Section 4: Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with 34 C.F.R. §§ 200.12-200.24 and section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

4.1 Accountability System.

Instructions: Each SEA must describe its accountability, support, and improvement system consistent with §§ 200.12-200.24, §299.17 and with section 1111(c) and (d) of the ESEA. Each SEA may include any documentation (e.g., technical reports or supporting evidence) that demonstrates compliance with applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

A. Indicators. Describe the measure(s) included in each of the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency, and School Quality or Student Success indicators and how those measures meet the requirements described in §200.14(c)-(e) and section 1111(c)(4)(B) of the ESEA for all students and separately for each subgroup of students used to meaningfully differentiate all public schools in the State. The description should include how each indicator is valid, reliable, and comparable across all LEAs in the State. For the School Quality or Student Success measure, the description must also address how the indicator is supported by research that performance or progress on such measures is likely to increase student achievement and graduation rates and aids in the meaningful differentiation of schools by demonstrating varied results across all schools in the State.

B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>• ISTEP+ for grades 3-8 &amp; 10</td>
<td>School-level proficiency rate and participation rate in the subject areas of English/language arts and Mathematics for grades 3-8 and 10, measured annually based on the statewide annual assessment and alternate assessment.</td>
<td>• Beginning with SY2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ISTAR for students with most significant cognitive disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Utilizes ISTEP+ &amp; ISTAR through SY2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes growth metric for grade 10 that’s calculated in the same manner as the academic progress indicator for grades 4-8</td>
<td>• Utilizes ILEARN, English 10 and Algebra I End of Course Assessments &amp; alternate assessments beginning SY2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes an improvement metric for grade 12 based on the increase in number of proficient students on the graduation qualifying exam from grade 10 to grade 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Progress</th>
<th>ISTEP+ for grades 4-8</th>
<th>School-level growth score determined by points awarded under the Growth to Proficiency Table in the subject areas of English/language arts and Mathematics for grades 4-8, measured annually based on the statewide annual assessment</th>
<th>Beginning with SY2018 Utilizes ISTEP+ through SY2018 Utilizes ILEARN beginning SY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth to Proficiency Table—combines growth to standard model using student growth percentiles, and value table model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>Four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate</td>
<td>School-level four-year graduation rate, plus the difference between five-year and four-year graduates</td>
<td>Beginning with SY2018 Utilizes most recently finalized graduation cohort; for SY2018, will use the 2017 cohort for the four-year calculation and the 2016 cohort for the five-year calculation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate (five-year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress in Achieving English Language Proficiency</td>
<td>WIDA ACCESS 2.0</td>
<td>Percent of English learners who have either attained English language proficiency or met annual growth target during the school year being assessed</td>
<td>Beginning with SY2018 Utilize WIDA ACCESS 2.0 results from SY2018—growth measured between SY2017 and SY2018 results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth to Standard model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Quality or Student Success—College- and Career-Readiness</td>
<td>Achievement of postsecondary and workforce readiness indicators</td>
<td>Percent of graduates at the school who demonstrated college- and career-readiness</td>
<td>Beginning with SY2018 Utilizes most recently finalized graduation cohort; for SY2018, will use the 2017 cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Quality or Student Success—Student Attendance</td>
<td>Addressing Chronic Absenteeism</td>
<td>Percent of students at the school that meet one of two definitions of a “model attendee”—persistent attendee or improved attendee</td>
<td>Beginning with SY2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indiana’s Student-Centered Accountability System

Indiana’s State Board of Education is the body responsible for adopting the statewide accountability system. Therefore, some components of this plan are yet to be determined given the need for State Board action. Further, all components within this plan are tentative, pending State Board approval.

The following guiding principles were applied when developing this plan:

- The accountability system should be student-centered, and set targets that encourage high expectations and increased levels of achievement for all students.
- The accountability system should be comprehensible, and provide actionable information for schools to utilize in improving educational opportunities for its students.
- To the extent practicable, the accountability system should reflect the complex nature of education.
- The accountability system should focus attention on schools that need support in order to provide all students in the State with an equitable academic experience that contributes to postsecondary and workforce success.

Indiana’s student-centered accountability be based on five indicators: academic achievement, academic progress, graduation rate, school quality/student success and English learner proficiency.

- **Academic Achievement Indicator**
  - **Purpose:** to recognize that proficiency demonstrates the work schools are doing toward student mastery of grade-level standards
  - **Goal:** indicator should consider students at all levels of performance, rewarding students that achieve high levels of proficiency accordingly, and acknowledging the efforts of students toward achieving proficiency

- **Academic Progress Indicator**
  - **Purpose:** to recognize that growth demonstrates the work schools and students are doing to improve academically
  - **Goal:** indicator should acknowledge and reward students and schools that are demonstrating or exceeding the expected annual improvement or growth toward proficiency; and identify students and schools that are not demonstrating adequate improvement for assistance and resources

- **Graduation Rate Indicator**
  - **Purpose:** to recognize that the capstone of a K-12 education is preparedness for postsecondary education or workforce entrance
  - **Goal:** indicator should consider the different graduation paths of each student, and provide varied opportunities to adequately equip students for the next stage.
• School Quality/Student Success Indicator
  o Grades 3-8
    ▪ **Purpose:** to recognize the impact of school environment on the social and academic cultivation of students.
    ▪ **Goal:** indicator should consider student preparedness, which can be determined through early warning indicators; and consider the importance of a safe and accepting environment for students that is conducive to learning and success.
  o Grades 9-12
    ▪ **Purpose:** to recognize that the capstone of K-12 education is preparedness for postsecondary education or workforce entrance
    ▪ **Goal:** indicator should consider the different graduation paths of each student, and provide varied opportunities to adequately equip students for the next stage.

• English Language Proficiency Indicator
  o **Purpose:** to recognize that proficiency of the English language is vital to academic success of the English learner population in the K-12 environment and beyond
  o **Goal:** indicator should reward students and schools for working toward proficiency and language acquisition, and for demonstrating improvement or growth from year to year

In an effort to establish a transparent system, Indiana utilizes an A-F letter grade system. Points are awarded for each indicator, and the individual indicator scores culminate into the overall rating for the school. The following scale is used to determine which letter grade is awarded to a school:

- 90.0 – 100.0+ points = A
- 80.0 – 89.9 points = B
- 70.0 – 79.9 points = C
- 60.0 – 69.9 points = D
- 0.0 – 59.9 points = F.

