

---

# ESEA Flexibility Request

---



Revised September 28, 2011

This document replaces the previous version, issued September 23, 2011.  
(The document was formatted to ease usability on October 14, 2011)

U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, DC 20202

OMB Number: 1810-0708  
Expiration Date: March 31, 2012

## Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0708. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 336 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS: ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

---

Introduction	iii
General Instructions	iv
Table of Contents	1
Cover Sheet for ESEA Flexibility Request	3
Waivers	4
Assurances	6
Consultation	8
Evaluation	8
Overview of SEA’s ESEA Flexibility Request	8
Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students	9
Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support	11
Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership	17
Sample Plan Template	19

## INTRODUCTION

---

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) is offering each State educational agency (SEA) the opportunity to request flexibility on behalf of itself, its local educational agencies (LEAs), and its schools, in order to better focus on improving student learning and increasing the quality of instruction. This voluntary opportunity will provide educators and State and local leaders with flexibility regarding specific requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) in exchange for rigorous and comprehensive State-developed plans designed to improve educational outcomes for all students, close achievement gaps, increase equity, and improve the quality of instruction. This flexibility is intended to build on and support the significant State and local reform efforts already underway in critical areas such as transitioning to college- and career-ready standards and assessments; developing systems of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support; and evaluating and supporting teacher and principal effectiveness.

The Department invites interested SEAs to request this flexibility pursuant to the authority in section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), which allows the Secretary to waive, with certain exceptions, any statutory or regulatory requirement of the ESEA for an SEA that receives funds under a program authorized by the ESEA and requests a waiver. Under this flexibility, the Department would grant waivers through the 2013–2014 school year, after which time an SEA may request an extension of this flexibility.

## REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF REQUESTS

The Department will use a review process that will include both external peer reviewers and staff reviewers to evaluate SEA requests for this flexibility. This review process will help ensure that each request for this flexibility approved by the Department is consistent with the principles described in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*, which are designed to support State efforts to improve student academic achievement and increase the quality of instruction, and is both educationally and technically sound. Reviewers will evaluate whether and how each request for this flexibility will support a comprehensive and coherent set of improvements in the areas of standards and assessments, accountability, and teacher and principal effectiveness that will lead to improved student outcomes. Each SEA will have an opportunity, if necessary, to clarify its plans for peer and staff reviewers and to answer any questions reviewers may have. The peer reviewers will then provide comments to the Department. Taking those comments into consideration, the Secretary will make a decision regarding each SEA's request for this flexibility. If an SEA's request for this flexibility is not granted, reviewers and the Department will provide feedback to the SEA about the components of the SEA's request that need additional development in order for the request to be approved.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

---

An SEA seeking approval to implement this flexibility must submit a high-quality request that addresses all aspects of the principles and waivers and, in each place where a plan is required, includes a high-quality plan. Consistent with ESEA section 9401(d)(1), the Secretary intends to grant waivers that are included in this flexibility through the end of the 2013–2014 school year. An SEA will be permitted to request an extension of the initial period of this flexibility prior to the start of the 2014–2015 school year unless this flexibility is superseded by reauthorization of the ESEA. The Department is asking SEAs to submit requests that include plans through the 2014–2015 school year in order to provide a complete picture of the SEA’s reform efforts. The Department will not accept a request that meets only some of the principles of this flexibility.

**High-Quality Request:** A high-quality request for this flexibility is one that is comprehensive and coherent in its approach, and that clearly indicates how this flexibility will help an SEA and its LEAs improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students.

A high-quality request will (1) if an SEA has already met a principle, provide a description of how it has done so, including evidence as required; and (2) if an SEA has not yet met a principle, describe how it will meet the principle on the required timelines, including any progress to date. For example, an SEA that has not adopted minimum guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with principle 3 by the time it submits its request for the flexibility will need to provide a plan demonstrating that it will do so by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. In each such case, an SEA’s plan must include, at a minimum, the following elements for each principle that the SEA has not yet met:

1. **Key milestones and activities:** Significant milestones to be achieved in order to meet a given principle, and essential activities to be accomplished in order to reach the key milestones. The SEA should also include any essential activities that have already been completed or key milestones that have already been reached so that reviewers can understand the context for and fully evaluate the SEA’s plan to meet a given principle.
2. **Detailed timeline:** A specific schedule setting forth the dates on which key activities will begin and be completed and milestones will be achieved so that the SEA can meet the principle by the required date.
3. **Party or parties responsible:** Identification of the SEA staff (*e.g.*, position, title, or office) and, as appropriate, others who will be responsible for ensuring that each key activity is accomplished.
4. **Evidence:** Where required, documentation to support the plan and demonstrate the SEA’s progress in implementing the plan. This *ESEA Flexibility Request* indicates the specific evidence that the SEA must either include in its request or provide at a future reporting date.
5. **Resources:** Resources necessary to complete the key activities, including staff time and additional funding.
6. **Significant obstacles:** Any major obstacles that may hinder completion of key milestones and activities (*e.g.*, State laws that need to be changed) and a plan to overcome them.

Included on page 19 of this document is an example of a format for a table that an SEA may use to submit a plan that is required for any principle of this flexibility that the SEA has not already met. An SEA that elects to use this format may also supplement the table with text that provides an overview of the plan.

An SEA should keep in mind the required timelines for meeting each principle and develop credible plans that allow for completion of the activities necessary to meet each principle. Although the plan for each principle will reflect that particular principle, as discussed above, an SEA should look across all plans to make sure that it puts forward a comprehensive and coherent request for this flexibility.

Preparing the Request: To prepare a high-quality request, it is extremely important that an SEA refer to all of the provided resources, including the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*, which includes the principles, definitions, and timelines; the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, which includes the criteria that will be used by the peer reviewers to determine if the request meets the principles of this flexibility; and the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions*, which provides additional guidance for SEAs in preparing their requests.

As used in this request form, the following terms have the definitions set forth in the document titled *ESEA Flexibility*: (1) college- and career-ready standards, (2) focus school, (3) high-quality assessment, (4) priority school, (5) reward school, (6) standards that are common to a significant number of States, (7) State network of institutions of higher education, (8) student growth, and (9) turnaround principles.

Each request must include:

- A table of contents and a list of attachments, using the forms on pages 1 and 2.
- The cover sheet (p. 3), waivers requested (p. 4-5), and assurances (p. 5-6).
- A description of how the SEA has met the consultation requirements (p. 8).
- An overview of the SEA's request for the ESEA flexibility (p. 8). This overview is a synopsis of the SEA's vision of a comprehensive and coherent system to improve student achievement and the quality of instruction and will orient the peer reviewers to the SEA's request. The overview should be about 500 words.
- Evidence and plans to meet the principles (p. 9-18). An SEA will enter narrative text in the text boxes provided, complete the required tables, and provide other required evidence. An SEA may supplement the narrative text in a text box with attachments, which will be included in an appendix. Any supplemental attachments that are included in an appendix must be referenced in the related narrative text.

Requests should not include personally identifiable information.

Process for Submitting the Request: An SEA must submit a request to the Department to receive the flexibility. This request form and other pertinent documents are available on the Department's Web site at: <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility>.

Electronic Submission: The Department strongly prefers to receive an SEA's request for the flexibility electronically. The SEA should submit it to the following address: [ESEAFlexibility@ed.gov](mailto:ESEAFlexibility@ed.gov).

*Paper Submission:* In the alternative, an SEA may submit the original and two copies of its request for the flexibility to the following address:

Patricia McKee, Acting Director  
Student Achievement and School Accountability Programs  
U.S. Department of Education  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3W320  
Washington, DC 20202-6132

Due to potential delays in processing mail sent through the U.S. Postal Service, SEAs are encouraged to use alternate carriers for paper submissions.

### **REQUEST SUBMISSION DEADLINE**

SEAs will be provided multiple opportunities to submit requests for the flexibility. The submission dates are November 14, 2011, a date to be announced in mid-February 2012, and an additional opportunity following the conclusion of the 2011–2012 school year.

### **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE MEETING FOR SEAS**

To assist SEAs in preparing a request and to respond to questions, the Department will host a series of Technical Assistance Meetings via webinars in September and October 2011.

### **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

If you have any questions, please contact the Department by e-mail at [ESEAflexibility@ed.gov](mailto:ESEAflexibility@ed.gov).

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Insert page numbers prior to submitting the request, and place the table of contents in front of the SEA’s flexibility request.

CONTENTS		PAGE
Cover Sheet for ESEA Flexibility Request		4
Waivers		5
Assurances		7
Consultation		9
Evaluation		36
Overview of SEA’s ESEA Flexibility Request		36
<b>Principle 1: College- and Career-Ready Expectations for All Students</b>		<b>37</b>
1.A	Adopt college- and career-ready standards	37
1.B	Transition to college- and career-ready standards	38
1.C	Develop and administer annual, statewide, aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth	119
<b>Principle 2: State-Developed Differentiated Recognition, Accountability, and Support</b>		<b>166</b>
2.A	Develop and implement a State-based system of differentiated recognition, accountability, and support	166
2.B	Set ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives	176
2.C	Reward schools	200
2.D	Priority schools	203
2.E	Focus schools	229
2.F	Provide incentives and supports for other Title I schools	246
2.G	Build SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning	255
<b>Principle 3: Supporting Effective Instruction and Leadership</b>		<b>259</b>
3.A	Develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	259
3.B	Ensure LEAs implement teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	269

**TABLE OF CONTENTS, CONTINUED**

For each attachment included in the *ESEA Flexibility Request*, label the attachment with the corresponding number from the list of attachments below and indicate the page number where the attachment is located. If an attachment is not applicable to the SEA’s request, indicate “N/A” instead of a page number. Reference relevant attachments in the narrative portions of the request.

<b>LABEL</b>	<b>LIST OF ATTACHMENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Con 20,21	Notice to LEAs	18
Con 20, 21	Comments on request received from LEAs (if applicable)	18
Con 20, 21	Notice and information provided to the public regarding the request	18
1A Attach 1,2,3,4	Evidence that the State has formally adopted college- and career-ready content standards consistent with the State’s standards adoption process	38
1A Attach 4	Memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs) certifying that meeting the State’s standards corresponds to being college- and career-ready without the need for remedial coursework at the postsecondary level (if applicable)	38
NA	State’s Race to the Top Assessment Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (if applicable)	N/A
1C Attach 1,2,4	Evidence that the SEA has submitted high-quality assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review, or a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review (if applicable)	121
NA	A copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups (if applicable).	168
2D Attach 1	Table 2: Reward, Priority, and Focus Schools	202
3A Attach 7,8,9	A copy of any guidelines that the SEA has already developed and adopted for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems (if applicable).	263
3A Attach 10	Evidence that the SEA has adopted one or more guidelines of local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems	277
NA	Additional PARCC Information	N/A
NA	Additional Information about Indiana’s A-F school grading system	166
	Indiana’s A-F school grading rule	171



NA	Information about Indiana’s Growth Model	171
NA	Bottom 25 percent Information	173
NA	School Turnaround Information	208
NA	Principle 3 Additional Information	259

## COVER SHEET FOR ESEA FLEXIBILITY REQUEST

Legal Name of Requester: Indiana Department of Education	Requester's Mailing Address: 151 West Ohio Street Indianapolis, IN 46204
State Contact for the ESEA Flexibility Request  Name: Marcie Brown  Position and Office: Deputy Chief of Staff  Contact's Mailing Address: 151 West Ohio Street Indianapolis, IN 46204  Telephone: 317-232-0551  Fax: 317-232-8004  Email address: mbrown@doe.in.gov	
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Dr. Tony Bennett	Telephone: 317-232-6610
Signature of the Chief State School Officer:  X	Date: November 14, 2011
The State, through its authorized representative, agrees to meet all principles of the ESEA Flexibility.	

**WAIVERS**

By submitting this flexibility request, the SEA requests flexibility through waivers of the ten ESEA requirements listed below and their associated regulatory, administrative, and reporting requirements by checking each of the boxes below. The provisions below represent the general areas of flexibility requested; a chart appended to the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Frequently Asked Questions* enumerates each specific provision of which the SEA requests a waiver, which the SEA incorporates into its request by reference.

- 1. The requirements in ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(E)-(H) that prescribe how an SEA must establish annual measurable objectives (AMOs) for determining adequate yearly progress (AYP) to ensure that all students meet or exceed the State’s proficient level of academic achievement on the State’s assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than the end of the 2013–2014 school year. The SEA requests this waiver to develop new ambitious but achievable AMOs in reading/language arts and mathematics in order to provide meaningful goals that are used to guide support and improvement efforts for the State, LEAs, schools, and student subgroups.
- 2. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(b) for an LEA to identify for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring, as appropriate, a Title I school that fails, for two consecutive years or more, to make AYP, and for a school so identified and its LEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA and its Title I schools need not comply with these requirements.
- 3. The requirements in ESEA section 1116(c) for an SEA to identify for improvement or corrective action, as appropriate, an LEA that, for two consecutive years or more, fails to make AYP, and for an LEA so identified and its SEA to take certain improvement actions. The SEA requests this waiver so that it need not comply with these requirements with respect to its LEAs.
- 4. The requirements in ESEA sections 6213(b) and 6224(e) that limit participation in, and use of funds under the Small, Rural School Achievement (SRSA) and Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) programs based on whether an LEA has made AYP and is complying with the requirements in ESEA section 1116. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA that receives SRSA or RLIS funds may use those funds for any authorized purpose regardless of whether the LEA makes AYP.
- 5. The requirement in ESEA section 1114(a)(1) that a school have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more in order to operate a schoolwide program. The SEA requests this waiver so that an LEA may implement interventions consistent with the turnaround principles or interventions that are based on the needs of the students in the school and designed to enhance the entire educational program in a school in any of its priority and focus schools, as appropriate, even if those schools do not have a poverty percentage of 40 percent or more.
- 6. The requirement in ESEA section 1003(a) for an SEA to distribute funds reserved under that section only to LEAs with schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may allocate section 1003(a) funds to its LEAs in order to serve any of the State’s priority and focus schools.

- 7. The provision in ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) that authorizes an SEA to reserve Title I, Part A funds to reward a Title I school that (1) significantly closed the achievement gap between subgroups in the school; or (2) has exceeded AYP for two or more consecutive years. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may use funds reserved under ESEA section 1117(c)(2)(A) for any of the State’s reward schools.
- 8. The requirements in ESEA section 2141(a), (b), and (c) for an LEA and SEA to comply with certain requirements for improvement plans regarding highly qualified teachers. The SEA requests this waiver to allow the SEA and its LEAs to focus on developing and implementing more meaningful evaluation and support systems.
- 9. The limitations in ESEA section 6123 that limit the amount of funds an SEA or LEA may transfer from certain ESEA programs to other ESEA programs. The SEA requests this waiver so that it and its LEAs may transfer up to 100 percent of the funds it receives under the authorized programs among those programs and into Title I, Part A.
- 10. The requirements in ESEA section 1003(g)(4) and the definition of a Tier I school in Section I.A.3 of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) final requirements. The SEA requests this waiver so that it may award SIG funds to an LEA to implement one of the four SIG models in any of the State’s priority schools.

*Optional Flexibility:*

An SEA should check the box below only if it chooses to request a waiver of the following requirements:

- The requirements in ESEA sections 4201(b)(1)(A) and 4204(b)(2)(A) that restrict the activities provided by a community learning center under the Twenty-First Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program to activities provided only during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session (*i.e.*, before and after school or during summer recess). The SEA requests this waiver so that 21st CCLC funds may be used to support expanded learning time during the school day in addition to activities during non-school hours or periods when school is not in session.

**ASSURANCES**

By submitting this application, the SEA assures that:

- 1. It requests waivers of the above-referenced requirements based on its agreement to meet Principles 1 through 4 of the flexibility, as described throughout the remainder of this request.
- 2. It will adopt English language proficiency (ELP) standards that correspond to the State's college- and career-ready standards, consistent with the requirement in ESEA section 3113(b)(2), and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet the new college- and career-ready standards, no later than the 2013–2014 school year. (Principle 1)
- 3. It will develop and administer no later than the 2014–2015 school year alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2) and are aligned with the State's college- and career-ready standards. (Principle 1)
- 4. It will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State's ELP standards, consistent with the requirements in ESEA sections 1111(b)(7), 3113(b)(2), and 3122(a)(3)(A)(ii). (Principle 1)
- 5. It will report annually to the public on college-going and college credit-accumulation rates for all students and subgroups of students in each LEA and each public high school in the State. (Principle 1)
- 6. If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and uses achievement on those assessments to identify priority and focus schools, it has technical documentation, which can be made available to the Department upon request, demonstrating that the assessments are administered statewide; include all students, including by providing appropriate accommodations for English Learners and students with disabilities, as well as alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(a)(2); and are valid and reliable for use in the SEA's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system. (Principle 2)
- 7. It will report to the public its lists of reward schools, priority schools, and focus schools at the time the SEA is approved to implement the flexibility, and annually thereafter, it will publicly recognize its reward schools. (Principle 2)
- 8. Prior to submitting this request, it provided student growth data on their current students and the students they taught in the previous year to, at a minimum, teachers of reading/language arts and mathematics in grades in which the State administers assessments in those subjects in a manner that is timely and informs instructional programs, or it will do so no later the deadline required under the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. (Principle 3)
- 9. It will evaluate and, based on that evaluation, revise its own administrative requirements to

reduce duplication and unnecessary burden on LEAs and schools. (Principle 4)

- 10. It has consulted with its Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in its request.
- 11. Prior to submitting this request, it provided all LEAs with notice and a reasonable opportunity to comment on the request and has attached a copy of that notice (Attachment 1) as well as copies of any comments it received from LEAs (Attachment 2).
- 12. Prior to submitting this request, it provided notice and information regarding the request to the public in the manner in which the State customarily provides such notice and information to the public (*e.g.*, by publishing a notice in the newspaper; by posting information on its website) and has attached a copy of, or link to, that notice (Attachment 3).
- 13. It will provide to the Department, in a timely manner, all required reports, data, and evidence regarding its progress in implementing the plans contained throughout this request.

