year is not available. The test was administered in September 2004, and the results will not be available until the end of the current year or the beginning of 2005.

Clarify LEP Title III served students data for table 2.3b. Indiana's data shows 2,302 number of students who participated in the reading/language arts assessment. The number of Title III served students for 2002-03 school year is listed as 16,446. Specify any variations in data such as first year LEP students and former LEP classified students being monitored for two consecutive years. For States that exercised the LEP flexibilities under Title I, Part A, e.g., for excluding first year LEP students from reading/language arts assessments and/or including former LEP students in the LEP subgroup, please indicate if this affected AMAO attainment.

STATE RESPONSE:

Table 2.3a includes data from the English/Language Arts section of the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) academic assessment. ISTEP+ was only administered at grades 3,6,8, and 10 in the 2002-03 school year so only a fraction of the total 16,446 K-12 Title III served LEP students were tested. The number of Title III served LEP students scoring at a passing rate in the tested grades was 2,302.

3. Effectiveness of Title III programs and activities in assisting LEP students to make progress in attaining English language proficiency and meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards.

Address and explain the process for identifying if LEAs met or did not meet the Title III AMAOs. In addition, address if the AYP data for the LEP subgroup was disaggregated to identify Title III served.

STATE RESPONSE:

As indicated in the above revision to section 2.1, several sources were used to identify if LEAs did or did not meet the Title III AMAOs. The AMAO performance targets for SY 2003-04 were compared to Title III LEA performance data for 2003-04 to make determinations for making progress and attaining English proficiency. Data from the Indiana Annual State Report Card was reviewed and was utilized to identify LEAs that failed to meet AYP for the LEP subgroup.

All LEP students within the subgroup are served by Title III, so there was no need to further disaggregate the AYP data for the LEP subgroup.

7. Number of LEP students transitioned out of language instruction educational programs into classrooms where instruction is not designed for LEP students.

7.1 During the two preceding fiscal years, have Title III served LEP students transitioned into classrooms where instruction is not designed for LEP students?

Indiana indicates that for the 2003-04 school year, a total of 1,924 students were transitioned out of language instruction educational programs into classrooms where instruction is not designed for LEP students. Please confirm that this number represents only Title III served students as requested.

STATE RESPONSE:

Yes, this data only represents Title III served students. It was gathered from the Title III Annual Performance Report submitted by LEAs.

7.2 Demonstrate through data in Tables 7.2a - 7.2.b monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students, and who are no longer receiving services under Title III met the State adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets in math and reading/language arts required under Title I.

Table 7.2a and Table 7.2b:

Provide a reasonable timeline and a plan with regards to what Indiana is doing on developing a mechanism to ensure that LEP students can be monitored after they exit their programs. When is the expected date of completion to have in place this mechanism? If a timeline or a plan has not been set yet, let me know when you can have the timeline and plan sent to me.

STATE RESPONSE:

The SEA collects data from LEAs in a variety of ways. The DOE-LM (language minority) is an annual data collection instrument used to gather data on LEP students. Currently, this instrument does not include a field to monitor the academic assessment performance data of former Title III served students that have been reclassified from LEP to fluent English proficient (FEP) status.

The DOE-LM data collection instrument could be modified to include this data but the data collected would be from the administration during the previous Fall. For example, the March 05 DOE-LM would collect Fall 04 test data. The next DOE-LM collection will be due in March 2005 and the data layout has already been released on the SEA website. Any changes to the data layout must be made available to LEAs in advance in order for them to modify their local data collection systems. Due to this, the earliest implementation of this process would be March 2006.

Another option would be to add a disaggregation category to the ISTEP+ academic assessment for former Title III served students that have been reclassified from LEP to fluent English proficient (FEP) status. The next time ISTEP+ will be administered is September 2005. This would require the authorization of the Assistant Superintendent of the Center for Special Populations and the Assistant Superintendent of the Center for Assessment, Research, and Information Technology as well as modifications to ISTEP+ manuals, consumable student materials, and to the structure of reports.

Regardless of the method selected, this information is challenging to collect at the SEA level. The SEA will discuss these options and review current practices in other States to determine the best method for developing this mechanism for the 2005-06 school year.