**Academic Achievement Indicator**
The Academic Achievement Indicator is based on the same measure as the statewide long-term goal for academic achievement, and is aligned to the long-term goal of increasing statewide proficiency levels for all students and for each subgroup. The Academic Achievement Indicator measures the performance of all students. Performance results of individual subgroups on the Academic Achievement Indicator will be reported out annually.

A school receives a score for the Academic Achievement Indicator based on a proficiency rate and a participation rate. The proficiency rate identifies the percentage of students who receive a “Pass” or “Pass Plus” on the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+) assessment or the Indiana Standards Tools for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR) assessment in the subject areas of English/language arts and Mathematics respectively. The participation rate considers how many students participated in the assessment. The proficiency rate and participation rate for each subject are multiplied together to yield a score. If a school satisfies the requirement to assess at least 95 percent of the students enrolled at the school during the test window, then the participation multiplier defaults to one. If a school fails to satisfy the 95 percent
participation rate requirement, then the proficiency rate for the respective subject area is multiplied by the actual participation rate. The English/language arts score and the Mathematics score are then weighted equally to yield the overall Academic Achievement Indicator score.

For example, if a school has a proficiency rate of 80 percent and a participation rate of 90 percent on the math assessment, then the math score for the Academic Achievement Indicator would be calculated as follows: 80 (proficiency rate points) * .90 (participation rate multiplier) = 72.0 points. If the school would have satisfied the 95 percent participation rate, then the math score would equal the actual proficiency rate since the participation rate multiplier would default to 1.

It is important to note that the proficiency rate score considers students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, whereas the participation rate score considers students enrolled at the school during the test window regardless of overall enrollment.

**Calculation Example:**

**English/Language Arts Score**

\[
\frac{\text{# students passing assessment} \times \text{# students enrolled during test window}}{\text{# students taking assessment}}
\]

**Math Score**

\[
\frac{\text{# students passing assessment} \times \text{# students enrolled during test window}}{\text{# students taking assessment}}
\]

**Overall Academic Achievement Indicator Score**

\[
\frac{(\text{English/Language Arts Score} + \text{Math Score})}{2}
\]

A measure of growth is also included for grade 10, and an explanation of how this growth is measured may be found under the “Academic Progress Indicator” section.

It is important to note that Indiana will see a change in its annual statewide assessment beginning with the 2018-19 school year. Students in grades 3 through 8 and 10 will be assessed annually based on the Indiana Learning Evaluation Assessment Readiness Network (ILEARN) assessment program for English/language arts and Mathematics, which includes end-of-course assessments in English 10 and Algebra I. Indiana is currently in the process of developing these new assessments, and will need to reassess the Academic Achievement Indicator and the Academic Achievement goal during and after this assessment transition.
**Academic Progress Indicator**

A school receives a score for the Academic Progress Indicator based on points generated from the “growth to proficiency table” by each individual student. The growth to proficiency table uses a combination of the growth to target model and the value table growth model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. Each student is assigned to a “prior year status” group based on the proficiency score received on the annual statewide assessment in the immediately preceding school year. The three proficiency statuses of “Pass Plus”, “Pass”, and “Did Not Pass” are broken into substatuses in order to capture all levels of movement. Then, an observed growth score is identified for each student. The observed growth score equates to the student growth percentile ranking, which measures how a student performed on the current year assessment when compared with Indiana students who had similar achievement on the previous year’s assessment. The student’s prior year status and observed growth score are cross-referenced to identify the target range under which the student fell. These target ranges are established based on historical data that anchor the definitions of “low”, “standard”, or “high” movement so that target ranges falling under the “standard” movement column reflect the expectation of one year of learning; target ranges falling under the “low” movement column reflect growth below the typically expected amount of annual movement; and target ranges falling under the “high” movement column reflect growth above the typically expected amount of annual movement, with movement towards proficiency specifically not passing the assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Year Status</th>
<th>Target Range</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Target Range</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
<th>Target Range</th>
<th>Points Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Plus 2</td>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65-99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Plus 1</td>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65-99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass 3</td>
<td>0-45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46-64</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>65-99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass 2</td>
<td>0-44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45-62</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63-99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass 1</td>
<td>0-43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44-59</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60-99</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass 3</td>
<td>0-35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36-54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55-99</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass 2</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31-54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55-99</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Pass 1</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26-54</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55-99</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A school receives a score for the Academic Progress Indicator based on points earned through demonstrations of growth made by each individual student on the annual statewide assessment for grades 4-8 and 10 in the subject areas of English/language arts and Mathematics respectively. The scores for English/language arts and Mathematics are weighted equally to yield the overall Academic Progress Indicator score. The Academic Progress Indicator measures the performance of all students. Performance results of individual subgroups on the Academic Progress Indicator will be reported out annually.

The Academic Progress Indicator for grades 9-12 also includes an improvement indicator that considers how
many students who did not pass the graduation qualifying exam during the first administration were able to pass the graduation qualifying exam on a subsequent administration prior to graduation. Because Indiana will be shifting away from a graduation qualifying exam, the 10-12 improvement score will be phased out.

**Calculation Example:**

**English/Language Arts Score**

\[
\text{Sum of observed growth points per student} \\
\# \text{ students receiving observed growth points}
\]

**Math Score**

\[
\text{Sum of observed growth points per student} \\
\# \text{ students receiving observed growth points}
\]

**Overall Academic Progress Indicator Score**

\[
\frac{(\text{English/Language arts growth score} + \text{Math growth score})}{2}
\]

**10-12 Improvement Score**

\[
(\text{Percentage of students that passed the E/La Assessment in Grade 12} - \text{Percentage of students that passed the E/La Assessment in Grade 10}) \times 10
\]

*Repeated for Math and added to subject area growth score*

With the change in statewide assessments beginning with the 2018-19 school year, Indiana anticipates reevaluation of the Growth to Proficiency table to ensure that the prior year status cuts and target ranges for each movement type are statistically valid and accurately reflect academic progress. Further, any amendments to the table will ensure meaningful differentiation.

**Graduation Rate Indicator**

The Graduation Rate indicator is based on two metrics: the four-year graduation rate, and the five-year graduation rate improvement. The four-year graduation rate metric uses the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined by Sec. 8101(25)(A) of Title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). A school that attains a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 90.0 percent or higher will receive a full 100.0 points for this indicator. If a school’s four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate is less than 90 percent, then the four-year graduation rate score equates to the actual graduation rate (e.g., four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate = 85.4% = 85.4 points).
The five-year graduation rate improvement metric considers how many more students the school was able to graduate at the end of five years. The difference between the five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate and the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the same cohort is used to identify the additional students that graduated, and points are awarded based on this difference. For example, if a school’s four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate was 80.0 percent and its five-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the same cohort of students was 88 percent, then the school would receive 8 points for the five-year graduation rate improvement score (88.0% - 80.0% = 8.0 points).