**If the SEA selects Option A or B in section 3.A of its request, indicating that it has not yet developed and adopted all guidelines for teacher and principal evaluation and support systems, it must also assure that:**

- 14. It will submit to the Department for peer review and approval a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year. (Principle 3)

## CONSULTATION

An SEA must meaningfully engage and solicit input from diverse stakeholders and communities in the development of its request. To demonstrate that an SEA has done so, the SEA must provide an assurance that it has consulted with the State’s Committee of Practitioners regarding the information set forth in the request and provide the following:

1. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from teachers and their representatives.

### Initial Waiver Submission

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) has worked proactively in taking advantage of its extensive communication network and infrastructure to engage and consult with stakeholders regarding the key components of the state’s flexibility plan. This includes initiating dialogue with the leaders of various education interest groups, soliciting input from State Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Tony Bennett’s numerous advisory groups (including his Superintendents Advisory Council and Principals Advisory Council), all local superintendents in the state, and Indiana’s Title I Committee of Practitioners.

Given the tight timeframe between release of the application and the deadline for submission, IDOE sought to distribute and discuss the state’s plan with as many stakeholders as quickly and efficiently as possible. IDOE circulated the draft plan in a targeted manner for review and employed a survey tool to collect feedback in an organized way. IDOE held a meeting via WebEx to discuss the plan and solicit feedback from the Committee of Practitioners.

Additionally, Dr. Bennett shared details of his plan during a series of teacher forums—which include presentations by Dr. Bennett and other IDOE staff as well as question and answer time with attendees— held in eight cities throughout Indiana in recent weeks.

The feedback received on the plan to date has been positive, and very few suggestions have been offered. A member of our Title I Committee of Practitioners encouraged IDOE to identify methods to clearly communicate to parents any changes stemming from being granted the requested flexibility, and as a result the IDOE built communication with parents into our ESEA Flexibility communication strategy.

Since the time of initial submission of the waiver application in November, Dr. Bennett and IDOE staff have communicated with a number of educator groups about the waiver, fielding feedback whenever it is offered. Those groups include the following:

- Email to all teachers in the state via IDOE’s periodic teacher electronic newsletter
- Superintendents Advisory Council
- Principals Advisory Council
- Non-Public Education Association representatives
- Indiana Education Reform Cabinet
- The Educator Learning Link Ambassadors Program (teachers who have volunteered to

be IDOE “ambassadors” within their school buildings)

- Teacher Advisory Council (Teacher of the Year and Milken winners)
- Indiana does not have a formal ELL-related teacher association or group with whom to meet, but see the answer question 2 below for our best efforts at consulting with representatives of this group.

It is important to note that collaboration and communication are not just activities the IDOE initiated within the past few weeks. In fact, Dr. Bennett has made educator and community outreach a key priority in his strategy to comprehensively transform student outcomes in Indiana.

Along with collaboration with regard to the state’s flexibility plan, IDOE has gathered input from educators, parents, and the public on every reform initiative—from state accountability metrics and teacher evaluations to Common Core implementation and performance-based compensation systems. Without a doubt, frequent input and constant two-way communication have been instrumental in the successful passage of “Putting Students First,” Indiana’s groundbreaking education agenda passed into law in the spring of 2011.

To ensure the successful implementation of these reforms, Dr. Bennett has dedicated an unprecedented amount of time and energy to personally meeting with educators throughout the state. He has visited schools in 81 of Indiana’s 92 counties since taking office, engaging in direct dialogue with students, parents, teachers, administrators and community leaders. Since August 2010, Dr. Bennett personally has met with more than 9,000 educators in a variety of settings to present reform proposals, hear feedback and suggestions, and answer important questions regarding the new education laws. He met with educators in many formats, including public forums, informational and small group meetings at schools across the state, teacher/principal/superintendent advisory groups, and one-on-one conversations with school leaders and teachers in his office.

In addition, Dr. Bennett’s IDOE staff has met with more than 30,000 educators during that same time period, sharing details of exciting new reform initiatives—like Indiana’s trailblazing Growth Model—and supporting educators as they work to implement reforms like locally-developed educator evaluations. At the same time, IDOE has seized upon the intersection of the four principles of ESEA flexibility and Indiana’s recently enacted legislation to illustrate to stakeholder groups across Indiana the close alignment between state and federal priorities. This intersection provides local school districts for the first time an unprecedented opportunity to leverage federal and state resources in supporting the challenging work of school innovation and improvement.

Additionally, the IDOE sends via email biweekly updates directly to about 100,000 teachers and other stakeholders. These updates provided yet another vehicle for IDOE to promote the opportunities of ESEA flexibility and to collect feedback. For example, the state’s proposed accountability plan, described in greater detail as part of Principle 2, was greatly enhanced as a direct result of input received in response to these communications to the field.



Dr. Bennett and the department also maintained an open-door policy with members of the Indiana State Teachers Association as well as other groups representing education professionals. The department held at least seven meetings with ISTA senior officials during the 2011 legislative session and continues to work with teacher representatives at the local and state level. In addition, Dr. Bennett and senior staff members continue to enjoy a productive relationship with the Indiana Association of School Principals and the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents. Both groups have made substantial contributions to the revamped school accountability process.

IDOE has also created specialized advisory boards and councils so members can contribute significantly to the development of important initiatives and tools as well as share information with other educators and provide regular feedback. For example, The Educator Learning Link (TELL) is a network of educators who volunteer to share with colleagues in their buildings important updates from IDOE. Currently, there are 641 TELL Ambassadors across the state. The Indiana Educator Reform Cabinet (IERC) is another group of eager and committed teachers who devote about thirty hours per year to organizing regional meetings and discussing and providing useful input on education issues and IDOE initiatives. All of these groups have been engaged in the development of the state's flexibility plan.

Educators also played an important role in IDOE's efforts to develop the best possible teacher and principal evaluation legislation and model rubrics, described further in Principle 3. The Educator Evaluation Cabinet helped ensure the proposed laws and tools were fair, rigorous, and multifaceted. As part of IDOE's current efforts to implement Indiana's new educator effectiveness law, the state worked with The New Teacher Project (TNT) to launch the Indiana Teacher Effectiveness Pilot Program. Administrators, teachers and community members from six school districts are working together to implement new evaluation tools that provide meaningful feedback and recognize the best educators. This important initiative allows the IDOE to provide vital resources to schools while empowering local teachers and school leaders to be the driving force behind policies that will improve student learning and close achievement gaps. Specialized groups of educators—such as ELL teachers, special education teachers, art teachers and music teachers—are also helping to create guidance documents to support local school districts as they develop their own evaluation metrics and tools.

The development of Indiana's new state accountability model was an eighteen month process that incorporated input from key educational stakeholders in Indiana. In the spring of 2010, the IDOE convened two separate councils to serve as advisory committees for IDOE's development of the new A-F school accountability model. Based on the significantly distinct instruments used to measure the effectiveness of the schools encompassing grades K-8 compared to grades 9-12, it was quickly determined that two discrete models were needed. One group was dedicated to developing the Elementary and Middle Schools (E/MS) model while the other focused on the High Schools (HS) model.

### [June 2014 Amendments and Waiver Extension](#)

Since January 2013, engaging with stakeholders, either formally or informally has been a priority of Superintendent Ritz and Indiana Department of Education staff. At the heart of the work of the Department is strong emphasis on supporting educators in college and career ready standards, aligning assessments, support and monitoring all of our schools, and encouraging strong accountability for educators and principals.

The Indiana Department of Education has a comprehensive multifaceted communication approach targeting educators and their representatives designed to meaningfully engage them in the Indiana ESEA waiver. IDOE seeks to engage all stakeholders that may have impact or communication influence with teachers and their representatives.

Since Superintendent Ritz began her term in January 2013, addressing the three principles of this waiver has been ongoing with stakeholders, the State Board of Education, the Indiana Education Round Table, Indiana’s General Assembly legislative leadership, Governor Pence and his Center for Education and Career Innovation, and the U.S. Department of Education. Due to legislative action, there have not only been areas to bring into compliance but areas to be developed for amendments.

IDOE has proactively engaged the legislative leadership outside of legislative session to keep members abreast of waiver information have included face to face conversations hosted by IDOE subject matter staff specialists. (Attachment Con 1 and Attachment Con 2) The Superintendent has also conducted personal conversations with key leaders on subject matter related to the elements of the waiver. (Attachment Con 3 )

The communication during the same time period also includes weekly DOE Dialogue newsletters that are sent to all superintendents, principals, and key stakeholder groups, such as Indiana Association of School Principals and Indiana State Teachers Association. (Attachment Con 4,5,6,7) (Attachment Con 8 and 9 )

In addition to the written weekly update, IDOE posts daily on social media. IDOE hosts six Facebook sites with over 6,500 followers with an average of over 20,000 views per post and a twitter feed with over 13,000 followers. When appropriate, the posts have included specific communication regarding the Indiana ESEA waiver extension request. (Attachment Con 10 )

IDOE has conducted, and will continue to conduct, meetings with the following educator stakeholders groups, discussing many topics contained in this request (either individually and/or as an invitation to a broader stakeholder group meeting). The following attachment reflects direct meetings between the Superintendent and these groups. (attachment Con 11 ) IDOE staff also meets with these various stakeholder groups on many topics related to principles in this waiver.

Superintendent’s Advisory Stakeholder Group  
Indiana’s Parent Teacher Association (PTA)

ARC of Indiana  
 Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education?  
 Indiana State Teachers Association  
 American Federation of Teachers, Indiana  
 Indiana Association of Career and Technical Education Directors  
 School Counselors Advisory Committee  
 Indiana Charter School Leadership  
 Indiana Non-Public School Association  
 Indiana School Board Association  
 Indiana Association of School Principals  
 Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents  
 Indiana Urban Schools Association  
 Indiana Small and Rural Association  
 Hoosier Family of Readers Council and Regional Advisory Groups  
 Education Service Centers  
 Indiana Regional Superintendent Councils  
 Stand for Children  
 Center for Leadership Development (Indianapolis)  
 Teach Plus

There are three additional direct teacher engagement forums that are in the formation process. The first is a Superintendent created group called the Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Group. This will include Teachers of the Year, Milken Award Winners, and National Board Certified Teachers. The Superintendent first engaged this group at her inaugural summit on school improvement, as described below, but now plans to bring them back on a routine basis. The second forum under design is a direct communication to teachers. Currently, IDOE reaches teachers through various social media forums, our IDOE hosted Learning Connection, DOE Dialogue, website and online communities of practice. However, it is our goal to reach 100% of the teachers and plans for how to expedite this process are underway. The third forum will be the addition of a separate section of the DOE Dialogue titled, “ESEA Flexibility Waiver” to draw attention to important updates related to the waiver.

An additional layer of engagement under Superintendent Ritz’s leadership has been regional summits with a single content focus. The summits that have flexibility plan alignment have been our summits focused on school improvement, college and career ready mathematics and strengthening community partnerships. (Attachment Con 12)

Since May 1<sup>st</sup> 2014, when IDOE received the Indiana part B monitoring plan, the engagement has been focused on next steps as outlined by USED.

There have been many ways of seeking this targeted feedback. This included regular presentations at public State Board of Education meetings. (Attachment Con 13, 14, 15) targeted calls with USED joined by legislative leadership and staff members from the Governor’s agency Center for Education and Career Innovation (Attachment Con 16 and 1)

and a targeted meeting of the Superintendent’s Advisory Stakeholder Group regarding substantive flexibility waiver amendments (Attachment Con 17 ).

2. A description of how the SEA meaningfully engaged and solicited input on its request from other diverse communities, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English Learners, business organizations, and Indian tribes.

### Initial Waiver Submission

Dr. Bennett’s Superintendents Advisory Committee, Principals Advisory Committee, School Boards Advisory Committee, ARC of Indiana and Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) were all consulted and asked for feedback. A draft was published for review and a survey tool was established to collect organized feedback. A WebEx conference call was held to solicit discussion and feedback from the Committee of Practitioners. IDOE also shared a draft of the application with our local Stand for Children chapter to ensure buy-in—particularly surrounding altered accountability requirements.

Since the time of initial submission of the waiver application in November, Dr. Bennett and staff have communicated with a number of groups about the waiver, fielding feedback whenever it offered. Those groups include the following:

- PTA Advisory Committee
- ARC of Indiana
- Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education
- National Council on Educating Black Children
- Indianapolis Urban League
- Central Indiana Corporate Partnership
- Indiana Chamber of Commerce
- Stand for Children
- While it only met twice a year and has not been scheduled to meet during the waiver process, IDOE plans to work with the state’s migrant parent advisory council at its next meeting to fully communicate about the waiver.

In fact, the state under Dr. Bennett’s leadership enjoys a vast network of grassroots oriented groups ready to contribute to import initiatives. The following entities have been established by the department or invited to provide regular input to support efforts to increase communication and collaboration between the department and field:

- Indiana Dual Credit Advisory Council
- Indiana Association of Career and Technical Education Directors
- ESC Director's Advisory Committee

- Superintendents Advisory Council
- Principals Advisory Council
- School Boards Advisory Council
- PTA Advisory Committee
- School Counselors Advisory Committee
- ARC of Indiana
- Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education
- Non-Public Education Advisory Committee
- Reading Advisory Council
- Indiana Education Reform Cabinet
- The Educator Learning Link Ambassadors Program
- Teacher Advisory Council (Teacher of the Year and Milken winners)
- Textbook Advisory Committee
- Indiana School Board Association
- Indiana Association of School Principals
- Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- National Council on Education Black Children
- Indianapolis Urban League
- Central Indiana Corporate Partnership
- Indiana Chamber of Commerce
- Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce
- Teach Plus

As with his outreach to educators, Dr. Bennett has made stakeholder outreach and engagement a priority during his tenure. To engage families, IDOE has partnered with Indiana's Parent Teacher Association to make sure parents and guardians receive important information about IDOE's efforts to provide more educational options, increase accountability, recognize and reward great educators, and increase local flexibility. Dr. Bennett and IDOE recognize the important role families play in educating their children. To help encourage and support parental involvement, IDOE created and introduced The Parent Pledge, a contract between teachers and parents meant to foster greater parental engagement. .To date, more than 4,000 parents in more than 200 schools have signed the pledge, and several schools have developed their own locally tailored versions of this written commitment.

In the development of the state's flexibility plan, IDOE has made every effort to engage stakeholders, gather information, and build upon partnerships with a variety of community groups. For example, the Arc of Indiana, established in the mid-1950s by parents of children with intellectual and other developmental disabilities, has worked with IDOE in all aspects of the state's education reform agenda. These partnerships are particularly powerful when it comes to the state's efforts to turn around its chronically underperforming schools and school districts, which often have a higher concentration of at-risk and high-needs students. To help

organize public meetings and share important information with parents and community members in these school communities, IDOE has worked closely with civic organizations such as the Urban League, the NAACP, Indiana’s Commission on Hispanic and Latino Affairs, and the Indiana Civil Rights Commission. Based on the positive feedback from these groups as part of the state’s early turnaround efforts, IDOE has made community outreach and engagement a key accountability metric for schools under state intervention.

Corporate partnerships have also played a critical role in Indiana’s reform efforts. Companies like Comcast have partnered with IDOE to rapidly expand the availability of certain technologies, like broadband internet and on-demand educational programming, for Indiana schools. To help local school districts save money and retain instructional staff to drive more dollars directly to student learning, companies like Cummins (based in Columbus, Indiana) have partnered with IDOE to send corporate Six Sigma experts into schools to identify cost-saving opportunities so more dollars can flow into Indiana’s classrooms. Recently, more than ten additional companies have stepped forward to offer similar efficiency training and support to our local schools. Support such as this from corporate groups helps to undergird the state’s efforts to keep the focus of schools on quality instruction.

As with our plans to continue our collaborative efforts with teachers, IDOE will also maintain efforts to reach out and engage education stakeholders. One way Indiana has expanded its collaborative and outreach efforts, by adding an Educator Effectiveness Communications and Outreach Manager as well as an Educator Effectiveness Communications Specialist. These two new positions will work together to develop, organize and execute outreach and engagement strategies for Indiana educators (including strategies aimed at parents and students) and will worked to partner with key community stakeholders.