The sum of the four-year graduation rate score and the five-year improvement score yields the overall Graduation Rate Indicator score. The Graduation Rate Indicator measures the performance of all students. Performance results of individual subgroups on the Graduation Rate Indicator will be reported out annually.

Calculation Example:

Four-Year graduation score

\[
\frac{\text{# graduates in cohort}}{\text{# students in cohort}}
\]

*If rate ≥ 90.0%, then score defaults to 100.0%, or 100.0 points*

Five-Year improvement score

\[
\frac{\text{# five year grads in previous cohort}}{\text{# students in previous cohort}} - \frac{\text{# four year grads in previous cohort}}{\text{# students in previous cohort}}
\]

Overall Graduation Rate Indicator score:

Four-year graduation score + five-year improvement score

**English Language Proficiency Indicator**

Indiana administers the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 to English learners in grades K-12 as its annual English language proficiency assessment to measure attainment of English language proficiency. Student growth toward and achievement of proficiency, as measured by the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment, will be the basis of the English Language Proficiency Indicator, and will be applicable to grades K-12. The English Language Proficiency Indicator will be incorporated in the statewide accountability system for the first time beginning with the 2018 school year.

Indiana will use the growth to target model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. Each student will be assigned a student growth percentile ranking and an annual growth target that is established based on the student’s proficiency level, grade level and age upon
initial identification as an English learner. Each year after the student’s initial identification and administration of the WIDA ACCESS 2.0, the student is expected to make acceptable growth toward English language proficiency. As such, a student who meets or exceeds her annual growth target will count toward the school’s English language proficiency score. Additionally, a student who attains proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment will count toward the school’s English language proficiency score. The percent of English learners who meet or exceed the annual growth target or attain proficiency will determine the overall English Language Proficiency Indicator score.

**Calculation Example:**

\[
\frac{\text{# ELs hitting annual growth target}}{\text{Total # ELs}} + \frac{\text{# ELs attaining English language proficiency}}{\text{Total # ELs}}
\]

The WIDA Consortium recently reset cut scores for Levels 1 through 5 on the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment. Indiana has only administered the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment for two years, and therefore does not have longitudinal data to confidently determine the student growth targets, statewide goal or timeline for the attainment of English language proficiency for its English learner population at this time. As such, Indiana will revisit the English Language Proficiency Indicator calculation as more years of data become available.

**School Quality or Student Success Indicator**

The vision for the School Quality/Student Success Indicator is that it be made up of measures for culture, climate and academic achievement beyond English/language arts and Mathematics. Further, the measures of the School Quality/Student Success Indicator should be actionable and directly correlated with student achievement and growth.

The School Quality/Student Success Indicator for grades 9-12 is a college- and career-readiness achievement rate that is calculated for grade 12. This metric considers how many graduates completed an activity to prepare for postsecondary education or demonstrate workforce readiness. The college- and career-readiness achievement rate is based on the total number of graduates who completed at least one of the following:

- Earned a passing score on an International Baccalaureate exam;
- Earned a passing score on an Advanced Placement exam;
- Earned at least three (3) college credit hours from an approved course; or
- Earned an approved industry certification.

Indiana has established a goal that at least 25 percent of graduates demonstrate college- or career-readiness. Therefore, if a school’s college- and career-readiness achievement rate is 25 percent or higher, then its college- and career-readiness achievement score defaults to 100.0 points. If this achievement rate is below 25 percent, then the actual achievement rate is multiplied by a state goal to yield the final overall domain score.
Calculation Example:

\[
\frac{\# \text{Passed} + \# \text{Passed} + \# \text{Earned} + \# \text{Earned Industry}}{\text{AP Exam} \text{ IB Exam} \text{ Dual Credit} \text{ Certification}} \times 25\%
\]

Total Number of Graduates

It is recommended that the initial School Quality/Student Success Indicator for grades K-8 be a measure to address chronic absenteeism. Chronic absenteeism is an early warning indicator of academic risk and dropout. There is a vast body of research that demonstrates a correlation between student attendance and academic and performance outcomes for students, including achievement, graduation rates and dropout rates. Specifically, research indicates a negative correlation between proficiency and graduation rates and chronic absenteeism, and a positive correlation between dropout rates and chronic absenteeism (Schanzenbach, Bauer & Mumford, 2016). A study of Chicago Public Schools found that high numbers of absences in middle and high school were tied to a lack of credit accumulation, lower grade-point average, and reduced odds of graduation from high school (Allensworth, Gwynne, Moor, de la Torre, 2014). Further, a student in California found that only 17 percent of chronically absent students were proficient readers by the end of grade 3 as compared to 64 percent of students who missed less than 5 percent of the school year (Bruner, Discher & Chang, 2011). A review of Indiana’s 2015 cohort found that students who graduated in four years missed an average of approximately six days over their school career as compared to an average of approximately 12 days for dropouts over their school career.

In order to address chronic absenteeism, the School Quality/Student Success indicator will consider two the percent of “model attendees” at the school during the school year being assessed. A “model attendee” is defined as either a student who demonstrated persistent attendance during the school year, or demonstrated improved attendance from the previous school year.

A recent study of elementary schools in urban districts found that schools with average daily attendance rates higher than 97 percent rarely have a problem with chronic absenteeism (Bruner, Discher & Chang, 2011). This data led to the definition of a “persistent attendee” as a student who has attended school for at least 98.33 percent of her enrollment during the school year. Establishing the threshold for a persistent attender above 97 percent securely demonstrates a lack of problems with chronic absenteeism at the school.

In order to acknowledge improvement made over time to address chronic absenteeism, the definition of a “model attendee” also includes a student who has demonstrated improved attendance from the previous school year. Specifically, a student whose percent of days attended during the school year being assessed increased at least 3 percent over the previous school year is considered to be improving in attendance. A student who sees a 3 percent increase in attendance would be attending school for approximately six (6) more days than the previous school year. By improving a student’s attendance by 3 percent over the previous school year, a student is closing the gap between being chronically absent and persistently attending.

A final score is generated based on the percent of model attendee students at the school. The initial goal is for each school to have at least 50 percent of its student body meeting the definition of a “model attendee”.
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Calculation Example:

\[
\frac{\text{# Persistent Attendees} + \text{# Improving Attendees}}{\text{Total Number Students Enrolled}} \times 50\%
\]

A Note on the Climate and Culture Assessment/Survey

The long-term goal for the School Quality/Student Success Indicator is to utilize a school climate and culture assessment. Strong support from stakeholders was given to the inclusion of a school culture and climate assessment. Indiana recognizes that further work needs to be done before a climate and culture assessment may be successfully implemented in a statewide accountability system, including an audit of statewide capacity; a review of necessary resources; a study of what climate and culture metrics are valued; and a scan of current data collections to determine where data collections may need to be expanded. Indiana will work with state, district and school leaders in education to develop the long-term culture and climate indicator during the 2017-18 school year; and intends to bring forth a proposal during the summer of 2018. This proposal will also include a timeline and roll-out plan to ensure that implementation of the indicator may be successful and contribute meaningful information.

C. Subgroups.

i. Describe the subgroups of students from each major and racial ethnic group, consistent with §200.16(a)(2).

Indiana’s accountability system includes the following subgroups when the minimum N count is met: All students, American Indian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, Multiracial, Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, White, Students with Disabilities, English learners, and Economically Disadvantaged Students.

ii. If applicable, describe the statewide uniform procedures for:

a. Former English learners consistent with §200.16(b)(1).

For accountability calculations, Indiana will uniformly continue to include the results of English learners previously identified as Limited-English Proficient that have been re-designated as Fluent-English Proficient in the English learner subgroup for an additional four years after re-designation as Fluent-English Proficient.

b. Recently arrived English learners in the State to determine if an exception is appropriate for an English learner consistent with section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA and §200.16(b)(4).

Indiana will uniformly apply statewide flexibility as it pertains to English learners that have recently arrived in the United States. Indiana defines a “recently arrived English learner” as
an English learner enrolled in US schools for less than twelve (12) cumulative months during the school year. Indiana will uniformly apply statewide flexibility for recently arrived English learners to provide three (3) years before fully incorporating the achievement results of recently arrived English learners in accountability determinations. In year one, recently arrived English learners will participate in the statewide annual assessment, but results will be excluded from accountability calculations and determinations. In year two, recently arrived English learners will participate in the statewide annual assessment, and growth scores only will be included in accountability calculations and determinations. In year three and beyond, recently arrived English learners will participate in the statewide annual assessment, and achievement and growth scores will be included in accountability calculations and determinations.

D. Minimum Number of Students. Describe the minimum number of students that the State determines are necessary to be included in each of the subgroups of students consistent with §200.17(a)(3).

Under the ESEA waiver, Indiana established multiple minimum numbers dependent on the accountability indicator. Specifically, a minimum number of 30 was established for proficiency determinations; a minimum number of 10 was established for graduation rate and college- and career-readiness determinations; and a minimum number of 40 was established for growth determinations. The minimum number of students for accountability determinations was a topic of discussion for the stakeholder workgroup. Emerging from this discussion were two primary schools of thought: all students should be included in accountability, and no students should be masked; and a lower n-size may have too large an impact on a school’s performance by skewing the perception of that performance. There was certainly some difficulty in finding a balance between promoting accountability for all students and ensuring validity and reliability of accountability determinations. The final determination on the minimum number of students necessary to be included for accountability determinations will be made by the State Board.

Describe the following information with respect to the State’s selected minimum number of students:

i. How the State's minimum number of students meets the requirements in §200.17(a)(1);
ii. How other components of the statewide accountability system, such as the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), interact with the minimum number of students to affect the statistical reliability and soundness of accountability data and to ensure the maximum inclusion of all students and each student subgroup under §200.16(a)(2);

Indiana’s accountability system does not currently have procedures for averaging data.

iii. A description of the strategies the State uses to protect the privacy of individual students for each purpose for which disaggregated data is required, including reporting under section 1111(h) of the ESEA and the statewide accountability system under section 1111(c) of the ESEA;


E. **Meaningful Differentiation.** Describe the State’s system for meaningfully differentiating all public schools in the State, including public charter schools, consistent with the requirements of section 1111(c)(4)(C) of the ESEA and §§ 200.12 and 200.18.

Indiana utilizes an A-F grading system that is based on a 0.0 – 100.0 point scale. The summative score, as reflected by the letter grade assigned to the school after indicators are appropriately weighted to reflect the available indicators for the school. Summative ratings and associated data will be calculated for all students and each subgroup, and shared with the public in a data dashboard format on the Department’s website.

In 2016, Indiana saw the following distribution of overall A-F letter grades for public schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016 Overall A-F Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In reviewing the results from the 2015-16 school year, some concerns arose regarding whether the indicators within the accountability system “meaningfully differentiated” schools. The final determination on the definition of “meaningful differentiation” and any associated changes to ensure that these indicators provide for meaningful differentiation will be made by the State Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Achievement</th>
<th>Academic Progress</th>
<th>Graduation Rate</th>
<th>School Quality Student Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe:

i. The distinct levels of school performance, and how they are calculated, under §200.18(b)(3) on each indicator in the statewide accountability system;

Each A-F letter grade is based on the points accumulated from each indicator within the accountability system that is applicable and available for the school. The 0.0 – 100.0 point scale applied to each indicator score is also applied to the overall A-F letter grade. As mentioned above, each indicator receives its own score, and then these indicators scores are weighted accordingly to yield the final summative rating. This summative rating indicates the distinct level of performance for each school.
ii. The weighting of each indicator, including how certain indicators receive substantial weight individually and much greater weight in the aggregate, consistent with §200.18(c) and (d).

The weightings of each indicator are dependent upon which indicators are available for each respective school. An indicator may not be available for a school due to small student population or lack of applicable grades. In order to accommodate for the fact that some schools will not have all domains available, Indiana’s accountability system recalibrates by distributing the weight of any missing indicator to the remaining indicators in a proportionate manner. Weights of indicators differ based on grade span to emphasize priorities and state education policies at different levels of the education.

In Indiana’s accountability system, the academic indicators receive substantial weight individually, and in aggregate much greater weight than the School Quality or Student Success Indicators. Since the school quality/student success indicator is a new component of the statewide accountability system in Indiana, and does not yet fully reflect the vision for the indicator, the indicator has been initially assigned a small weight of the overall accountability system. As the School Quality/Student Success Indicator for grades 3-8 becomes a more stable metric, and Indiana expands this indicator to include a culture and climate assessment, the weight of the school quality/student success indicator will increase in the overall accountability system.