### June 2014 Amendments and Waiver Extension

Superintendent Ritz has made it her own personal priority and mission of the IDOE staff to maintain and further grow meaningful engagement of diverse communities, including students, parents, community based organizations, civil rights organizations and organizations representing students with disabilities and English learners and business organizations. Outlined here, and then again in greater detail within each principle, IDOE has made certain stakeholders understand the priorities of IDOE and commitment to learning of all students.

Since January 2013, the Superintendent has visited schools, education forums, Rotary clubs, Kiwanis groups, United Way and other not-for-profit group events, parent events, education, civil rights and community organizations, and city and town community events in 63 of the 92 Indiana counties.

Superintendent Ritz also serves on key state committees/commissions where diverse stakeholders also serve (Indiana Commission for the Improvement of the Status of Children, Indiana Career Council, and the Indiana Education Round Table. Conversations in some of these meetings have had focus on standards development, service to children in our Title I

schools, assessments, and teacher quality. (Attachment Con 11)

In addition, the Indiana Department of Education conducts meetings with the following stakeholders, discussing many topics contained in this request (either individually and/or as an invitation to a broader stakeholder group meeting) (Attachment Con 11 )

Superintendent’s Advisory Stakeholder Group  
Indiana’s Parent Teacher Association (PTA)  
ARC of Indiana  
Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education  
Indiana Chamber of Commerce  
Indiana State Teachers Association  
American Federation of Teachers, Indiana  
Indiana Association of Career and Technical Education Directors  
School Counselors Advisory Committee  
Indiana Charter School Association  
Indiana Non-Public School Association  
Indiana School Board Association  
Indiana Association of School Principals  
Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents  
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People  
Indianapolis Urban League  
Indiana Urban Schools Association  
Indiana Small and Rural Association  
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce  
Hoosier Family of Readers Council and Regional Advisory Groups  
100 Black Men  
Education Service Centers  
Concerned Clergy of Indianapolis  
Indiana Regional Superintendent Councils  
Teach Plus  
Stand for Children  
Center for Leadership Development (Indianapolis)

The most targeted change at the Indiana Department of Education that has direct impact regarding improved communication and input since January 2013 has been the creation of the Outreach Division of School Improvement.

IDOE is committed to creating equitable and high quality opportunities for all Indiana students by providing levels of support and intervention to Indiana schools. The Outreach Division of School Improvement accomplishes this mission of support through the use of regional coordinators partnering with a support staff at the IDOE. There are thirteen regional coordinators who are based in the nine educational service centers throughout Indiana.

The mission of Outreach is to be supportive, responsive, and proactive. The uniqueness in design of Outreach that relationships can be built in the local communities that can only come through a close personal relationship with an Outreach Coordinator who knows the unique needs of all the stakeholders in the community. Outreach Coordinators live and work within the region that they serve.

As such, IDOE has found many partners throughout the state who are concerned and interested in assisting with the education of all Hoosier children. The Outreach Coordinators serve as the bridge for community partners and Indiana educators. This local, personalized link between the community and needs of the schools has allowed IDOE to reach out to the educators and community specific organizations, such as students, parents, community-based organizations, civil rights organizations, organizations representing students with disabilities and English learners and business organizations in a targeted way.

The Outreach Coordinator in each area typically attends local school board meetings, chamber of commerce meetings, Indiana Works Councils meetings and other local events sharing the vision and mission of IDOE. In addition the Outreach Coordinators publish local newsletters with important information from IDOE tailored to each region. (Attachment Con 18 )

Each region has unique strengths and challenges and assistance is differentiated to schools as a response to the needs. By sharing resources, concerns and celebrations at the monthly Outreach Coordinator meetings, IDOE is able to connect schools in need of services and support with one another. (Attachment Con 19 )

The Outreach staff, along with communication and collaboration among the various IDOE divisions has provided communication to stakeholders and gathered input to inform the content of this waiver.

There are two additional direct stakeholder engagement forums that are in the formation process. The first new forum will be the creation of a quarterly parent newsletter to be disseminated through IDOE's appropriate stakeholder groups, IDOE's parent portal on the website and social media. The second forum is the creation of a Superintendent's Student Advisory Group. This group will meet each semester to engage high school students in various topics regarding education.

In addition to engaging with the Title I Committee of Practitioners IDOE conducted an online survey organized by principle to gather public comment. The comment window was June 17-24<sup>th</sup>. The foci of these have been for formal input with regards to the Indiana extension request and key amendments. The feedback provided by these comments informed the work of IDOE on subsequent drafts of each section of the waiver. (Attachment Con 20 , 21)

Regarding this consultation section of the waiver, public comments were made that the draft did not include enough evidence to demonstrate the involvement of diverse stakeholders. As a



result, the draft was rewritten to encompass IDOE’s breadth and depth of communication and engagement with diverse stakeholders.

As part of IDOE’s overall high quality plan for Family and Community Engagement and Outreach, there are also separate Family and Community Outreach plans for each principle of this waiver. Below is a summary of the Family and Community Engagement and Outreach plan elements by principle. In addition, each principle narrative section describes family and community engagement and outreach. Incorporation of public comment into this document is also included in the sections below.

### **Principle I:**

As a result of public comment, Principle 1 was reorganized to reflect the highly quality plan format. IDOE included additional communication strategies to teachers regarding assessment blueprints and specific ECA implementation activities.

IDOE fully engaged stakeholders in the development of Indiana’s 2014 college and career ready standards To facilitate comprehensive educator awareness of the new college and career ready standards and assessment, IDOE will use desktop delivery models to provide easy access to information, leveraging the viral nature and efficiency of social media. IDOE’s communication tools such as its website, the Learning Connection, and DOE Dialogue will continue to convey all official resources to education stakeholders. It is important to note that Indiana was an early adopter of the Common Core State Standards has been working with educators since 2011 in transitioning classroom practice and standards to align to college and career ready expectations. Therefore, there were many lessons learned during that transition from Indiana Academic Standards to Common Core, and IDOE has designed our strategies for supporting our educators in this most recent adoption in a very targeted approach.

A new Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014) web page hub: [www.doe.in.gov/standards](http://www.doe.in.gov/standards) has been developed to consolidate all official IDOE standards and assessment related guidance and documents into one user-friendly location. This new hub will be populated and updated with guidance, test blueprints, and resources for all student populations and stakeholders on a routine and intentional basis.

Additional means for meaningful consultation and engagement with stakeholder groups for the work of Principle I includes the following:

#### **College and Career Ready Standards and Assessments:**

- Field surveys to seek most important resource needs for supporting new college and career ready standards
- Creation of online communities of practice to link educators on topic specific resources to support college and career ready standards and assessments. These include grade level and content specific groups including special needs teachers by specialty, teachers of students with high ability, second language learners and students with disabilities.

- Redesign of standards resource site on IDOE website that includes links for Educators, Parents and Communities. <http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/englishlanguage-arts>
- Specialized group field surveys, such as for teachers of students with disabilities to determine specific resource needs
- Regional professional development days to focus on implementation of college and career ready standards and aligned assessments. There will be targeted invitations to parents and business and community stakeholders.
- Development of content specific groups, such as math, that include k-12 and higher education, parents, and diverse stakeholder groups to delve into practices and needs for the specific areas.
- Maintain system for educator involvement in assessment creation from specification and test blueprint development, to passage review, content and bias sensitivity review and standard setting.
- On-going communication with Indiana’s Testing Advisory Committee at a minimum four times per year. One focus of such collaboration including updates on Principles and elements of ESEA flexibility that impact assessment.
- Use of the “Assessment Monthly Overview” WebEx format for test coordinators to provide updated information on ESEA flexibility.

#### Special Education

- Develop differentiated resource materials and distributed through IN\*Source, About Special Kids and ARC of Indiana as well as through school communities
- Host informative meetings regarding Principles and elements of the ESEA flexibility waiver with Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education, State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities, state stakeholder group for the Indiana Systemic Improvement Plan, and the Education Committee of the ARC of Indiana.

#### English Learners

- Facilitate Title III Director and INSTESOL Leadership meetings (regionally and statewide) and provide focused information from the SEA including updates on the ESEA waiver.
- Maintain communication through the “EL Monthly Happenings” newsletter that is shared via Learning Connection and the IDOE website.
- Utilize the Indiana Education Service Centers to host conversations with LEA leaders and teachers, including Title I, Title III and Title I Part C specialized with one focus of meetings to be updates on ESEA waiver.
- Share print and video materials with parents at the LEA level regarding ESEA flexibility (all materials will be translated in Spanish as well )

#### Principle II:

As a result of public comment, Principle 2 incorporated suggestions to more fully describe Outreach for School Improvement and its capacity to address low performing schools. In addition, IDOE provided more specific explanations regarding Turnaround Principles with

respect to school leadership changes.

The state’s process and strategies for intervening in the lowest performing schools is predicated upon the development of clear goals and measurable success indicators through the lens of a seminal framework developed by Mass Insight and outlined in *The Turnaround Challenge*, which U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan has called “the Bible of school turnaround.” Indiana is currently one of a few select states participating in Mass Insight’s School Development Network as part of a concerted effort to trailblaze cutting-edge, best-in-class turnaround policies. Indiana has continued its work with Mass Insight and has created a network designed to support schools with similar needs in various stages of school improvement. The attached report from Mass Insight outlines Indiana’s progress in turnaround as of April 2014, with the new model of Outreach melded with the work initiated by the former Office of School Improvement and Turnaround. Indiana will implement suggestions from the Mass Insight Diagnostic report during the 2014-15 school year.

(Attachment Con 4)

Additional means for meaningful consultation and engagement with stakeholder groups for the work of principle II included the following:

- ESEA Waiver Implementation meetings for Focus and Priority school leadership
- Clear communication plan to Outreach Coordinators regarding principles and elements of the ESEA waiver
- Professional Development delivered to LEAS to ensure understanding of ESEA flexibility requirements
- Formal memos to LEA Superintendents and Principals to ensure ESEA flex expectations were understood.

### Principle III:

As a result of public comment, Principle 3 incorporated language regarding monitoring and support for school evaluation systems and providing professional development regarding SLO measures and instructional best practices.

Indiana’s evaluation system provides a transparent way to validate the quality of a school’s human capital by coupling professional accountability with school accountability. Examining the new evaluation data system relative to the new A-F accountability framework provides a unique perspective as IDOE continues to support the field in this new and innovative approach to transforming schools and developing more effective teachers and leaders. This check and balance between school accountability and educator accountability is transparent to the public; aggregate teacher evaluation results by school are posted on the IDOE website with each school’s accountability grade at: [www.doe.in.gov/evaluations](http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations).

Additional means for meaningful consultation and engagement with stakeholder groups for the

work of Principle III includes the following:

- Sharing site hosted on the IDOE website will include routinely updated tools for teachers and principals to support evaluation.
- Partnership with education service centers across the state to provide professional development for teacher and principals and respective evaluation systems.
- Surveys to teachers, principals, evaluators and superintendents on feedback for the IDOE resources site
- Creation of site for historic display of all evaluation ratings data for the public

In summary, IDOE has been, and will continue to, maintain its commitment to engaging meaningfully with teachers and their representatives and other diverse communities in the formats described in this consultation section and outlined in the Family and Community Engagement and Outreach high quality plan.

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**Consultation - Family and Community Engagement and Outreach**

**Key Components Of Family and Community Engagement for all Principles of ESEA FLEXIBILITY**

1. Ensuring understanding meaningful engagement and solicitation from teachers and their representatives on an ongoing basis to inform SEA implementation of its ESEA flexibility request
2. Ensuring understanding meaningful engagement and solicitation from parents, including parents of students with disabilities and English Learners, and other diverse stakeholders on an ongoing basis to inform SEA implementation of its ESEA flexibility request.

**Key Component #1**

Ensuring understanding meaningful engagement and solicitation from teachers and their representatives and on an ongoing basis to inform SEA implementation of its ESEA flexibility request

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Inform waiver submission through State Board of Education meetings, phone calls with USED involving legislative leadership, Governor’s Office and Center for Education and Career Innovation staff	May 1-June 23, 2014	Superintendent  IDOE leadership	Meeting presentations, recordings of phone calls, Meeting calendars	Staff	No current obstacles

Conducted summits that had Flexibility plan alignment					
Conduct regular conversations with Superintendent's Stakeholder Advisory Group	Minimum of every other month, or more frequent as topics have necessitated immediate feedback	Superintendent	Agendas Email Correspondence Notes from meetings	Staff and organization representatives	No current obstacles
Conduct meetings with education stakeholder groups	1/2013 and ongoing	Superintendent  IDOE staff	Superintendent calendar and IDOE staff calendars	Staff	No current obstacles
Communicate with educators and their representatives via DOE Dialogue, social media and Learning Connection	1/2013 and ongoing	IT and Communications Departments	DOE Dialogues, social media posts, Learning Connection forums	Staff	No current obstacles
Engage legislative leadership	1/2013 and ongoing	Superintendent and Governmental Affairs Department	Communication log	Staff	No current obstacles

Reconnect with identified past Indiana Teachers of the Year, Milken Award Winners, and National Board Certified Teachers to form Superintendent’s Teacher Advisory Group	9/2014 and Quarterly	Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent	Invitation Emails Agenda Presentation Materials Minutes/Notes	Funding for time if during school day	No current obstacles
Launch Teacher Communication System	9/2014-Ongoing Quarterly	Communications Team	Quarterly communication	Staff	No current obstacles
Addition of a separate section of DOE Dialogue titled, “ESEA Flexibly Waiver”	7/2014 and ongoing weekly in DOE Dialogue messages	Communications Team	DOE Dialogues	Staff	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #2</b>					
Ensuring understanding, meaningful engagement and solicitation from parents, including parents of students with disabilities and English Learners, and other diverse stakeholders on an ongoing basis to inform SEA implementation of its ESEA flexibility request.					
<b>Key milestones and activities</b>	<b>Detailed timeline</b>	<b>Party responsible</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Significant obstacles</b>
Public comment window open on waiver amendments	6/17-24 2014	IT Department staff	Public comments	Staff	No current obstacles
Statewide visits to schools, education forums, and other events with diverse community groups	1/2013 and ongoing	Superintendent	Superintendent’s calendar	Staff	No current obstacles

Formal assignment to statewide commission or committees, such as Commission on Improving the Status of Children in Indiana and Indiana Career Council	5/2013-ongoing	Superintendent	Agendas Minutes	Staff	No current obstacles
Conduct stakeholder meetings across the state to diverse stakeholder groups such as 100 Black Men, Chamber of Commerce, PTA associations and member organizations	1/2013-ongoing	Superintendent  IDOE staff as assigned	Agendas Presentation Materials	Staff	No current obstacles
Operationalize Outreach Division of School Improvement	Summer of 2013 and ongoing	Superintendent and IDOE leadership	Materials from Division of Outreach  Hiring of Outreach Coordinators	Staff	No current obstacles
Create of quarterly parent newsletter	9/2014 and ongoing quarterly	IDOE Communications Staff	Quarterly newsletters	Staff	No current obstacles
Create of Superintendent’s Student Advisory Group	Meet each semester of 2014-15 school year; ongoing each semester	Superintendent	Superintendent’s calendar	Staff	No current obstacle



Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Standards and Assessments					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Create of online communities of practice to link educators on topic specific resources to support college and career ready standards and assessments. These include grade level and content specific groups, Including teachers of students with high ability, English language learners and students with disabilities.	May 2014- Ongoing	College and career ready cross division team and IT department staff	IDOE website college and career ready resource website with communities of practice active and regularly prompted by subject matter experts at IDOE	Staff	No current obstacles
Development of 2014 Indiana Academic Standards	May 2013- April 2014	IDOE Staff	Process documents of revision and publication of final standards	Stakeholders Public Comment IDOE Staff SBOE Staff Commission for Higher Education Staff K-12 Panel of Educators National Experts Consultants	No current obstacles

Create field surveys as needed to seek most important resource needs for supporting new college and career ready standards	April 2013-Ongoing	College and career ready cross division team and IT department staff	Survey results	Staff	No current obstacles
Redesign of standards resource site on Indiana Department of Education website that includes links for Educators, Parents and Communities. <a href="http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/englishlanguage-arts">http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/englishlanguage-arts</a>	April 2014-Ongoing	College and career ready cross division team and IT department staff	IDOE website with date stamped updates on a regular basis	Staff	No current obstacles
Regional professional development days to focus on implementation of college and career ready standards and aligned assessments. Targeted invitations to parents and business and community stakeholders	Summer of 2014 -ongoing	College and career ready cross division team	Agenda, sign in sheets and materials	Staff	No current obstacles
Development of content specific groups, such as math, that includes k-12 and higher education, parents, and diverse stakeholder groups to delve into practices and needs for the specific areas.	May 2014-August 2015	College and career ready cross division team and IT department staff	Agenda, sign in sheets and materials	Staff	No current obstacles