Below are summary tables that identify the weights of each indicator dependent upon which indicators are available:

| Grades 3-8 |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Academic Achievement Weight** | **Academic Progress Weight** | **School Quality/Student Success Weight** | **English Language Proficiency Weight** |
| AA | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| AA, AP & SQSS | 45 | 50 | 5 | 0 |
| AA, AP, SQSS & ELP | 40 | 45 | 5 | 10 |

AA = Academic Achievement Indicator
AP = Academic Progress Indicator
SQSS = School Quality or Student Success Indicator
ELP = English Language Proficiency indicator
Grades 9-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA &amp; AP</th>
<th>GR &amp; CCR</th>
<th>AA, AP, GR &amp; SQSS</th>
<th>AA, AP, GR, SQSS, ELP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Achievement Weight**

**Academic Progress Weight**

**Graduation Rate Weight**

**School Quality/Student Success Weight**

**English Language Proficiency Weight**

iii. The summative ratings, and how they are calculated, that are provided to schools under §200.18(b)(4).

E. annual meaningful differentiation and will improve the school's participation rate so that the school meets the applicable requirements.

The participation rate is incorporated into the statewide accountability system under the Academic Achievement Indicator. The participation rate serves as a multiplier under the Academic Achievement Indicator. If a school satisfies the requirement to assess at least 95 percent of the students enrolled at the school during the test windows, then the multiplier defaults to one. If a school fails to satisfy the 95 percent participation requirement, then the proficiency rate for the respective subject area is multiplied by the actual participation rate. This practice lowers the overall Academic Achievement Indicator score within the accountability system for any school that does not assess at least 95 percent of its students.

**D. Data Averaging.** Describe the State’s uniform procedure for averaging data across school years and combining data across grades as defined in §200.20(a), if applicable.

Indiana’s accountability system generates scores for schools based on two distinct grade spans: grades 3-8 and grades 9-12. Grade levels within each span are combined in order to generate the overall scores for each indicator of the accountability system.

In an attempt to generate accountability determinations for all public schools in Indiana, the accountability system established an aggregation practice to yield more schools meeting the minimum number of 30 students for accountability calculations. If a school does not have at least 30 students in all applicable grade levels then the accountability system incorporates the results of students from any previous school years until the minimum number of 30 has been met.
Only students enrolled at the school for at least 162 days, or 90 percent of the school year, will be included in accountability and long-term goal determinations. All students attending during prescribed data submission dates will be included for annual reporting.

**E. Including All Public Schools in a State’s Accountability System.** If the States uses a different methodology than the one described in D above, describe how the State includes all public schools in the State in its accountability system including:

i. Schools in which no grade level is assessed under the State's academic assessment system (e.g., P-2 schools), although the State is not required to administer a formal assessment to meet this requirement;

Schools serving kindergarten, grade one and grade two are referred to as “feeder schools” for accountability purposes. Feeder schools receive an A-F summative letter grade based on the indicator scores of the school or schools that receive the students after the students matriculate from grade two. If more than five (5) schools receive students from the feeder school, then the scores of the five schools that receive the highest census of students from the feeder school are averaged to determine the feeder school’s overall A-F letter grade. These schools will, however, receive their own indicator scores for the School Quality/Student Success Indicator and the English Language Proficiency Indicator.

ii. Schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., P-12 schools);

Indiana’s accountability system calculates summative annual grades based on two grade spans: grades 3-8 and grades 9-12. The accountability system acknowledges that there are schools that serve grades from both grade spans, and accommodates these variant configurations by calculating the indicator scores and overall summative A-F letter grade with an enrollment weight consideration. Each grade span receives a score accordingly, and then the score for that grade span is weighted based on the school’s overall enrollment within each grade span. For example, if a school served grades 7-12 and 75 percent of the student population fell into the 9-12 grade span, then the 9-12 score would make up 75 percent of an indicator score and the 7-8 score would make up 25 percent of an indicator score.

iii. Small schools in which the total number of students that can be included on any indicator under §200.14 is less than the minimum number of students established by the State under §200.17(a)(1), consistent with a State’s uniform procedures for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable;

Indiana’s accountability system aggregated prior years of data in order for schools to attain the minimum number of students required to calculate each indicator in the accountability system. If a school cannot attain the minimum number of students required to calculate an indicator, then
the weights of the available indicators are adjusted to accommodate the missing indicator. If no indicators may be calculated for a school, then no A-F grade is assigned to the school.

iv. Schools that are designed to serve special populations (e.g., students receiving alternative programming in alternative educational settings, students living in local institutions for neglected or delinquent children, students enrolled in State public schools for the blind, recently arrived English learners); and

Indiana has a separate accountability system for adult high schools that predominantly serve a population that belong to a graduation cohort that has already graduated; or are over the age of eighteen (18) at the time the student was enrolled at the school.

The annual summative A-F letter grade for an adult high school is based on a graduation score and a college- and career-readiness score. The graduation score is comprised of a graduation to enrollment percentage metric (number of students graduation during the school year / within-year average number of students enrolled), and a graduation rate metric similar to the graduation rate indicator used in the general statewide accountability system. The college- and career-readiness score is similar to the school quality/student success indicator used in the general statewide accountability system; however, the goal for adult high schools is for at least 80 percent of its graduates to achieve a college- and career-ready indicator.

Indiana’s School for the Blind and School for the Deaf are state-run institutions and as such do not generate a school letter grade. The students attending the School for the Blind or the School for the Deaf are included in the accountability roster of the school of legal settlement or the school that sent the student to the institution to ensure that these students are included in the accountability system.

v. Newly opened schools that do not have multiple years of data, consistent with a State’s uniform procedure for averaging data under §200.20(a), if applicable.

Schools that are open for three years or less have the option to incorporate all available domains when determining the annual summative A-F letter grade for the school, or utilizing only the growth domain score.
4.2 Identification of Schools.

A. Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

i. The methodologies, including the timeline, by which the State identifies schools for comprehensive support and improvement under section 1111(c)(4)(D)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(a) and (d), including: 1) lowest-performing schools; 2) schools with low high school graduation rates; and 3) schools with chronically low-performing subgroups.

Lowest-Performing Schools
A school will be identified for comprehensive support based on whether the Title I school receives an “F” letter grade or falls within the lowest-performing 5% of all Title I schools. Indiana will annually rank all Title I schools based on average total points earned on the accountability system over the past three years. Any Title I school identified as performing in the bottom 5% of all Title I schools after considering three years of data will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement. Further, Indiana will identify schools for comprehensive support under this criteria annually, beginning with the 2018-19 school year. Identification for comprehensive support under this criteria will occur during the fall. A school will have the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year. Indiana will also publish an annual list of “at-risk” schools to provide notice of the need to drive urgency for improvement. The “at-risk” schools will be those in the bottom 6 – 10% of all Title I schools.

Schools with Low High School Graduation Rates
Schools will be identified for comprehensive support and improvement based on whether the average four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate over the past three years is below 67%. Any public school that serves grade 12, has an average four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate below 67% and has not already been identified for comprehensive support due to performing in the bottom 5% of schools will be identified for comprehensive support. Schools will be identified for comprehensive support under this criteria annually, beginning with the 2018-19 school year. Identification for comprehensive support under this criteria will occur during the fall. A school will have the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year. Indiana will also publish an annual list of “at-risk” schools to provide notice of the need to drive urgency for improvement. The “at-risk” schools will be those public high schools with a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate of 70% or lower.

Schools with Chronically Underperforming Subgroup/s
Indiana will identify a school for comprehensive support and improvement based on whether it has one or more subgroups with an overall accountability score at or below the lowest performing 5% threshold, and has not met exit criteria from additional targeted support. Any public school that has not already been identified for comprehensive support under another criteria and does not meet exit criteria from additional targeted support will be identified for comprehensive support under this criteria. Schools will be identified for comprehensive support under this criteria annually, beginning with the 2020-21 school year. Identification for comprehensive support under this criteria will occur during the fall, and will be based on whether the school met exit criteria from additional targeted support within the established timeline. A school will have the duration of the school year in which the school is identified as a planning year.
ii. The uniform statewide exit criteria for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement established by the State, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, under section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(1).

In order to exit comprehensive support and improvement status, a school must satisfy all of the following criteria:

- The school must no longer meet the eligibility criteria for comprehensive support as demonstrated by attainment of a “C” letter grade or higher on the statewide accountability system for two (2) consecutive school years.
- The school must demonstrate a strong plan for sustainability of the progress it has made. This plan must outline the school’s theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and progress monitoring plan. Further, the plan must consider any adjustments in funding, resources and other supports that may occur after exiting comprehensive support and improvement status.

B. Targeted Support and Improvement Schools. Describe:

i. The State’s methodology for identifying any school with a “consistently underperforming” subgroup of students, including the definition and time period used by the State to determine consistent underperformance, under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(1) and (c).

Indiana will identify a school for targeted support and improvement based on whether it has one or more subgroups with an overall accountability score at or below the lowest performing 5% threshold for at least two consecutive school years.

ii. The State’s methodology, including the timeline, for identifying schools with low-performing subgroups of students under 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)(2) and (d) that must receive additional targeted support in accordance with section 1111(d)(2)(C) of the ESEA.

Indiana will identify a school for targeted support and improvement based on whether it has one or more subgroups with an overall accountability score at or below the lowest performing 5% threshold.

iii. The uniform exit criteria, established by the SEA, for schools participating under Title I, Part A with low-performing subgroups of students, including the number of years over which schools are expected to meet such criteria, consistent with the requirements in 34 C.F.R. § 200.22(f).

In order to exit additional targeted support and improvement status, a school must satisfy all of the following criteria:

- The school must no longer meet the eligibility criteria for additional targeted support five years after initial identification, as demonstrated by the subgroup attaining a “C” letter grade or higher on the statewide accountability system for two (2) consecutive school years.
- The school must demonstrate a growth trajectory for the subgroup/s that initially identified the school for additional targeted support, and provide an explanation of how the school will maintain this growth trajectory.
● The school must demonstrate a strong plan for sustainability of the progress it has made. This plan must outline the school’s theory of action, measurable goals, aligned strategies, and progress monitoring plan. Further, the plan must consider any adjustments in funding, resources and other supports that may occur after exiting comprehensive support and improvement status.

4.3 State Support and Improvement for Low-performing Schools.
A. School Improvement Resources. Describe how the SEA will meet its responsibilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.24(d) under section 1003 of the ESEA, including the process to award school improvement funds to LEAs and monitoring and evaluating the use of funds by LEAs.

Title I School Improvement Grants for Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools
The IDOE will award planning grants to all Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools in their first year of identification. Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools will thus receive at least one year of Title I school improvement funding (1003a), allocated to ensure they and their district achieve three objectives.

1. Conduct a comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement;
2. Develop a school improvement plan that is driven by the qualitative and quantitative findings from a comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement; and
3. Ensure the required conditions (e.g., leadership at all levels, academic strategy, student supports) are in place to enable successful implementation of the entire school improvement plan during the following school year.

To support local efforts to develop and prepare for full implementation of comprehensive school improvement plans, the IDOE will provide the following supports prior to this planning grant phase with Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts.

1. Develop a model comprehensive needs assessment, aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement;
2. Provide a recommended protocol for planning and conducting the comprehensive needs assessment, including strategies for meaningful stakeholder engagement; and
3. Define an optional menu of supports for districts and schools to support their planning and/or implementation of one or more sections of this recommended protocol.

If Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts fulfill the three aforementioned objectives for the Title I school improvement planning grant during the school year for which they are awarded these funds, they will be able then apply for one or two years of a Title I school improvement implementation grant.

Under this rubric-based, competitive process, districts will be expected to purposefully differentiate their Title I school improvement implementation grant applications on behalf of their Comprehensive Improvement and
Support Schools based on each school’s comprehensive needs assessment, school improvement plan and conditions for success. The implementation grant application and its corresponding scoring rubric will be anchored in the same evidence-based framework for school improvement around which the comprehensive needs assessment and school improvement planning template are organized. Applications will only be awarded funding if the proposed evidence-based interventions meet the requirements of being in one of the top three tiers of evidence as required under ESSA. Once these Title I school improvement implementation grants are awarded, the IDOE will integrate its monitoring of these recipients into its ongoing cycle of supports for the Comprehensive Improvement Support Schools and their districts, with an additional emphasis on periodic resource allocation review to ensure Title I school improvement funds and other resources are promoting equity and excellence for all students.

If a district’s Title I school improvement implementation grant application for a Comprehensive Improvement and Support School is not approved, the IDOE will continue to provide supports to that school and its district as outlined in the next section on supports for Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts. What’s more, the IDOE will consider awarding a Title I school improvement planning grant for a second year to a Comprehensive Improvement and Support School that applied for, but was not initially awarded an implementation grant, based on the quality and potential their application.