Maintain system for educator involvement in assessment creation from specification and test blueprint development, to passage review, content and bias sensitivity review and standard setting.		College and career ready cross division team with assessment specialist	Meeting dates Publications related to college and career ready assessment	Staff	No current obstacles
On-going communication with Indiana’s Testing Advisory Committee at a minimum four times per year. One focus of such collaboration will be updates on Principles and elements of ESEA flexibility that impact assessment.	Ongoing	Assessment Specialists	Agenda and materials	Staff	No current obstacles
Use of the “Assessment Monthly Overview” WebEx format for test coordinators to provide updated information on ESEA flexibility.	Ongoing	Assessment Specialists	Cataloged WebEx presentations and related materials	Staff	No current obstacles
<b>Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for English Learners</b>					
<b>Key milestones and activities</b>	<b>Detailed timeline</b>	<b>Party responsible</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Significant obstacles</b>
Plan, hold, and facilitate Title III Director meetings(regionally and as a whole), INTESOL Leadership group meetings to ensure they are up to date on the latest information from the SEA including ESEA Flexibility waiver and components	8/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting agendas and sign in sheets	INTESOL, Staff	No current obstacles

Create and public EL Monthly Happenings Newsletter and share via Learning Connection and the Website (This includes updates from the department including ESEA Flexibility waiver and components)	8/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Sample newsletters	Staff	No current obstacles
Professional development session shared at education service centers around the state and school districts regarding components of the ESEA Flexibility waiver and regulations for Title I, III, and Title I, Part C	10/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Materials	Staff, Education Service Centers	No current obstacles
Create print and video materials to share with parents at the LEA level regarding ESEA Flexibility components (all materials will be translated into Spanish)	Summer and fall 2014	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Published materials	Bilingual staff, IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
Collaborate with INTESOL to host a parent breakout session at the annual conference where parents can become familiar with ESEA flexibility waiver, ask questions, and provide feedback. All materials will be provided to the LEAs to use with parents that were unable to attend.	Fall 2014 – and annually	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Parent breakout materials	Staff	No current obstacles
Plan, hold, and facilitate Parent Advisory Council meetings around the state to ensure parents or migrants are up to date on the latest information from the SEA including ESEA Flexibility waiver and components	Summer 2014 0 on-going	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting agendas	Title I, part C	No current obstacles

Develop and implement parent surveys as needed that are available online	Fall 2014-on-going	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Survey results	IDOE technology team, Jotform	No current obstacles
<b>Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Students with Disabilities</b>					
<b>Key milestones and activities</b>	<b>Detailed timeline</b>	<b>Party responsible</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Significant obstacles</b>
An informational resource, describing the waiver and its implications for LEAs, teachers, and students (including students with disabilities) will be developed and provided to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ IN*SOURCE</li> <li>▪ About Special Kids (ASK) and</li> <li>▪ ARC of Indiana</li> </ul> for distribution and communication to their parent constituents. Informational resource (described above) will also be posted on the IDOE Special Education website and provided to the TA resource centers as a resource for parents of students with disabilities	September 2014	Office of Special Education	Resource document Documentation of distribution to stakeholder groups	Staff	No current obstacles
Meet with and provide information to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the executive committee of the Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education</li> <li>▪ the State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities</li> <li>▪ the stakeholder group for the State Systemic Improvement Plan</li> </ul>	July 2014 and ongoing	Office of Special Education	Notes from meetings and materials shared	Staff	No current obstacles

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Education Committee of the ARC of Indiana to ensure they have current information from the SEA including ESEA flexibility waiver and components</li> </ul>					
<p><b>Key Components of Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Focus and Priority Schools</b></p>					
<p>Conducted a stakeholder meeting to explain ESEA waiver implications for Focus and Priority Schools prior to sharing information in regional meetings with school leadership teams</p>	<p>11/2013-12/2013 annually</p>	<p>Outreach Division of School Improvement</p>	<p>Email from stakeholder meeting with agenda</p>	<p>Stakeholders</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p>Provided school leadership teams comprised of superintendents, principals and teachers, with ESEA requirements, expectations, and implications</p>	<p>12/2013-ongoing</p>	<p>Outreach Division of School Improvement</p>	<p>Training materials from regional meetings</p>	<p>ESEA Flexibility FAQs and Dave English, USED</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p>Provided professional development to Outreach Coordinators to ensure understanding of ESEA Flex requirements and implications</p>	<p>9/2013-ongoing</p>	<p>Outreach Division of School Improvement leadership</p>	<p>Monitoring handbook, agendas from coordinator PD dates</p>	<p>IDOE Outreach team Mass Insight</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>

Provided professional development and training to LEAs to ensure understanding of ESEA Flex requirements and implications	12/2013 (regional meetings annually)	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Outreach Division of School Improvement resource guide PowerPoint from meetings	IDOE technology team IDOE Outreach team MA Rooney Foundation	No current obstacles
Formal memo and ongoing follow-up communication to Superintendents and Principals to ensure materials, tools, and ESEA Flex expectations were clearly communicated and disseminated	12/2013-6/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Formal memo and ongoing emails	IDOE Staff	No current obstacles
<b>Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Teacher and Principal Evaluation and Support Systems</b>					
<b>Key milestones and activities</b>	<b>Detailed timeline</b>	<b>Party responsible</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Significant obstacles</b>
Create and share updated teacher and principal implementation documents via Learning Connection and the IDOE’s Evaluation Website (This includes updates from the department including ESEA Flexibility waiver and components)	8/2013-ongoing	IDOE Office of Educator Effectiveness and Licensing (EEL)	Files via Learning Connection and IDOE Evaluations Website	EEL and communications staff	No current obstacles
Professional development session shared at education service centers around the state and school districts regarding components of the ESEA Flexibility waiver and teacher and principal evaluation systems	2011-ongoing annually	IDOE EEL staff	Education Service Center flyers, agendas and sign in sheets	Education Service Centers	No current obstacles

Survey to teachers, principals, evaluators and superintendents on implementation of evaluation plans to improve guidance on the Learning Connection and IDOE Evaluation website	2013	IDOE EEL staff	Survey and survey results	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
LEAs submit evaluation plan for teachers and principals through Legal Standard 12 for Accreditation and post on IDOE website	2012 and submitted annually	IDOE Educator Effectiveness and Licensing (EEL) and Accreditation staff	LEA evaluation plans with LEA superintendent assurance	IDOE Online Legal Standards website  IDOE EEL and Accreditation staff	No current obstacles
SEA posts LEAs submit final evaluation ratings results for teachers and principals	Annually	IDOE EEL staff	IDOE website of final evaluation ratings of 249 LEAS and 1993 schools for teachers and principals, including Higher Ed teacher prep programs by years of experience	IDOE data collection and technology team	No current obstacles



<p>Strategic plan for displaying all historic evaluation ratings data to all stakeholders on IDOE website</p>	<p>Annually starting 2014</p>	<p>IDOE EEL, data collection and technology staff</p>	<p>Final evaluation rating for all principals and teachers by school and LEA on IDOE’s COMPASS data website</p>	<p>IDOE data collection and technology team</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
---	-------------------------------	---	---	---	-----------------------------

## EVALUATION

The Department encourages an SEA that receives approval to implement the flexibility to collaborate with the Department to evaluate at least one program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs implement under principle 1, 2, or 3. Upon receipt of approval of the flexibility, an interested SEA will need to nominate for evaluation a program, practice, or strategy the SEA or its LEAs will implement under principles 1, 2, or 3. The Department will work with the SEA to determine the feasibility and design of the evaluation and, if it is determined to be feasible and appropriate, will fund and conduct the evaluation in partnership with the SEA, ensuring that the implementation of the chosen program, practice, or strategy is consistent with the evaluation design.

Check here if you are interested in collaborating with the Department in this evaluation, if your request for the flexibility is approved.

### OVERVIEW OF SEA'S REQUEST FOR THE ESEA FLEXIBILITY

Provide an overview (about 500 words) of the SEA's request for the flexibility that:

1. explains the SEA's comprehensive approach to implement the waivers and principles and describes the SEA's strategy to ensure this approach is coherent within and across the principles; and
2. describes how the implementation of the waivers and principles will enhance the SEA's and its LEAs' ability to increase the quality of instruction for students and improve student achievement.

Like all Americans, Hoosiers are responding to the call for dramatic change in our education system. In 2011, Indiana took the biggest step in state history to advance education reform by passing the "Putting Students First" agenda. This comprehensive legislative package, which focused on teacher quality and flexibility coupled with a marked expansion in educational options for students and families, represented a sea change to the state's education landscape.

The opportunity to request ESEA flexibility catches Indiana full stride in implementing the bold education reforms within "Putting Students First" – reforms that align completely with the four principles for improving student academic achievement and increasing the quality of instruction for all students. This flexibility will allow Indiana to set the bar high for the state and the nation by raising our standards and expectations for students, educators and school systems without succumbing to the temptation to water down important accountability provisions.

Indiana's reform strategy reflects the following three tenets of Dr. Bennett: (1) competition, (2) freedom, and (3) accountability. Educational offerings and instructional quality can only improve in an environment of healthy competition; parents must have the freedom to choose the best educational options for their children, while school leaders must have the flexibility to make decisions based on their students' needs; and all stakeholders must be held

accountable for their individual performance.

Building upon “Putting Students First,” ESEA flexibility will help fundamentally shift the role of IDOE from a compliance-based organization to one that supports educators in carrying out swift-moving and sweeping reforms. IDOE recognizes the need to focus on setting high standards and expectations, supporting bold and innovative practices, and holding schools accountable – and then getting out of their way while they deliver.

Flexibility to discard the 2013-2014 proficiency requirement will allow Indiana to fully utilize new advances in measuring student growth and overall school performance. Indiana’s proposed state accountability plan aligns with federal efforts to support high standards and increase transparency. The accountability framework the state will implement uses easy-to-understand (A-F) categories for school performance, includes measures of both pass/fail and growth, and puts a strong focus on closing the achievement gap by targeting growth for the lowest 25% of students.

Indiana’s coordinated effort to improve teacher quality throughout the state aligns with federal priorities and clearly establishes a sound basis for flexibility related to the Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) requirement. Indiana is now focused on evaluation systems and tools that analyze student outcomes and provide teachers the professional support needed to ensure growth. In 2011, legislation ensures all school corporations will utilize annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include student achievement and growth data and support efforts to make sure every child has access to quality instruction.

Efforts to attain other flexibilities focus on similar attempts to realistically and transparently align federal priorities with recent reforms and structural advances at the state and local level. Indiana is committed to not only meeting NCLB’s and ESEA’s minimal standards but also to going far beyond them to drive meaningful reforms in college and career readiness, school accountability, educator effectiveness, and the reduction of superfluous rules and regulations. This must be the case. Our flexibility plan must be demanding enough to convey the sense of fierce urgency necessary to transform Indiana’s schools and support those who run them and teach in them. Most important, our plan must focus on the students whose lives depend on the quality of learning our schools provide. Nothing matters more than that.

## PRINCIPLE 1: COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY EXPECTATIONS FOR ALL STUDENTS

### 1.A ADOPT COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

<p><b>Option A</b></p> <p>The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that are common to a significant number of States, consistent with part (1) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.</p> <p>i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State’s standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)</p>	<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p><b>X</b> The State has adopted college- and career-ready standards in at least reading/language arts and mathematics that have been approved and certified by a State network of institutions of higher education (IHEs), consistent with part (2) of the definition of college- and career-ready standards.</p> <p>i. Attach evidence that the State has adopted the standards, consistent with the State’s standards adoption process. (Attachment 4)</p> <p>ii. Attach a copy of the memorandum of understanding or letter from a State network of IHEs certifying that students who meet these standards will not need remedial coursework at the postsecondary level. (Attachment 5)</p>
--	---

### 1A Attachments 1, 2, 3, and 4

## 1.B TRANSITION TO COLLEGE- AND CAREER-READY STANDARDS

Provide the SEA’s plan to transition to and implement no later than the 2013–2014 school year college- and career-ready standards statewide in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for all students and schools and include an explanation of how this transition plan is likely to lead to all students, including English Learners, students with disabilities, and low-achieving students, gaining access to and learning content aligned with such standards. The Department encourages an SEA to include in its plan activities related to each of the italicized questions in the corresponding section of the document titled *ESEA Flexibility Review Guidance*, or to explain why one or more of those activities is not necessary to its plan.

Indiana has been a leading state in content standards, assessments, and graduation requirements, establishing a strong foundation from which to transition to college and career ready standards.

In 2001, Indiana was one of five states (along with Kentucky, Massachusetts, Nevada, and Texas) selected to participate in the American Diploma Project, a national initiative created to ensure high school graduation standards and assessments across the nation accurately reflect the knowledge and skills that colleges and businesses really require of high school graduates.

Even before the advent of Common Core State Standards, Indiana was considered to have among the strongest state standards in the nation. Later, Indiana was deemed to be one of a few states to have mathematics and E/LA standards rank on par with the CCSS.

Indiana’s Core 40 has been a model of college and career ready high school diploma standards nationally. The Indiana State Board of Education adopted new course and credit requirements for earning a high school diploma. A list is available at <http://www.doe.in.gov/core40/overview.html>. Adopted originally in 1994, the Core 40 system now offers students with the option to earn one of four diploma types:

- General
- Core 40
- Core 40 with Academic Honors
- Core 40 with Technical Honors

Additionally, students who qualify can earn dual honors credentials in both academic honors and technical honors.

The Indiana General Assembly has made completion of Core 40 a graduation requirement for all students beginning with those entering high school in fall of 2007. The law included an opt-out provision for parents who determine that their student could benefit more from the General Diploma. The law also makes Core 40 a minimum college admission requirement for the state’s public four-year universities beginning in the fall of 2011.

On August 3, 2010 and by unanimous agreement, the Indiana State Board of Education adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) for English/Language Arts (E/LA) and grades 6-12 Literacy for Social Studies, History, Science and Technical Subjects, and for Mathematics. See Attachment 4 for a copy of the board minutes that show adoption of the CCSS

Soon after adopting the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in August 2010, Indiana became the first state in the nation to align its teacher preparation standards with the CCSS and require colleges to incorporate them into their pre-service preparation programs. The Indiana Professional Standards Advisory Board (whose responsibilities and authority has now been transferred to the state board of education), in conjunction with the IDOE, approved the new developmental and content standards for educators in December 2010. Hundreds of educators and representatives from K-12 and higher education participated in the development of the new teacher preparation standards..

Indiana moved quickly to transition from the Indiana State Standards to the Common Core State Standards. Across the state, educators of kindergarteners have begun providing instruction *only* on the Common Core State Standards in the 2011-12 school year. First and second grade instruction *only* on the Common Core State Standards will roll out in 2012-13. Hoosier students in all remaining grades will receive instruction only on the Common Core State Standards during the 2013-14 school year.

In terms of instructional methods aligned to the Common Core State Standards, Math teachers began implementing the Common Core’s Standards for Mathematical Practice for

the 2011-12 school year. All teachers began teaching the Common Core Literacy Standards in grades 6-12 for their disciplines during this school year.

### Alignment to Common Core State Standards

In April 2010, the Mathematics and English/Language Arts specialists at IDOE, in conjunction with a team of teachers and university professors, analyzed the alignment between early drafts of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and the Indiana Academic Standards (IAS). This initial analysis yielded a document that was presented to Indiana's Education Roundtable on May 18, 2010. Co-chaired by the Governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction, Indiana's Education Roundtable serves to improve educational opportunity and achievement for all Hoosier students. Composed of key leaders from education, business, community, and government, the Roundtable is charged with doing the following:

- Ensuring the state has world class academic standards for student learning,
- Aligning the *Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)* assessments that measure student achievement with those standards,
- Setting the passing scores for *ISTEP+*, and
- Making ongoing recommendations focused on improving student achievement to the Governor, Superintendent of Public Instruction, General Assembly, Indiana State Board of Education, and others.

A subsequent analysis was completed for the final released CCSS documents using materials provided by Achieve, Inc., and the results of this analysis were presented to the Education Roundtable and the State Board of Education to assist with their decision to adopt the Common Core Standards on August 3, 2010.

To provide additional information to teachers in the alignment of resources and assessment to the CCSS, IDOE specialists translated the information from these two analyses into documents that summarized not only the level of alignment but also descriptive statements to provide further information on the gaps that existed. A final product of this analysis was a subset of CCSS in both Mathematics and E/LA at each grade that schools should begin building into their curriculum to assist in closing the identified gaps between the IAS and the CCSS.

For the 2010-2011 school year, the Indiana Department of Education updated all course descriptions to align with the CCSS, integrating literacy standards in history, social studies, science, fine arts, physical education, world languages, and technical subjects. The department is working with Indiana Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages to implement the framework for resources for teachers of world languages.

Indiana's Response to Instruction (RTI) work in 2010, culminated in guidance to the field to

better identify student knowledge and gaps. Through RTI, IDOE will ensure we focus on access to the common core state standards and equal opportunity for all Hoosier students.

To increase access to Common Core **State** Standards for Literacy in Technical Subjects for students participating in career and technical education courses, Indiana set aside funds and released a request for quotes on an academic integration project. Further, Career and Technical Education federal funds available at both local and state level **were** allocated toward improving student performance on core indicators for CCSS in English/Language Arts and Mathematics.