**Multiple-School Title I School Improvement Grants**

The IDOE will also create a multiple-school Title I school improvement grant specifically for districts with four or more Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools. These funds will be leveraged to help districts design and implement sustainable, large-scale school improvement initiatives (e.g., Transformation Zones, Innovation Networks) that meet student needs and improve student outcomes in multiple Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools. Districts will not be required to include each of their Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools in their application, but will need to explain how they plan to support these schools separately, drawing on evidence from each school’s comprehensive needs assessment. To encourage locally-driven school improvement innovations, the IDOE will otherwise limit its guidelines and guardrails for this grant to the regulations for the use of Title I, Part A funds as well as the evidentiary requirements for evidence-based interventions under ESSA.

To improve the likelihood that a district’s multiple-school strategy for school improvement will have a demonstrable, sustainable impact on student outcomes, the IDOE will adopt the same differentiated planning and implementation grant phases as outlined above for the school-specific Title I school improvement grants. Unlike the school-specific Title I school improvement planning grant, this multiple-school school improvement strategy planning grant will be awarded in a rubric-based, competitive manner. The IDOE will require districts to apply for a one-year planning grant, with three specific objectives.

1. Fully operationalize the multiple-school strategy, including but not limited to long-term goals, short-term benchmarks, budgets that demonstrate the district’s capacity to sustain the strategy long-term;
2. Meaningfully engage stakeholders in the process of developing and refining the strategy across the planning period; and
3. Ensure the necessary conditions are in place to enable successful implementation of at least the first phase of the multiple-school improvement strategy during the following school year.

Districts could also petition the IDOE for the right to apply directly for a multi-year, multiple-school implementation grant by citing evidence that they have already fulfilled the requirements of the multiple-school planning grant with fidelity.

To help facilitate the development of evidence-based, multiple-school strategies for school improvement, the IDOE will provide the following forms of technical assistance prior to this planning grant phase with districts that have more than four Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools.

1. Connect local leaders with individuals and organizations that have a demonstrated track record of success in large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives;
2. Facilitate on-site, shared learning opportunities for local leaders to see large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives in action; and
3. Provide an evidence-based framework for large-scale, district-driven school improvement initiatives.

If districts fulfill the three aforementioned objectives for the multiple-school Title I school improvement planning grant during the school year for which they are awarded these funds, they then can apply for one or two years of a multiple-school Title I school improvement implementation grant. This rubric-based, competitive grant process will operate similarly to the single-school implementation grant application described above in terms its use of a scoring rubric that is aligned to an evidence-based framework for school improvement, in this instance focused on a district’s readiness to implement a large-scale school improvement initiative. Similarly, applications will only be awarded funding if the proposed evidence-based interventions meet the requirements of being in one of the top three tiers of evidence as required under ESSA and the proposed uses of funding abide by the regulations for Title I, Part A funds.

When a multiple-school Title I school improvement implementation grant is awarded, the IDOE will integrate its monitoring of the Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools impacted by this district-driven school improvement initiative into its ongoing cycle of supports for Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts, focused in particular on the extent to which resources, including but not limited to Title I school improvement funds are being leveraged to promote equity and excellence for all students.

If a district’s Title I school improvement implementation grant application for a cohort of Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools is not approved, the IDOE will continue to provide supports to those schools and the district as outlined in the next section on supports for Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools and their districts. Recognizing the complexities associated with developing plans and setting the necessary conditions for large-scale, district-led school improvement strategies, the IDOE will consider awarding a Title I school improvement planning grant for a second year to a district and the multiple Comprehensive Improvement and Support Schools it applied on behalf of, based on the potential of their application and their emerging capacity to fulfill its vision.
B. Technical Assistance Regarding Evidence-Based Interventions. Describe the technical assistance the SEA will provide to each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement, including how it will provide technical assistance to LEAs to ensure the effective implementation of evidence-based interventions, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(b), and, if applicable, the list of State-approved, evidence-based interventions for use in schools implementing comprehensive or targeted support and improvement plans consistent with § 200.23(c)(2)-(3).

The IDOE’s model for supporting locally-driven school improvement initiatives will be guided by the theory of action described on the next page:
If the IDOE provides a research-based model for developing, evaluating and refining school improvement plans (SIP)
- By creating a SIP template that is organized around research-based school improvement principles;
- By sharing SIP exemplars for the field (i.e., districts and schools) that represent numerous school types and contexts;
- By offering a clear set of optional SIP supports for the field that encompass their development, evaluation and refinement; and
- By targeting required supports in districts based on the percentage of their schools identified as CSI or TSI and the number of years that they have been in either form of improvement status.

And the IDOE promotes evidence-based interventions for school improvement plans
- By developing an Indiana-specific version of the What Works Clearinghouse that illustrates how and where evidence-based interventions for school improvement have been successful in Indiana;
- By modifying the list of potential evidence-based interventions for schools as they remain in CSI or TSI status in a research-backed manner; and
- By providing specialized technical assistance to districts that want to undertake a systemic, multiple-school intervention strategy.

And the IDOE distributes models for using data to review and improve school improvement plans
- By creating a model process for the field to use to continuously review its SIPs in a data-backed manner;
- By sharing exemplars that illustrate what this model process looks like in practice in various contexts;
- By targeting required supports in districts based on the percentage of their schools identified as CSI or TSI and the number of years that they have been in either form of improvement status.

And the IDOE organizes targeted professional learning opportunities
- By identifying the shared problems of practice that the field is facing, with an emphasis on the challenges faced in specific regions;
- By accessing local and/or national expertise on these shared problems of practice;
- By facilitating focused, ongoing professional learning opportunities for intentionally selected groups of leaders at all levels; and
- By sharing the process used and resources developed through these professional learning opportunities with the broader field.

And the IDOE helps facilitate partnerships with Technical Assistance Providers (TAPs)
- By creating model processes to inform the field's identification of TAPs to partner with as well as an evaluation of their impact;
- By intentionally introducing districts to TAPs with a demonstrated track record of impact in a priority area for improvement in one or more of their CSI or TSI schools; and
- By facilitating partnerships with TAPs that can provide specialized technical assistance to districts that want to undertake a systemic, multiple-school intervention strategy.

Then all Hoosier students will be college and career ready, allowing them to successfully embark on their chosen path in life.
The IDOE will use an intentionally sequenced set of expectations for Targeted Support and Improvement Schools (TSI) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) and differentiate its levels of support for schools and districts to fulfill these expectations in service of supporting locally-driven school improvement efforts and improving student outcomes.

**Plan and Conduct a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)**

The components for planning and conducting a Comprehensive Needs Assessment presented below are adapted from “Using Needs Assessments for School and District Improvement, A Tactical Guide,” authored by Julie Corbett and Sam Redding and published by the Center on School Turnaround and the Council of Chief State School Officers in 2017.