In Indiana, **at the time of the initial flexibility request**, an estimated one quarter to one third of students taking CTE courses are students with disabilities. These students benefited from the common core literacy standards via the academic integration project.

#### Outreach and Dissemination of CCSS

Over the past few years, IDOE has built a portal to conduct better outreach and dissemination of information across the state. The Learning Connection portal was developed by IDOE and plays a prominent role in fostering communication to and between Hoosier teachers and in supporting the implementation of IDOE's strategic initiatives, such as the transition to the CCSS. The portal hosts communities of practitioners, with approximately 80 to 90% of all Indiana of teachers registered. Usage is growing – there are over 10,000 members of the literacy community, 3,000 in the curriculum and instruction community, and nearly 2,000 in the mathematics community. About 5,000 total resources are available through these three communities, and salient topics are discussed in forums weekly, monitored by DOE staff members.

By providing data, resources, and tools for school improvement, the functionality of the Learning Connection can be leveraged across IDOE initiatives aimed at improving student learning. The system offers the following four distinct benefits to every teacher:

1. Access to longitudinal student-level data from numerous sources to support instructional decisions and increase student achievement;
2. Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues from across the state through the communication tools in the communities;
3. Online lesson planning and curriculum design capabilities; and
4. A common point of access for information from IDOE.

During the month of August **2011**, all public and accredited-private K-12 schools in Indiana received shipments of materials related to student success and college and career readiness.

- A magazine for grade K-10 students and their families
  - The magazines are jointly produced by the Indiana Commission for Higher Education and the Indiana Department of Education through the state's Learn

More Indiana partnership.

- Each version of the K-10 magazine provides a grade-specific overview of information tied to student success: how plan, prepare and pay for college and career success, tips for a good start this academic year, methods of career exploration, an explanation of the Core 40 options, and more.
- Content is tied to the Indiana Student Standards for Guidance.
- A magazine for grade 11 and 12 students
  - The magazine provides information on planning, preparing and paying for college success, including tips on scholarship searches, finding a college, and more.
- Graduation Plans for grade 8 and 9 students
  - An online version is available at [learnmoreindiana.org/plan](http://learnmoreindiana.org/plan).
- College GO! Week kits
  - This year all schools serving grades K-12 will receive College GO! Week materials, including elementary schools.
  - Materials include posters, postcards, banner and starter guides.
  - Visit [CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org](http://CollegeGoWeekIndiana.org) for more information.

The K-10 magazine began including information about CCSS soon after the adoption of the standards and goes to home with every K-12 student in Indiana.

The Indiana Department of Education’s redesigned website **was** launched in January of 2012 **had** pages targeted to families, parents, and student, and **was** utilized to offer key information to each audience about the CCSS.

There are nearly 300 school districts across the state in addition to approximately 60 charter schools. Through a partnership with the Curriculum Institute, IDOE offered a series of three informational sessions around the state regarding the CCSS. Starting in June of 2011, nearly 900 curriculum directors, district-level administrators, and building-level administrators have participated in professional development sessions. Sessions planned for the end of 2011 through February of 2012 **add**ed instructional coaches to the target audiences. By February 2, 2012, an additional 600 participants received **ed** professional development on transitioning to the CCSS. The first three sessions **focus**ed on curriculum directors, district and building-level administrators, including school principals, and instructional coaches.

The following outlines the sessions’ targeted audience, scope, and number of participants.

#### **Session I**

**Intended Audience:** Curriculum directors and district-level administrators

#### **Overview:**

- Transitioning to the CCSS with the Indiana multi-year transition plan
- Update on the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) Consortium
- Strategies for utilizing Indiana’s Instructional and Assessment Guidance documents



- Discussion on the requirements of IAS versus the CCSS
- Development of a district-wide action plan

Session I		
Date	Location	Number of Participants
June 17, 2011	Indianapolis, IN	190
June 30, 2011	Indianapolis, IN	45
September 7, 2011	Plymouth, IN	56
September 8, 2011	Decatur, IN	76
October 14, 2011	Highland, IN	61
October 19, 2011	Jasper, IN	28
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>456</b>

### Session II

**Intended Audience:** Curriculum directors, district-level administrators, building-level administrators

**Overview:**

- Update on the PARCC content framework and additional resources
- Major shifts in mathematics and ELA
- Requirements of PARCC assessments versus the *ISTEP+* assessment
- Conducting a close reading of the standards

Session II		
Date	Location	Number of Participants
October 18, 2011	Connersville, IN	36
October 31, 2011	Fort Wayne, IN	172
November 1, 2011	Plymouth, IN	139
November 8, 2011	Highland, IN	52
November 9, 2011	Indianapolis, IN	36

December 6, 2011	Jasper, IN	32 registered thus far
January 24, 2012	West Lafayette, IN	30 registered thus far
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>435 (not including the 12/6 &amp; 1/24 sessions)</b>

**Session III**

**Intended Audience:** Curriculum directors, district-level administrators, building-level administrators, and instructional coaches

**Overview:**

- Update on the Indiana transition plan and available resources
- PARCC Model Content Frameworks
- The importance of Disciplinary Literacy, core competencies, and securely held content
- Mathematics Resource Analysis Tool

Session III		
Date	Location	Number of Participants (Current Registrations / Total Capacity)
January 10, 2012	Jasper, IN	19/32
January 11, 2012	Connersville, IN	31/36
January 17-18, 2012	Fort Wayne, IN	128/175
January 25, 2012	Highland, IN	22/100
January 30, 2012	Indianapolis, IN	27/75
January 31, 2012	Plymouth, IN	11/80
February 2, 2012	Plymouth, IN	16/80
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>TBD</b>

Participants asked for greater specificity regarding the design of curriculum and instruction around the new standards. Future sessions were planned to include specific content and

pedagogy related to implementing the Mathematical Practices, disciplinary literacy, the role of argument and evidence-based writing, and so forth.

In February 2012, IDOE planned follow up professional development focused on all teachers, as well as school principals. These sessions were specific to mathematics and E/LA CCSS. IDOE identified which teachers and principals participated, and planned to train representatives from each school district in the state, utilizing a train-the-trainer approach to scale up. The Learning Connection was leveraged to disseminate resources created through the teacher sessions described above.

IDOE continued to utilize larger conferences to scale up general awareness and professional development on the Common Core State Standards. One opportunity was the summer reading conference. In 2011, nearly 1,500 teachers, administrators, and parents attended the conference. IDOE also utilized large scale events hosted by our partners to raise awareness and understand of the CCSS. Conferences hosted by the American College for Education (ACE) in 2011 trained 500 teachers in mathematical practices and 200 reading teachers trained by Dr. Louisa Moats.

Indiana conducted additional outreach and dissemination of information on the CCSS to key stakeholders to increase awareness and understanding. With the support of PARCC, IDOE hired a full time Project Manager in early 2012 to coordinate the work of key action groups responsible for targeted aspects of the work identified below. These groups phased in over the course of one year, with the initial meeting of the Vision Team was in December of 2011. Coordinated by the Project Manager, each group was aligned its work with the others.

Group	Purpose
Vision Team	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify CCSS and PARCC vision for Indiana</li> <li>• Define key messages and expectations</li> <li>• Develop plan for Indiana based on strengths and needs</li> <li>• Determine SEA role</li> <li>• Define graduation implications</li> </ul>
Steering Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement vision</li> <li>• Define Functional Groups and appoint group leaders</li> <li>• Define delivery chain</li> </ul>
Functional Work Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create and deliver products and processes, as outlined by Steering Committee</li> </ul>

## Focus Groups

- Gather feedback from the field
- Ensure appropriate SEA support

A partnership between IDOE and the Indiana Commission for Higher Education forged a coordinated process to carry out outreach to higher education faculty and administrators about the transition to the CCSS and to PARCC. Indiana was one of ten states selected for a grant to assist K-12 and postsecondary education systems in alignment to the Common Core State Standards and assessments that will measure them.

The grant program, called Core to College: Preparing Students for College Readiness and Success, aimed to foster long-term collaborations between state higher education and K-12 entities that will improve student achievement and college readiness and ultimately, increased rates of enrollment and graduation. One key to this success was using the CCSS and assessments to establish a statewide common definition of college readiness to signal a student's preparedness for credit-bearing college courses. Having such a baseline informed processes to transition students successfully between high school and higher education environments.

#### Professional Development, Supports and Materials for CCSS

To support students with disabilities, professional development of local directors of special education and administrators will be required to implement the Acuity-Indiana IEP data comparison explained previously in this document. The delivery of this professional development is manageable and achievable in the near term. USDOE's Office of Special Education supports nine resource centers that build capacity in the delivery of instruction. Trainings are already offered on Acuity; more were added in 2012.

Indiana participated in the General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) through the National Alternate Assessment Center. This grant focused on creating a new alternate assessment to replace Indiana's current ISTAR alternate assessment. In 2012, IDOE explored utilization options for the new assessment. The new assessment measured students on the alternate standards based on the CCSS.

The GSEG grant required a specific work group dedicated to substantive professional development, which focused on how to appropriately and effectively teach students with cognitive impairments. It centers on how to provide appropriate instruction in English/Language arts, Mathematics, and all academic subjects. The professional development involved the curriculum, the standards of which will be the "core connections" to the CCSS.

As referenced above, in conjunction with the Curriculum Institute and the state's regional Education Service Centers (ESCs), IDOE developed and presented a three-part professional

development series on Indiana's plan for transitioning to the CCSS and the PARCC assessments. The purpose of these sessions **was** to assist district- and building-level administrators in moving from the current set of Indiana Academic Standards and *ISTEP+* to the CCSS and PARCC assessment. The sessions provided updates and discussion on the curriculum alignment guidance documents, instruction and assessment guidance documents, and the PARCC developments. Sessions II and III specifically targeted the building administrators.

Throughout the 2010-11 school year, IDOE specialists worked with teachers and university faculty to develop transition guidance documents. IDOE developed sixteen individual videos for Mathematics, E/LA, and 11 content areas. The videos explained the instructional changes that likely need to take place during the implementation of the CCSS as well as identify resources schools can use to better understand and implement these changes.

From October 2010 through February 2011, IDOE worked with Indiana teachers and the Charles A. Dana Center at the University of Texas Austin to evaluate the quality and alignment of Mathematics textbooks and curricular materials to the CCSS. IDOE made these reviews public, and the materials have been used widely to help districts understand the effect of the CCSS on local curriculum and instruction decisions. The state **was** engaged in a parallel process for the analysis of reading materials **that was** completed by March 2012, and **planned** to conduct a similar review for E/LA during the summer of 2012.

IDOE actively engaged educators in Indiana to support the CCSS in the development and delivery of aligned instructional materials. **In early 2011, IDOE** convened a “curriculum council” that vetted much of the materials the department distributed on the transition to the CCSS. The council helped determine the instructional priorities referenced immediately below. IDOE developed several instructional materials aligned to the CCSS, exemplified by the following:

- In conjunction with PARCC, IDOE developed content frameworks that will serve as a strong basis for future work;
- IDOE evaluated the alignment of Mathematics textbooks to the CCSS and is currently reviewing reading textbooks;
- The IDOE begin reviewing E/LA materials in **2012**;
- Indiana’s state-wide curriculum maps **were** revised and include “instructional priority” standards from the CCSS, which showed how to integrate the CCSS with the Indiana standards from now until 2014-15. Each year, IDOE provided an updated list of “instructional priorities;” and
- In the **Fall** of 2011 IDOE began the process of writing a Secondary Literacy Framework, which (1) provided guidance to school leaders on what the CCSS literacy standards mean and guidance on how they can be implemented; and (2) provided guidance to content-area teachers on how to incorporate these standards into existing lessons.

#### Accelerated Learning Opportunities

The vision of IDOE **was the** following: “The academic achievement and career preparation of all Indiana students will be the best in the United States and on par with the most competitive countries in the world.” The first pillar of the plan for achieving the vision **was to** “Create and promote a statewide culture of academic excellence, in which at least 25% of all graduates receive a score of 3, 4, or 5 on at least one Advanced Placement exam, a 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate exam, or receive the equivalent of 3 semester hours of college credit during their high school years.”

Providing all Indiana children with the academic preparation they will need to navigate a 21<sup>st</sup> Century global workplace began in earnest with the adoption of the P-16 Plan for Improving Student Achievement developed in 2003 by the Indiana Education Roundtable and the Indiana State Board of Education. The P-16 plan is an integrated approach to ensuring success for students at every level of education, providing an ongoing strategic framework for aligning policies, resources, and strategies in the state.

Indiana leaders in education reform consider Advanced Placement (AP) courses and exams, International Baccalaureate courses and exams, and quality Dual Credits to be an important part of the effort to provide high standards and high expectations for all students. Each year IDOE informs all district superintendents, high school principals, and high school test coordinators that the administration of the PSAT/NMSQT would be funded by the state for all grade 10 students attending state accredited high schools. This enables extensive use of AP Potential™ to identify students who are likely to experience success in taking AP courses and the related exams. This tool of the PSAT may also be used for identification in all advanced coursework. IDOE also offers extensive workshops and online trainings for using AP Potential™; schools are then provided user names and passwords to utilize this predictive tool. This encourages schools to expand enrollment in their AP course offerings and dual credit course offerings or perhaps offer courses for the first time. Additional educator workshops will include the Summary of Answers and Skills and the Skills Insight tools free to schools who administer the PSAT. Beginning in July 2009, high schools were encouraged to identify a specific teacher or administrator as an “AP Champion” to further promote more students in both Paid and Free/Reduced Lunch categories to enroll in Advanced Placement classes.

In 1990, Indiana's General Assembly passed legislation that created a Program for the Advancement of Mathematics and Science. This program was established to encourage students to pursue advanced courses in critical fields of career employment such as biomedical sciences and engineering. Mathematics and science courses were judged to be critical for the continued economic welfare of the state. By July 1, 1994, each school corporation was required to provide Advanced Placement courses in Mathematics and science for students who were qualified to take them, and funds were provided to cover the cost of those exams and training for teachers. In 2011 this was 21,388 exams, up from 19,847 exams in 2010. Federal grant monies have traditionally paid for all AP exams for students on free/reduced lunch – thus eliminating the barrier for low income students (low income students accounted for 6,881 exams in 2011 and 5,588 exams in 2010).

The adoption of the Core 40 diploma has focused additional attention on the AP, International Baccalaureate (IB) and Dual Credit programs and has contributed to increasing numbers of students enrolled in each. Core 40 became the minimum diploma for all students entering high school in 2006. The additional requirements for the Core 40 with Academic Honors diploma include fulfilling one of five options: completion of two Advanced Placement courses and the associated exams, completion of two quality dual credit courses (equivalent to six college credits), a combination of Advanced Placement and dual credit courses to earn the required advanced academic credits, a minimum SAT or ACT score, or earning the full IB Diploma. 79% of Indiana students completed Core 40 curriculum in the 2009-10 academic year. Of these, 30% qualified for the Core 40 with Academic Honors diploma.

In 2010, the Indiana General Assembly passed House Bill 1135/Public Law 91, better known as the “AP Law.” This law provides that starting with the 2011 Advanced Placement exams, a student who earns a score of three or higher shall receive college credit toward his/her degree if he/she attends any Indiana public institution of higher education; this includes all two-year and four-year schools and any accompanying satellites. The actual number of exam scores of three or higher in 2011 was 22,954, which is over 18% more than in 2010. This translates into 68,862 college credit hours and a truly significant amount of college savings for students and their families.

In May, 2011, the Indiana Commission for Higher Education released a policy that limits the fees that public higher education institutions offering dual enrollment courses in the high school may charge high school students. This eliminates financial barriers for high school students taking college-level courses. Additionally Ivy Tech Community College, and all of its fourteen campuses statewide, has made a commitment to provide all dual enrollment courses that are offered in the high school setting to students at no cost.

Indiana has out-paced the national average in growth of students taking Advanced Placement exams, the number of test takers, and scores of three, four, and five:

- Indiana test takers grew by 9.7% in 2010-2011 (38,418 total) and 28.1% in 2009-2010 as compared to the national growth of 7% in 2010-2011 and 9.5% in 2009-2010.
- Growth in the number of exams taken in Indiana was 11.3% in 2010-2011 and 29.2% in 2009-2010 compared to the national growth of 7.6% in 2010-2011 and 10.2% in 2009-2010.
- The number of scores of 3, 4, or 5 increased by 16.8% in 2010-2011 and 13.3% in 2009-2010 as compared to 7.6% nationally in 2010-2011 and 8.3% in 2009-2010.

Access to AP is part of the overall achievement goal –to see increases in both access and success in all student demographic categories. The number of black students who passed an AP exam in Indiana in 2011 increased by 27% in one year and 123 percent in 5 years; Hispanic students who passed an AP exam increased by 25% in one year and 200% in five years.

Indiana has also demonstrated notable growth in the number of high schools that offer the IB

Diploma Program for students since the first school was authorized in 1986 to the 100% increase shown below. Twenty high schools around the state now offer the IB Diploma. Additionally three middle schools and three primary schools have been authorized to offer the full IB program for grades K-10. This growth exemplifies the concern of Indiana high schools to offer high-achieving students diverse and ever-broadening opportunities in preparing for success beyond high school.

#### Growth of Indiana High Schools Authorized to Offer IB Diploma Program

	1986	1995	2002	2004	2006	2007	2008	2009	2011
<b>Number of additional schools</b>		2	1	1	7	1	3	1	0
<b>Total IB schools</b>	1	3	4	7	14	15	18	19	20

Enrollment in IB classes now includes a significant number of low-income students as determined by Indiana's guidelines for the free and reduced lunch program. The number of low-income students registering for IB exams in May 2011 also indicates a projected increase of 75% from those projected to take the May 2010 exams. This continuing increase is explained primarily by the greater number of low-income IB students in the most recently authorized IB World schools.

To further support high schools and middle schools in the expansion of rigorous college-preparatory coursework, the Indiana General Assembly in 2011 passed the Mitch Daniels Early Graduation Scholarship. This scholarship allows students to graduate from high school in three years and apply the \$4,000 that would have been appropriated to the secondary school to the post-secondary institution on behalf of that student in the form of a scholarship. To make allowance for students to do this, schools may offer high school courses to qualified middle school students. Schools may also award students credit for courses by demonstration of proficiency.

The drive toward better college preparedness includes increasing the percentage of students completing the more rigorous requirements of Indiana's Core 40 diploma, Core 40 diploma with Academic or Technical Honors, and the IB Diploma. High student achievement is supported through implementing End-of-Course Assessments designed to ensure the quality, consistency, and rigor of Core 40 courses across the state. The state vision to have 25% of all Indiana graduates earn quality college credits has changed the culture of our schools, by asking each to support the student's success beyond K-12.

Schools in Hendricks County, near Indianapolis, created a cooperative to expand their dual credit programs. If one school in the county offers dual credit calculus, students from all other county schools may attend. Another example of culture change is at Speedway High School in Indianapolis where the local education foundation supported payments to students and teachers for passing AP exams. These one-time \$100 payments for each assessment



passed changed students' approach to testing and teachers' approach to instruction.

Northwest Indiana schools are collaborating to purchase a membership in the National Student Clearinghouse so they can track their own students' successes in post-secondary enrollment. This tracking will include persistence rates, graduation rates and grade point averages. This data will enable schools to take a close look at how their students fare in higher education.

Additionally, more schools than ever have adopted online providers for AP courses. These online courses are primarily delivered in schools that are too small to house a full AP program or in schools that want to offer the entire menu of AP courses but cannot afford to hire all the staff. This new access to AP for all students is a major shift in practice.

Indiana's A-F school grading metrics include a College and Career Ready metric. The College and Career Ready (CCR) metric has four indicators: passing an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, passing an International Baccalaureate (IB) exam, earning at three college credits (typically through Dual Credit), and earning an Industry Certification (Cert). Students demonstrating proficiency on any one of those metrics are counted in the numerator of the equation and no student is counted twice on a single metric or across metrics (it is an unduplicated count) – this allows for a percent of graduates at each school demonstrating proficiency on at least one of four very strong indicators of success beyond high school may be measured. The measure was built intentionally with four possible options for students (and schools) to demonstrate proficiency because while every Indiana school is required to deliver at least two AP courses and at least two dual credit courses (see below), some focus more on AP courses while others choose to focus more on dual credit courses. Additionally about twenty-two schools choose to provide IB courses and exams, and Industry Certifications are growing annually.

In 2006, the Indiana General Assembly passed a statute requiring all schools to provide at least two AP courses and at least two Dual Credit courses (IC 20-30-10-4 and IC 20-36-3-5). Concurrently, the legislature enacted legislation to support schools' pursuit thereof, including funding to pay for all math and science AP exams for all students, professional development monies (IC 20-36-3-8), and making sure free/reduced lunch students may take dual credit courses at no cost (IC 21-43-5-11). Free/reduced lunch students may take any AP exam at no cost due to federal appropriations.

In 2009, **IDOE** issued statewide goals of 90-25-90: 90% of students must pass the state mandatory annual assessments, 25% of students must graduate high school either passing an AP exam (scores of 3 or higher), or an IB exam (score of 4 or higher), or earn college credits (dual credits) or industry certifications, and 90% of students must graduate. These expectations apply to all Indiana schools and drive the metrics and methodology for the state's new accountability model, "A-F."

The setting of school and statewide goals around tangible targets coupled with mass

communication throughout the field of the significant state support for college-level courses proved beneficial to students immediately and is best evidenced by the following data points:

- (1) In 2009, 635 Black Indiana graduates took an AP exam. In 2010, that total jumped to 1,016 (60% growth). The previous one-year high for growth for this subgroup was 28%.
- (2) In 2009, 432 Hispanic Indiana graduates took an AP exam. In 2010, that total jumped to 738 (71% growth). The previous one-year high growth for this subgroup was 13%.

In fact, Indiana’s increase in student AP exam participation in 2010 was highest in the nation and its increase in the percentage of graduates passing an AP exam in 2010 was second highest. Preliminary analyses for 2011 results suggest that Indiana will land in a similar place again nationally.

In 2010, Indiana educational stakeholders formed the Indiana Dual Credit Advisory Council (IDCAC) to primarily handle the “explosion” in dual credit enrollments and the offering of too many courses that do not transfer to at least Indiana colleges. The council is comprised of members from K-12, higher education, think tanks, and the Indiana state legislature. IDCAC was concerned with the proliferation of dual credit offerings and enrollments throughout the state --which was growing too fast – and many of which were not transferable credits. An outcome of the group was the establishment of a list of Priority Liberal Arts and Priority Career and Technical Education courses which were determined based on their record of transferability and high enrollments. These courses receive state support through higher education state appropriations, are capped at a cost of \$25 per credit hour (Ivy Tech Community College, the state community college system, offers all of its classes for free), are the only courses that count for students pursuing the Academic or Technical Honors diploma (beginning for the class of 2016), and are the only courses that count for the College and Career Ready metric in the state’s new accountability measure (effective this year). These policies taken together help focus Indiana’s fast growing dual credit student participation around courses that carry the greatest relevancy and currency for its graduates when they enter post-secondary institutions.

Starting in 2006, Indiana has strategically aligned its resources around building one of the most robust College and Career Ready systems in the country ensuring that schools have the ability to provide these options to all students. This strategic plan is already proving successful and will continue to foster greater student preparedness to succeed in college and/or a career.

#### Educator Preparation and Licensing

Indiana engaged in a systematic reform to create an educational system that produces graduates who are able to compete successfully with students from across the nation and around the world. Attaining this vision involves reforms to all facets of Indiana’s educational

system, including educator preparation and licensing.

One part of the reform effort has involved educator licensing requirements. The Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA), enacted in 2010, revised Indiana’s educator licensing structure to emphasize content knowledge as follows:

- Elementary teachers (K to 6) must earn a baccalaureate degree consisting of an education major with a content-area minor OR a content area-major with an education major.
- Secondary teachers (5 to 12) must earn a baccalaureate degree consisting of any applicable content-area major—as well as a minor in education.

In spring of 2010, IDOE sought a contractor to develop high quality educator standards to support REPA and to provide guidance to educator preparation programs as they revise their programs to meet the state’s new licensing requirements. IDOE also stipulated that the standards would be grounded in scientifically-based research and aligned with IAS and the CCSS.

IDOE contracted with Pearson to develop the Indiana Developmental and Content Standards for Educators, which include educator standards in 46 content and administrative areas and at five school setting developmental levels. The standards are grounded in scientifically based research and are aligned with REPA, the IAS, Indiana Core Standards, the CCSS for Mathematics and for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects, standards of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), and other relevant standards of national professional organizations.

The Indiana educator standards are custom-designed for Indiana and articulate IDOE’s expectations regarding the content and pedagogical knowledge and skills that are important for Indiana educators. The primary focus of the 46 content-area standards is the subject-matter knowledge and skills needed to teach effectively in Indiana classrooms or to provide effective leadership in Indiana schools. The primary focus of the five school setting developmental standards is on the pedagogical knowledge and skills needed to teach in various school settings.

Indiana has standards that specifically address the following areas in the pedagogy standards:

School Setting	Standard Addressing English Learners	Standard Addressing Students with Disabilities	Standard Addressing Working with Low-Achieving Students
Early	1.6, 3.4, 4.5	1.5, 3.4, 4.4,	4.6

Childhood		6.8		
Elementary School	1.6, 3.6, 4.3	1.5, 3.6, 4.3, 6.10	3.10, 4.5	
Middle School	1.7, 3.6, 4.3	1.6, 3.6, 4.3, 6.8	3.10, 4.4, 7.2	
Secondary School	1.4, 1.6, 3.6, 4.3	1.5, 3.6, 4.3, 6.8	3.10, 4.4, 7.2	

In addition, Indiana has licensure content areas for teachers to gain additional certification in exceptional needs: mild intervention, exceptional needs: intense intervention, and teachers of English Learners.

IDOE developed customized licensure assessments in collaboration with Evaluation Systems to measure candidates' mastery of the new teacher standards. Content tests for all licensure areas will be developed and required for licensure. In addition, candidates will also complete a pedagogy assessment for licensure. Implementation of content and pedagogy tests occurred on February 10, 2014. A basic skills test aligned to the Indiana's Standards was developed and was required for admission to any teacher preparation program in Indiana. This test was implemented July 1, 2013.

IDOE worked with Evaluation Systems in the design of the data systems for the new licensure assessment system. Aggregate data on candidate performance per domain (logical groupings of individual standards) is provided to each teacher preparation program for review and program feedback.

IDOE is beginning the process of developing an accountability system for teacher preparation programs. The end result will mirror the P-12 accountability system which provides an easily understood A-F letter grade. A teacher preparation advisory group was established in the Fall of 2011 and began to determine sources of evidence, benchmarks, and applicable metrics recommendations.

Providing teacher preparation programs with a clear blueprint of state expectations through the standards, providing quality assessments and data reporting on candidate competency on these measurements, and reporting outcomes publically in a clearly communicated accountability system will ensure teacher preparation programs will better prepare teachers to teach all students.

New principal and superintendent standards were adopted at the same time the new teacher standards were developed.

The administrator standards begin with the following statement:

The School Building Leader standards reflect the most current research on effective educational leadership and advance a new and powerful vision of principal effectiveness. The standards define those skills and abilities that school leaders must possess to produce greater levels of success for all students. Bringing significant improvement to student achievement and teacher effectiveness requires an unapologetic focus on the principal's role as driver of student growth and achievement.

The standards provide a basis for professional preparation, growth, and accountability. However, the standards should not be viewed as ends in themselves; rather, they provide clarity for building leaders about the actions they are expected to take in order to drive student achievement and teacher effectiveness outcomes.

This statement indicates the expectation that the building principal first serve as the driver of student growth. All other roles and responsibilities should be in alignment with this primary function. New licensure assessments **were** developed, with implementation of new tests beginning September 1, 2013. Test development **was** customized to standards to ensure candidates have met state expectations as outlined in the standards document.

Indiana's plan to improve the preparation of incoming teachers and principals has three steps.

Step 1 – Provide rigorous, high quality standards that clearly communicate state expectations for teacher licensure programs.

Step 2 – Customize assessments that measure the standards to ensure candidates are well prepared. Provide timely specific outcome data aligned to standards regularly to programs to drive program improvement.

Step 3 – Design metrics for data collection on multiple measures to be applied to all teacher preparation programs to ensure accountability.

Indiana completed Step 1 in 2010, and programs will be required to fully implement those standards by 2013 in 515-IAC-9-1-2 Sec 2(d). Indiana is aggressively working on Step 2 with test implementation beginning September 1, 2013. Initial conversations on Step 3 began in **F**all of 2011 with the expectation of having an accountability system in place by 2014-2015.

#### Assessment

Indiana's assessment system is robust and comprehensive to prepare students at each grade level on their way to becoming college and career ready by the end of high school.

Assessments are standards-driven, student-centered, and learning-focused, and the curricular aims prepare students for post-secondary success. The assessment system supports learning-based and data-driven instruction; performance evaluation and

improvement; and accountability for educators, schools and school corporations.

### *Diagnostic Assessments*

Indiana’s assessment system begins with diagnostic assessments in grades K-2. Assessments at this level are focused on literacy and numeracy as they assess the student’s ability to read, comprehend, and use numbers. Wireless Generation’s tools, *mCLASS: Reading* and *mCLASS: Math*, are used to measure student progress in K-2.

Diagnostic assessments in grades 3-8 are also part of Indiana’s assessment system. Student learning in the content areas of English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies is measured using CTB/McGraw-Hill’s *Acuity* tools. Indiana also provides the *Acuity Algebra* program for schools.

Both *mCLASS* and *Acuity* provide immediate results, actionable reports, and instructional activities, which enable teachers to address the individual learning needs of students. In addition, professional development related to data analysis and using results to inform instruction plays an important role in the use of these diagnostic programs.

Acuity testing is widely used across the state: 90% of school districts use this assessment. Indiana implemented Acuity as a part of an updated assessment system that began in the spring of 2009, and the state budget contains a grant that allows all schools (grades 3-8 and Algebra 1) to use the Acuity assessments in either a diagnostic (4 times a year) or predictive (3 times a year) format, at no cost. The grant requires that all students, except those with the most significant disabilities, participate in the chosen format. Acuity also can be used “on demand” by educators to assess student mastery of standards at any time. Acuity tools not only provide detailed diagnostics but also deliver individualized links to instructional resources. IDOE also provides training to schools, not only on how to administer the test but how to interpret the data and use that to drive instruction.

Acuity is used as a tool that can be taken off grade level, and teachers can identify what material students have truly mastered. Teachers can do diagnosis any time they want. IDOE has recently launched enhancements to a series of reports that allow users to toggle between an Indiana view and a CCSS view of the current Acuity assessments. IDOE is currently working with our assessment vendor to build a fully-aligned common core specific version of Acuity.

As mentioned above, Acuity can be used to determine if special education students are close on track to pass a standardized assessment. There are two versions or delivery formats which schools select from, diagnostic (4 times a year) or predictive (3 times per year). For all students, the sequence of three assessments provides a prediction of how likely the student will be to pass the ISTEP+ test.

Each district must select one format to deliver; either diagnostic or predictive. Once they have the tests, they must be administered to all students. Acuity is not exclusive to a particular group and it does not exclude a group.

### *Accountability Assessments*

Indiana's assessment system includes summative assessments for students in grades 3-8. The *Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress-Plus (ISTEP+)* measures student progress in English/language arts and mathematics at each grade level, in addition to science in grades 4 and 6 and social studies in grades 5 and 7. *ISTEP+* is comprised of two assessment windows: the first window includes open-ended items in the four content areas as well as a writing prompt; the second window consists of multiple-choice items. *ISTEP+* at the high school level is implemented as End-of-Course Assessments (ECAs) in Algebra I, English 10, and Biology I.

Special populations are also part of Indiana's assessment system. The *Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR)* program measures student achievement in the subject areas of English/language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies based on alternate academic achievement standards. *ISTAR* is a web-based system that utilizes teacher ratings. The Case Conference Committee determines, based on the eligibility criteria adopted by the Indiana State Board of Education and the student's individual and unique needs, whether a student with a disability will be assessed with *ISTAR*.

The *LAS Links* assessment is used to determine a student's level of English proficiency. The placement test, administered upon the student's arrival in the United States, is used to determine the EL services appropriate for the student. The annual assessment, administered in January and February, is used to determine the student's current level of English proficiency and is used for accountability purposes.

### *Other Assessments*

The *Indiana Reading Evaluation and Determination (IREAD-3)* assessment measures foundational reading standards through grade 3. Based on the Indiana Academic Standards, IREAD-3 is a summative assessment developed in accordance with 2010's Public Law 109 which "requires the evaluation of reading skills for students who are in grade three beginning in the Spring of 2012 to ensure that all students can read proficiently before moving on to grade four."

The *Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting of Kindergarten Readiness (ISTAR-KR)* is a web-based instrument rated by teachers to measure skills in children from infancy to kindergarten. A derivative of Indiana's Early Learning Standards (which are part of the Foundations to Indiana Academic Standards), *ISTAR-KR* is aligned to the Indiana Standards for Kindergarten in the areas of English/language arts and mathematics and includes three functional areas: physical, personal care and social-emotional skills. Data from *ISTAR-KR* assessments are used for state reporting for PK students receiving special education, and the assessment can be used for local purposes for grades PK through 1.

The *National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)*, also known as "The Nation's Report Card," is used to demonstrate performance over time for a selected sample within Indiana. This assessment is administered annually to students in grades 4, 8, and 12 and can be used to compare student performance across the United States. During selected assessment cycles, *Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)*, *Program for International Student Assessment (PISA)*, and *Progress in International Reading Study (PIRLS)* are administered in conjunction with the *NAEP* assessment.

The variety of assessment tools encompassed within Indiana's assessment system provide vertical articulation through a student's entire K-12 experience, enabling teachers, parents, schools, and school corporations to anticipate, determine, and address learning as it occurs. Indiana's assessment system drives and measures each student's annual academic progress and overall preparation for post-secondary success.