**Figure 2: Elements of a Comprehensive Needs Assessment**

- **Establish a Baseline**
  - Pre-populate the Comprehensive Needs Assessment template with readily available data

- **Collect Feedback**
  - Gather survey data from various stakeholders

- **Analyze Offsite Data**
  - Review data and compile headlines into an easily digestible format

- **Conduct an Onsite Review**
  - With a review team that includes representatives from various stakeholder groups

- **Analyze Onsite Data**
  - With at a minimum the same members of the review team, analyze data collected onsite to determine findings

**Supports from the IDOE for All TSI and CSI Schools and their Districts**

- Defined guidelines and guardrails for a Comprehensive Needs Assessment;
- Model template for and exemplars of CNAs for various school types and contexts;
- Expectations and recommended strategies for stakeholder engagement in CNAs;
- Webinars to build local capacity to effectively conduct CNAs; and
- Title I School Improvement Grants to support effective CNAs.

**Expectations for TSI Schools and their Districts**

- On an annual basis, plan and conduct a CNA in line with the guidelines and guardrails defined by the IDOE, focused on the needs of students in specific subgroups.
• Share the findings of the CNA, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged, with the IDOE.

**Expectations for CSI Schools and their Districts**

• On an annual basis, plan and conduct a CNA in line with the guidelines and guardrails AND using the template developed by the IDOE.
• Share the findings of the CNA, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged, with the IDOE.

**Differentiation by School Performance Trajectory**

• TSI schools and their districts can request targeted on-site or virtual technical assistance from the IDOE;
• Districts with one or more schools in year one of CSI status will receive targeted virtual technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Planning Grant for year one CSI schools;
• Districts with one or more schools in year two of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the design of and planning for the CNA; and
• Districts with one or more schools in year three or greater of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the design of planning for and implementation of the CNA.

**Develop, Implement and Refine a School Improvement Plan**

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment will provide CSI and TSI schools, their districts and the IDOE with a strong evidence base from which to develop new and refine existing School Improvement Plans.
Figure 3: Phases of the School Improvement Planning Process

Supports from the IDOE for All TSI and CSI Schools and their Districts
- Defined guidelines and guardrails for a School Improvement Plan (SIP);
- Model template for and exemplars of SIPs for various school types and contexts;
- Expectations and recommended strategies for engaging stakeholders in SIPs;
- Clearinghouse of actionable research on evidence-based interventions to include in SIPs;
- Webinars to build local capacity to effectively develop and progress monitor SIPs; and
- Title I School Improvement Grants to support the implementation of SIPs.

Expectations for TSI Schools and their Districts
- On an annual basis, develop, implement and progress monitor a SIP in line with the guidelines and guardrails and using the template defined by the IDOE, focused on the needs of students in specific subgroups.
- Share the SIP, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged, with the IDOE.
**Expectations for CSI Schools and their Districts**

- On an annual basis, develop, implement and progress monitor a SIP in line with the guidelines and guardrails and using the template developed by the IDOE.
- Share the SIP, highlighting the process that was used and how stakeholders were engaged, with the IDOE.

**Differentiation by School Performance Trajectory**

- TSI schools and their districts can request targeted on-site or virtual technical assistance from the IDOE;
- Districts with one or more schools in year one of CSI status will receive targeted virtual technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Planning Grant for year one CSI schools;
- Districts with one or more schools in year two of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the development of SIPs;
- Certain districts with one or more schools in years two and three of CSI status will receive targeted virtual and on-site technical assistance from the IDOE as a part of the Title I School Improvement Implementation Grant for year two and three CSI schools; and
- Districts with one or more schools in year three or greater of CSI status will receive targeted on-site technical assistance from the IDOE to support the development and implementation of SIPs.
C. More Rigorous Interventions. Describe the more rigorous interventions required for schools identified for comprehensive support and improvement that fail to meet the State’s exit criteria within a State-determined number of years consistent with section 1111(d)(3)(A)(i) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(f)(3)(iii).

If a school does not exit Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status within four school years, Indiana has a statutorily defined set of expectations for this school and its district. Under House Enrolled Act 1638, the Indiana State Board of Education has the authority to assign one or more interventions to persistently low-performing schools. If a school receives the lowest designation in Indiana’s school accountability model, which correlates to Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status, for four consecutive years, the Indiana State of Education (SBOE) holds at least one public hearing in its school corporation to consider and hear testimony concerning the following options for school improvement:

- Merging the school with a nearby school that is in a higher school performance category under Indiana’s school accountability model;
- Assigning a special management team to operate all or part of the school;
- Approving the school corporation’s plan to improve the school through creation of a transformation zone;
- Approving the school corporation’s plan to improve the school through creation of an innovation network school;
- The Indiana Department of Education’s recommendations for improving the school;
- Other options for school improvement expressed at the public hearing; and
- Closing the school.

The SBOE has the authority to determine which intervention(s) will improve the school and require the school and its district to implement the intervention(s). The SBOE also has the flexibility to delay any required interventions for one year if it determines that the majority of students in the school demonstrated academic improvement during the previous school year. In sum, if a school does not exit Comprehensive Support and Improvement School status within four years, the Indiana State Board of Education will engage with community stakeholders to determine the most impactful and appropriate intervention(s) for that school, thus fulfilling the ESSA requirement of assigning more rigorous interventions to persistently low-performing schools.
D. **Periodic Resource Review.** Describe how the SEA will periodically review, identify, and, to the extent practicable, address any identified inequities in resources to ensure sufficient support for school improvement in each LEA in the State serving a significant number or percentage of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support and improvement consistent with the requirements in section 1111(d)(3)(A)(ii) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.23(a).

In accordance with the requirements of ESSA, the IDOE will periodically review resource allocation to ensure school improvement efforts in LEAs with a significant number of CSI or TSI schools are leveraging resources to promote equity and excellence for all students.

For each LEA with one or more schools identified as CSI or TSI, the IDOE will review how state, federal and other resources are allocated to examine:
- Per pupil spending, disaggregated by specific federal and state funding sources;
- Access to and investment in high-quality pre-kindergarten;
- Distribution of staff, disaggregated by evaluation ratings, years of experience and certification(s); and
- Access to advanced coursework.

The IDOE is in the process of determining the frequency with which it can faithfully conduct these reviews as well as how best to integrate these reviews into other SEA-driven analyses of LEA’s data to reduce the burden on LEA through a streamlined approach.