The first PARCC assessment results describing the college and career readiness of Indiana's high school will not be available until well after the end of the 2014-15 school year. To begin the evolution toward those more demanding assessments based on the CCSS, Indiana has entered into agreements with ACT and College Board to pilot the interim use of their assessment suites as measures of college- and career- readiness to provide transition to the CCSS expectations for Indiana high schools. Both of the terminal instruments (ACT and SAT) have existing (pre-CCSS) determinations of college readiness. The Indiana graduating class of 2011 had only 31% of students who **chose** to take the ACT meet the all four of ACT's college ready benchmarks. To prepare students, parents, schools, teachers and the community for the rigor of the anticipated PARCC performance standards, all of the IDOE's reporting will use the available "College Ready" benchmarks.

Indiana currently pays for all sophomores in the state to take the PSAT. Based on the results of independent studies, Indiana will determine whether this test continues to provide the most beneficial information to students and schools in driving growth of college and career readiness as defined in the CCSS or if another element in either assessment suite provides information better aligned to measuring college and career readiness. If the SAT or ACT is chosen, IDOE would report the metric of college and career readiness for each high school and the state as a whole.

The Indiana Growth Model uses longitudinal student achievement data to estimate student growth. If strong alignment can be established between the 8<sup>th</sup> grade ISTEP+ assessments and the ACT/CB suites, Indiana would be able to incorporate growth measures into the high school data stream immediately. This will allow Indiana to provide student, classroom and school growth data for decision making and accountability well in advance of its availability from the PARCC assessment system.

Indiana's growth measures are based on ISTEP+ results for students in grades 4-8. This means that students in grades K-3 are excluded from these calculations, as are students taking the ISTAR or IMAST alternative test in lieu of ISTEP+. Most special education students



in Indiana take ISTEP+, while only a small percentage takes the ISTAR or IMAST.

It is important to note, however, that all students are calculated in the proficiency component of the new accountability model (ISTEP + IMAST + ISTAR). The proficiency side of the model remains the primary tool of the model while growth serves as a supplement that is utilized to reward schools for showing significant student improvement or to penalize schools that allow students to fall behind their peers.

Given the way ISTAR and IMAST are scaled it is simply not possible to calculate growth from one year to the next on these assessments. Of note, however, is that 97% of special education students in Indiana take the ISTEP+ for accountability purposes and therefore have growth model results and are included in the growth calculations.

At the high school level, Indiana is not able to calculate growth because of the non-linear relationship between the assessments (something we expect the new PARCC assessment will change). Instead, the state accountability model looks at proficiency rates and improvement. These calculations include all secondary students, incorporating the performance of students on the ISTEP+ and ISTAR (IMAST is not an option on the high school assessments).

The only students exempt from growth or improvement calculations are English Language Learner students who are LAS Links Level 1 proficient who are Level 1 for the first time and never tested at a higher level and LAS Links Level 2 proficient students who are Level 2 for the first time and never tested at a higher level – both of these levels of testers lack the language skills to comprehend the questions on ISTEP+. These students are excluded from the calculations only if they show growth on the LAS Links test and no student may exempt for more than two years, regardless of their current proficiency level on the Las Links exam (levels 1-5). The only students that do not have to show growth to be excluded are the first time Level 1 students, which serves as a replacement to the current exemption for students who have been in the country for less than a year.

This change in policy would serve as an added incentive for students to consider “what comes next” as an additional accountability measure for high schools and as a transition to the rigor of measures the CCSS and the PARCC assessment will bring to Indiana high schools.

The state’s pilot includes an independent evaluation and a timeline for making a recommendation at the end of this school year on adopting stronger Indiana college and career readiness tools and indicators for school years 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15.

Indiana worked with content committees and the state’s testing vendor on making changes to the 3-8 assessments within the current requirements of ESEA, current state contracts and available assessment dollars.

1. At each grade level and in both CCSS content areas, Indiana assessment and content specialists have begun the initial process of “double mapping” Indiana’s test items to the CCSS. During the Winter and Spring of 2012, larger practitioner committees met

to review and refine the mapping and alignment to CCSS and determine at which grade levels and content areas of the Common Core standards there are sufficient items to report CCSS data in addition to the regular Indiana standards results. These committees prepared recommendations for Indiana’s Expert Panel on the levels (student, classroom, and or school) which they believe this interim information will provide the most benefit. Indiana will rely on the Expert Panel for guidance on the most appropriate metric and methodology to use in reporting.

2. IDOE worked with the state’s test vendor on the remaining item development in the current contract to move (with the constraints of the current test blueprints) toward more “PARCC-like” items, selecting passages based on the proportion of reading types required by the CCSS and selecting those passages with a deliberate review of the range of text complexity.
3. Finally, Indiana joined Achieve, Student Achievement Partners and other states in collaboratively investigating a more systematic and cost effective process to better aligning state tests during this transition period with the common core and with PARCC. A short chain of emails explaining these efforts is located at Attachment 12. The steps involved include the following:
  - Identify the biggest shifts in the CCSS – the standards that result in the most significant changes teachers are likely to experience with regard to expectations for student learning and for instructional practices
  - Help each state determine the priority standards it wishes to incorporate into revised assessments, either as substitutes for existing items or as additions to the existing items.
  - Provide specifications and/or models for items associated with the key standards, including item types, which states can provide to their test vendors. These specifications are already under development for the PARCC item development ITN; consequently the participating states would be asking their vendors to develop items using the same specifications that will guide the development of PARCC assessments. Multiple states can draw on the same specifications to modify their own tests.

### Legislative action causing a shift in college and career ready standards and assessments

During the 2013 legislative session, the Indiana General Assembly passed HEA1427 (1B Attachment 1) requiring the implementation of college-and career-ready standards by July 1, 2014. In 2014, the Indiana General Assembly then passed SEA91 (1B Attachment 2), which voided the previously adopted set of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) upon the adoption of new college-and career-ready standards. The new standards for Mathematics and English/Language Arts were adopted by the SBOE on April 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014, upon the recommendation of the Indiana Education Roundtable (1B Attachments 3, 4 and 5) The Education Roundtable reviewed the standards that were developed by multiple panels of educators from across Indiana (1B Attachment 6). After the panels completed their work, a College and Career Ready panel (panel of higher education institution and career experts)

reviewed the proposed standards and recommended them to the Education Roundtable for approval. This panel’s task was to certify that students who meet the standards will not need remedial course work at the post-secondary level. (1B Attachment 7 )On May 28<sup>th</sup>, 2014 the Commissioner for Higher Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction certified that Indiana had completed its work in adopting college-and career-ready standards. (1B Attachment 8 )All newly adopted standards are available on IDOE’s website: <http://www.doe.in.gov/standards>

HEA1427(2013) also prohibited Indiana’s participation in any consortium concerning standards or assessments. As such, Indiana’s plan to utilize the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness of College and Careers (PARCC) assessment was no longer a viable option under Indiana law. Consequently, the Governor and Superintendent of Public Instruction sent letters to remove Indiana from the PARCC Governing Board, effective August 12, 2013. (1B Attachment 9 and 10)

As Indiana was already implementing Common Core State Standards when the General Assembly acted in 2013 and 2014, educators had already transitioned to college and ready standards in their classrooms. The newly adopted standards are also college and career ready, and as such Indiana teachers and students will be able to continue to prepare for college and careers.

Indiana was an earlier adopter of the Common Core State Standards and has been working with educators since 2011 in transitioning classroom practice and standards to align to college and career ready expectations. Therefore, there were many lessons learned during that transition from Indiana Academic Standards to Common Core, and IDOE has designed strategies for supporting educators in this most recent adoption in a very targeted approach.

#### **Technical Assistance for the Transition and Implementation of the college- and career-ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014)**

Prior to the adoption of the new Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014), IDOE was preparing to support LEAs, schools, administrators, and teachers as they plan for the 2014-15 school year. IDOE’s vision for standards transition and implementation was first presented to the State Board of Education (SBOE) on March 12, 2014. (1B Attachment 11)

IDOE outlined four goals in regards to supporting LEAs, schools, and educators as they transition to the new college- and career- ready standards:

- **100% Responsiveness**
- **100% Awareness**
- **100% Support**
- **100% Engagement**

To meet the goal of **100% Responsiveness**, IDOE issued a needs assessment survey in the Spring of 2014, and sought input from educators as to the most important supports IDOE could provide to assist with the transition to, and implementation of, the new Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014).

The image shows a screenshot of a web-based survey titled "College & Career Ready Standards Needs Assessment". The survey asks respondents to "Indicate which supports will be most useful to you:" and provides a list of options with checkboxes:

- Standards Correlation documents
- Quarterly instructional guidance for instruction
- Model content frameworks
- Videos on instructional shifts, disciplinary literacy, new resources..
- Curriculum maps
- Live PD offered by IDOE specialists/authorized partners
- Rubric for textbook/digital content alignment to standards
- Rubric for lesson plan alignment to standards
- Other

At the bottom of the form is a "Submit" button.

The survey collected data from the field to help IDOE identify and prioritize the resources to be developed and distributed to educators. The survey closed on May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and IDOE received feedback from 1,835 respondents – most of whom self-identified as teachers – that the most highly needed supports included:

- Rubrics for lesson plan alignment to the standards;
- Model Content Frameworks; and
- Resources for Special Populations (students with disabilities, English learners, and High Ability Students).

IDOE is responding to the feedback by prioritizing resources aligned to the most demanded supports. IDOE expects to publish the most highly demanded supports on a rolling basis beginning in July of 2014. Thereafter, IDOE will launch additional needs assessment surveys to ensure the needs of educators are continuing to be met.

To meet the **100% Awareness goal**, IDOE is conducting an intentional strategic outreach and dissemination campaign specific to the newly adopted college and career ready standards during the Summer of 2014. IDOE intends to leverage our best opportunities to raise awareness of K-12 educators and administrators as they plan for the 2014-2015 school year. IDOE has created a new logo to create a fresh new visual for all resources published by IDOE so education stakeholders can readily identify the new resources as part of the new college-

and career- ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014) portfolio.



To facilitate educator awareness, IDOE will also use desktop delivery models to provide easy access to information as well as social media. IDOE’s communication tools such as its website, the Learning Connection, and DOE Dialogue will continue to convey all official resources to education stakeholders. A new Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014) web page hub: [www.doe.in.gov/standards](http://www.doe.in.gov/standards) has been developed to consolidate all official IDOE standards related guidance and documents into one user-friendly location. All postings are branded and date stamped to indicate they are components of the new standards portfolio of resources. Importantly, the new hub leads to specific resources dedicated to special populations so high ability students, students with disabilities, and EL students are able to access the new standards as fully and widely as their peers. Over the Summer of 2014, teachers of special population students will be able to access resources specific for their classroom curriculum and instruction.

Finally, the new standards hub will also serve as a source of information for parents and community members. IDOE staff are working to identify existing and emerging resources specifically intended for non-educators, such as parents and guardians, parent organizations, and business/industry stakeholders.

On a rolling basis, IDOE specialists will post a selection of existing resources specific to those audiences and communicate in a way to promote access and understanding, such as resources in other languages, resources that are non-technical in nature and written in lay terms, or resources that relate standards as knowledge, skills, or abilities for the classroom or the workplace. One example for E/LA might be a resource making the case for on why media literacy – a new strand in Indiana’s new standards - is important in the 21<sup>st</sup> century classroom. In mathematics, a resource describing how problem solving is a commonly demanded skill for today’s workplace may be included.

Additionally, IDOE is leveraging key summer conferences to reach the 100% awareness goal. Each year, IDOE partners with schools across the state to offer “Summer of eLearning” conferences for educators. These highly anticipated and well-attended conferences provide

participants with the opportunity to learn about the new Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts & Mathematics (2014), to locate and explore support materials for the transition, and to join in new online communities of practice launched by IDOE. The communities of practice can be found on IDOE's website:

<http://www.doe.in.gov/elearning/2014-summer-elearning>. In 2013, nearly ten percent of Indiana's educators attended the "Summer of eLearning" regional conferences. In 2014, IDOE is expanding the opportunity for more educators, offering the 19 regional conferences. Crossfunctional teams of IDOE staff will be attending each of these conferences to raise awareness and answer questions about the new college- and career- ready Standards. In addition, these teams will also present during the Summer of 2014 at seven World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) Conferences, aimed at meeting the needs of English learners.

### Summer of eLearning Conferences

Location	Date
Perry Central Jr./Sr. High School (Leopold)	June 2, 2014
Center Grove High School (Greenwood)	June 10, 2014
Yorktown High School (Yorktown)	June 11, 2014
Northfield High School of MSD of Wabash County (Wabash)	June 12, 2014
East Noble High School (Kendallville)	June 13, 2014
Lafayette Jefferson High School (Lafayette)	June 17, 2014
Lowell Senior High School (Lowell)	June 18, 2014
Clinton Central Elementary (Michigantown)	June 19, 2014
Danville Community High School (Danville)	June 20, 2014
Batesville High School (Batesville)	June 24, 2014
South Vermillion Middle School	June 25, 2014
Scottsburg Middle School (Scottsburg)	June 25, 2014
Clay Middle School (Carmel)	July 8, 2014
Evansville Central High School (Evansville)	July 9, 2014
Richmond High School (Richmond)	July 15, 2014
Clark Middle School (Vincennes)	July 15, 2014
Jeffersonville High School (Jeffersonville)	July 21, 2014
Warsaw Community High School (Warsaw)	July 28, 2014
Chesterton High School (Chesterton)	August 5, 2014

### WIDA/English Learner Development Standards Professional Development

Location	Date
Monroe County Education Resource Center (Bloomington)	June 10, 2014
University of Saint Francis (Fort Wayne)	June 12, 2014
North Central High School (Indianapolis)	June 13, 2014
SCH Administration Center (Hammond)	June 24, 2014
Perry Township Administration Building (Indianapolis)	June 27, 2014

Forest Manor Professional Development Center (Indianapolis)	July 16, 2014
Perry Township Administration Building (Indianapolis)	July 17, 2014

Finally, IDOE staff are scheduled for presentations about the standards during annual large-scale Indiana statewide association meetings over the Summer and Fall of 2014. These annual events draw thousands of teachers, administrators, and LEA staff, allowing IDOE to strategically target large audiences to disseminate information about the new standards and assessments, resources, professional development opportunities, and future technical assistance.

#### Annual Statewide Association meetings

Indiana Urban Schools Association	June 18, 2014
Indiana State Teachers Association	June 19, 2014 (2 sessions)
Indiana School Boards Association	July 8, 2014 (2 sessions)
Indiana Black Expo	July 17, 2014 (number of sessions TBD)
Indiana Non-public Education Association	October 24, 2014 (2 sessions)

In addition to these key live events, educators can access guidance, FAQs, and post questions and comments in professional communities and fora on the Learning Connection. The Learning Connection hosts 81,943 active educator users, who have access to WebEx recordings, training modules, legal guidance, and sample documents. It is free and open to teachers, administrators, students, and parents. IDOE specialists, including specialists serving special populations, will continue to publish official materials on the Learning Connection to ensure all stakeholders have access to information about and resources aligned to the new standards.

To meet the goal of **100% Support**, IDOE staff created two documents that were provided to educators on June 2, 2014, these documents included:

- standards correlation guides
- standards vertical articulations

These resources constitute IDOE’s first tier priority, based on experience in transitioning to new standards. The standards correlation documents are available via IDOE’s standards resources web page: <http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/resources>.

The standards correlation documents offer a side-by-side layout of former and new standards, as well as comparative analysis of the various standards. The correlation documents have proven to be invaluable for teachers as they plan their classroom instruction, allowing teachers to readily identify what resources, lesson plans, and content may already be aligned to the adopted standards. The side-by-side layout also facilitates easy understanding of how specific standards from various sets are similar or dissimilar to one another. An example of an E/LA standards correlation page for 6<sup>th</sup> grade is found in the table immediately below.

Indiana Academic Standards 2014	Indiana Academic Standards 2006	Indiana Common Core State Standards 2010	Differences from Previous Standards
<b>READING: Literature</b>			
<b>6.RL.1: Read a variety of literature within a range of complexity appropriate for grades 6-8. By the end of grade 6, students interact with texts proficiently and independently at the low end of the range and with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.</b>	6.1.1: Read aloud grade-level-appropriate poems and literary and informational texts fluently and accurately and with appropriate timing, changes in voice, and expression.	RL.10: By the end of the year, read and comprehend literature, including stories, dramas, and poems, in the grades 6-8 text complexity band proficiently, with scaffolding as needed at the high end of the range.	This IAS 2014 Learning Outcome is an umbrella standard that clarifies the expectation that students are able to interact proficiently and independently at the low end of the range of complexity by the end of grade 6.
<b>6.RL.2.1: Cite textual evidence to support analysis of what a text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.</b>		RL.1: Cite textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text.	
<b>6.RL.2.2: Determine how a theme or central idea of a work of literature is conveyed through particular details; provide a detailed, objective summary of the text.</b>	6.3.6: Identify and analyze features of themes conveyed through characters, actions, and images.  6.5.8: Write summaries that contain the main ideas of the reading selection and the most significant details.	RL.2: Determine a theme or central idea of a text and how it is conveyed through particular details; provide a summary of the text distinct from personal opinions or judgments.	IAS 2014 shifts the focus from identifying the theme or central idea to determining how it is developed over the course of the text.
<b>6.RL.2.3: Explain how a plot unfolds in a series of episodes as well as how the characters respond or change as the narrative advances and moves toward a resolution.</b>	6.3.2: Analyze the effect of the qualities of the character on the plot and the resolution of the conflict.  6.3.9: Identify the main problem or conflict of the plot and explain how it is resolved.	RL.3: Describe how a particular story's or drama's plot unfolds in a series of episodes as well as how the characters respond or change as the plot moves toward a resolution.	IAS 2014 addresses both how the characters affect the plot and how the plot affects the characters. The IAS 2014 also increases the expectation by requiring a more in-depth explanation rather than a description.
<b>6.RL.2.4: Students are expected to build upon and continue applying concepts learned previously.</b>			

In reviewing and evaluating the new standards, IDOE intentionally designed an architecture of transparent organization, so that teachers can view the progression on standards across grade levels.

Educator resource toolkits were presented to the members of the State Board of Education and Indiana Education Roundtable during their respective meetings on June 23, 2014. In developing the components of the toolkits, IDOE offers a variety of resources for Hoosier educators.

The mathematics toolkit was published on the IDOE standards web pages specific to mathematics on June 26, 2014. For teachers of mathematics, IDOE has developed standard-specific examples (<http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/mathematics> and <http://www.doe.in.gov/standards/englishlanguage-arts>). The examples, presented next to standards, are intended to provide one graphic representation. They are not meant to limit teachers, but to be a starting point. Additional web-based resource links are also included in the toolkits to provide teachers with a jumping off point to identify additional resources. To ensure clarity and common understanding of terms utilized in mathematics, IDOE staff have created a glossary of terms, which is displayed in a graphic immediately below.





## Indiana Department of Education



### Indiana Academic Standards for Mathematics – Adopted April 2014 Glossary and Vocabulary Words – Draft 5-29-14

<u>Word or Symbol</u>	<u>Definition</u>
"=" equal	the Same value or the Same in number
< Less than	Smaller value or less in number
> Greater than	Greater value or more in number
2-D	Two Dimensional
3-D	Three Dimensional
<b>A</b>	
AA	Angle Angle Triangle Congruence
Absolute value	The distance of a number from zero; the positive value of a number
Acute triangle	A triangle that has all angles less than 90°
Addend	the numbers being added together.
Addition rule	When two events, A and B, are mutually exclusive, the probability that A or B will occur is the sum of the probability of each event. $P(A \text{ or } B) = P(A) + P(B)$
Additive Inverse	The additive inverse of any number $x$ is the number that gives zero when added to $x$ . The additive inverse of 5 is -5.
Adjacent Angles	Angles that share a common side.
Algorithmic	A set of rules for solving a problem with a specific number of steps
Algorithmic approach	A step by step procedure is used in long division
Alternate Interior Angles	Angles that are on opposite sides of the transversal and on the inside of the given lines.
Analog clock	A time piece that has moving hands and hours marked from 1 to 12 to show the time.
Analytically	A limit can be calculated analytically by using algebra or calculus.
Analyze	Examine in detail
Angle	The opening that is formed when two lines, line segments, or rays intersect.
Angle Bisectors	A ray in the interior of an angle that divides the angle into 2 congruent angles.

For teachers of E/LA, IDOE has also produced a toolkit, published on the website- and it includes the following components: a glossary of terms; a sample reading list organized by genre and grade level; and the text complexity rubric, guidance and samples. The glossary of terms is organized in the same format as the mathematics glossary and includes terms highlighted through the review and evaluation of the standards as key terms teachers commonly need to know. The sample reading list has been compiled with input from external stakeholders. Like the mathematics examples, the sample reading list is intended to provide a list of exemplar texts as a starting point for schools, rather than a mandatory and comprehensive list.

IDOE has created a robust text complexity rubric, guidance, and samples based on best practices used in other states. The rubric incorporates quantitative, qualitative, and task analysis to ensure a comprehensive review of texts that will resonate with unique local student populations. Immediately below is a sample of the text complexity rubric that will allow educators to determine the accessibility for specific grade levels.

<b>Measurement of Complexity for Literature</b> (TEMPLATE)	
<b>Text Title:</b>	<b>Genre:</b>
<b>Quantitative Measure(s):</b>	
<b>Qualitative Considerations:</b>	
<u>How much background knowledge is necessary to understand the text?</u>	
<i>(Consider cultural familiarity and literary knowledge necessary to understand allusions to other works)</i>	
<u>Does the text have a single level of meaning or are there multiple/hidden levels of meaning?</u>	
<i>(Consider the clarity of the theme(s))</i>	
<u>How is the text structured?</u>	
<i>(Consider if the structure is conventional or unconventional, if there is a single narrator or multiple narrators, if events are related in chronological order or if there are flashbacks and other manipulations of time)</i>	

Two sample analyses based on the rubric – [Charlotte’s Web](#) and [The Voice](#) – were completed by IDOE E/LA specialists to accompany the rubric and guidance in the educator resource toolkit.

The last resource included in IDOE’s top tier priority resources is guidance for instruction and assessment. This guidance, traditionally reviewed by IDOE’s Office of Assessment, will be published in August so educators may plan their locally-developed curriculum and instruction scope, sequence, and pacing around the new standards.

The remaining elements identified via the needs assessment survey are in various stages of development, and will be released on a rolling basis as quickly as possible, most likely in August and September. Additional needs assessment surveys will be launched to drill deeper into what supports are needed in the field, and to identify what resources are being created at the LEA and school levels.


In early June 2014, the Superintendent sent a letter to textbook/curricular material vendors doing business in Indiana to encourage them to work with LEAs to supply additional aligned

resources. The letter included the newly adopted sets of standards as well as the correlation guides, so that vendors could identify the alignment of their resources to the new standards. In July 2014, IDOE staff will make follow up calls to vendors to encourage collaboration with LEAs. A list of textbook/curricular material vendors who will be supplying additional aligned resources will be shared in the online communities of practices, as available. (1B Attachment 12)

To reach the goal of **100% Engagement**, IDOE has launched online communities of practice for all grade levels and content areas. In fostering these virtual communities, we expect to leverage local level expertise, innovation, and practitioner perspective in a free-market venue where ideas would be moderated and badged, but encouraged to organically develop and flow. Since launching these new online communities in early June 2014, there are 52 communities with over 2,000 educator members (as of 6/25/14).



Following the example of an already established successful online community of almost 200 eLearning coaches, additional Online Communities of Practice have been launched for all grade levels and content areas. These communities will provide teachers and administrators collaborative space to share ideas and resources. Professional development and resources will be provided around the digital content that IDOE is creating. This lesson creation work has already begun, with a consortium of educators from LEAs working collaboratively to provide ready-to-implement lessons, a template and teacher checklist to ensure high quality content. Below, a sample of these lesson bundle checklists is found below.




Aspect of Lesson Design	Quality Standard	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Objective	<b>Under Information tab &gt; Objective, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statements identifying what the students will learn and/or be able to do as a result of the lesson, e.g., “Students will...”</li> <li>• Kid-friendly language</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Summary	<b>Under Information tab &gt; Summary, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General summary of the bundle content</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Standards	<b>Under Standards tab, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All applicable standards</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Anticipatory Set/Connection to Prior Knowledge	<b>Under Content tab, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A “hook” to new learning that helps students understand the focus (i.e., Anticipation Guide, Quick Write)</li> <li>• Connections from new content to known content</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teach and Engage	<b>Under Content tab, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct instruction at the beginning and gradually release independence to students</li> <li>• Formative assessment to check for understanding</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment	<b>Under Content tab, include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formative and/or summative assessment</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Easy to follow and in a reasonable order</li> <li>• Fonts, headings, and/or icons help organize content</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Course Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Includes various media resources</li> <li>• Links, files, and videos function as expected</li> <li>• Rigorous content encourages higher-order thinking (i.e., Blooms)</li> <li>• Copyright protections are honored</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information Literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporates opportunities to teach</li> <li>• Allows students to practice good digital citizenship and information literacy</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Student Interaction	<b>Bundle should include at least one of three forms:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student-Student Interaction (e.g., collaborative projects, discussions, etc.)</li> <li>• Student-Teacher Interaction (quality feedback)</li> <li>• Student-Content Interaction (e.g., engaging content and resources with which students must interact and not just read or watch)</li> </ul>	<input type="checkbox"/>

To implement all of these activities, a cross functional standards planning team lead by the Assistant Superintendent for Student Achievement & Improvement was established, drawing selected staff from the offices of English Learners, Title I, eLearning, Special Education, college and career readiness, and assessment, to ensure a variety of perspectives were included in planning IDOE’s comprehensive supports for all educators and students across the state. The work of the standards planning team is managed through a project management process, and facilitated by a project manager who orchestrates all of the moving parts associated with this body of work. This structure ensures discipline and focus in

our work, so that quality resources are produced in a timely manner to empower teachers for the 2014-2015 school year, and beyond. IDOE has also continued cross division planning to develop the Response to Instruction (RTI) model to ensure all students, including students with disabilities and English learners, have full access to college and career ready standards and specific interventions. Planning meetings occurred on March 5 and April 29, 2014. (1B Attachments 13, 14,) To facilitate this work, a future no cost contract through June 2016 is currently being finalized with the Great Lakes Equity Center at IUPUI. (1B Attachment 15) During the 2013-2014 school year, IDOE worked with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center to enhance the resources and provide training on English learners and the RTI framework. The training consisted of a three-part workshop with Dr. Catherine Collier on separating the difference between disability and language. The three-part series included diverse regional representation with well over 100 participants at each session. (1B attachments 16, 17, 18) In addition to the workshops, six hours of webinars were recorded by Dr. Catherine Collier and posted on IDOE’s website. Indiana educators have access to this information at any point on IDOE’s website and have the opportunity to earn Professional Growth Points (PGPs) for viewing. Information and resources can be found at <http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/english-learner-resources>. In addition, IDOE has utilized the WIDA RTI resources. (1B Attachment 19)

With the needs assessment survey completed, the development and publication of key high quality resources, and the summer awareness campaign complete, IDOE will focus resources on strategic professional development opportunities targeted to meet the needs of all education stakeholders, including teachers of various subjects and serving special populations, administrators, and LEA staff in the Fall of 2014.

The pyramid graph represents IDOE’s holistic approach to ensure all stakeholders are prepared for the new standards at the outset of the 2014-2015 school year, from ongoing support and raising awareness of the new standards, to professional development and technical assistance.



IDOE will host 10 regional professional development conferences with role-based sessions specific to the unique needs of the spectrum of education stakeholders, including the following:

- Elementary Teachers
- Math Teachers
- English/Language Arts Teachers
- Humanities & Social Studies teachers
- Science Teachers
- CTE teachers
- Teachers of English learners
- Teachers of students with disabilities

- Principals
- Superintendents
- School counselors
- Central office staff
- Parents and community members
- Higher education professors and administrators
- Business and industry representatives

#### (1B Attachment 20)

The regions are aligned to Indiana’s Education Service Centers and IDOE’s outreach regions, leveraging existing networks and physical and human resources to execute events of the envisioned size and complexity. Event venues will be located on the campuses of postsecondary institutions and businesses in order to maximize awareness and participation by those stakeholders.

These events will be captured on video to produce clips for web-based information hosted on IDOE’s dedicated standards web pages. Content used for professional development events and input gleaned from them will be captured and utilized in web-based resources, such as Frequently Asked Questions and guidance documents.

Targeted technical assistance will be provided on a case-by-case basis, as determined through collection of information and needs identified by the desktop and onsite cycle monitoring. The Director of College and Career Readiness will prioritize corporations and schools with the greatest needs, and develop a technical assistance calendar for support by appropriate college and career ready staff. Technical assistance will be provided to individual corporations and schools on a rolling basis starting in the Fall of 2014 and throughout the 2014-2015 school year and beyond. Content used for technical assistance visits and input gleaned from them will be captured and utilized in web-based resources, such as Frequently Asked Questions and guidance documents.

#### **Monitoring of implementation of newly adopted college and career ready standards**

Pursuant to Indiana Code (IC) 20-26-12-24, teachers, administrators, and school boards have statutory authority to determine curricular and instructional materials for their schools and school corporations at the local level. As a matter of law and practice, curriculum and instruction is left to local control.

To monitor implementation, IDOE will launch a multi-tiered monitoring plan, using a blend of conventional and new monitoring approaches.

Traditionally, IDOE collects annual assurance through its accreditation process by school

principals that there is curriculum compliance with adopted statewide standards. This process is authorized by Indiana Administrative Code (511 IAC 6.1-5). In addition to assurances, IDOE will add two new monitoring methods:

1) IDOE will embed standards monitoring within existing monitoring systems across federal education and grant programs (including Title I, Title II, Title III, and Migrant Education programs). Grants Management Monitoring and Reporting (GMMR) Specialists who are already engaged in local monitoring at the onsite and desktop levels for Title IA, Title IIA, and Title III programs will add questions and seek evidence of local curriculum and instruction aligned to the new college and career ready standards. Upon collection of information and evidence, the College- and Career-Readiness Director in the Division of Student Achievement & Improvement will consolidate information and work with the Director of Special Education and the Director of Early Learning and Intervention to ensure local level access to the new standards by students with disabilities and English learners. Professional development will be identified through this process to ensure IDOE is offering resources and supports needed by educators.

2) IDOE will monitor local implementation of the standards through the online communities of practice, which will be moderated by IDOE specialists. As moderators, IDOE staff will have a statewide vantage point of discussions, trends, peer-to-peer resource sharing, which can be communicated broadly with interested stakeholders. Additionally, IDOE specialists will also be able to identify emerging needs in the field so the goal of 100% responsiveness can be met. Through the online communities of practice, IDOE specialists will have real time access to field demands and needs – without imposing a new data collection on the field.

### Students with Disabilities

#### **Transitioning to and Implementing College and Career Ready Standards: Technical Assistance**

The IDOE is fully committed to ensuring that students with disabilities have equal access to the college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014) and that teachers serving students with disabilities are prepared to effect a successful transition to the new standards, utilizing a variety of resources.

Indiana has an existing network of technical assistance (TA) resource centers providing support, technical assistance, and professional development to LEA personnel across the state who work with students with disabilities. The Indiana Resource Network (IRN) currently includes seven TA resource centers that focus on various areas designed to improve the education of and services to students with disabilities. The centers work individually, collaboratively, and in conjunction with IDOE's Office of Special Education to support activities designed for teachers and parents to ensure that they have the knowledge and tools needed to ensure that students with disabilities receive an appropriate education,



based on the college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014).

Three of the TA resource centers provide professional development and support to LEA personnel in areas related to Indiana’s Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014):

- Indiana IEP Resource Center (<http://indianaieprc.org>) The IEPRC supports LEA personnel in activities around developing Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) with a focus on writing, implementing, and measuring appropriate goals based on Indiana’s Academic standards.
- PATINS - Promoting Achievement through Technology and Instruction for All Students (<http://patinsproject.com>) In addition to assistive/accessible technology, PATINS provides training on Universal Design for Learning.
- Indiana Secondary Transition Center (<http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=3283>)  
The Center provides training to Indiana educators to ensure that standards-based IEP goals are written, implemented, and provide meaningful transition to postsecondary education and/or careers.

Examples of professional development and resources made available by these TA resource centers:

TA Resource Center	Professional Development	Date
IEP Resource Center	1B Attachments 21, 22	Dates listed within evidence
Secondary Transition Center	1B Attachments 23, 24	Dates listed within evidence
PATINS	1B Attachments 25, 41	Dates listed within evidence

TA Resource Center	Resources	Link
IEP Resource Center	Files including but not limited to: compliance, inclusive practices (access to general education standards and curriculum), measureable standards based goals, and progress monitoring	<a href="http://www.indianaieprc.org/index.php/remository/browse-downloads">http://www.indianaieprc.org/index.php/remository/browse-downloads</a>
Secondary Transition Center	Various resources, including but not limited to: Tuesday’s Transition Tips; Model for Aligning Self-determination and the General Curriculum Standards, Co-teaching and collaboration for diverse	<a href="http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=3304&amp;lang_search=INSTRC">http://www.iidc.indiana.edu/index.php?pageId=3304&amp;lang_search=INSTRC</a>

	learners, and Developing Educationally Meaningful and Legally Sound IEPs: Measurable Annual Goals	
PATINS	Educators: Over 700 links to internet based resources	<a href="https://delicious.com/patins">https://delicious.com/patins</a> ; <a href="http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=35&amp;Itemid=8">http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=35&amp;Itemid=8</a>
PATINS	Family Resources: parent trainings, summer programs, etc.	<a href="http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=37&amp;Itemid=7">http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=37&amp;Itemid=7</a>
PATINS	General Services	<a href="http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=90&amp;Itemid=23">http://patinsproject.com/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=90&amp;Itemid=23</a>

The other TA resource center members of the IRN provide collateral support to teachers in improving outcomes for students with disabilities, as well as to parents.

- IN\*SOURCE - Indiana Resource Center for Families with Special Needs (<http://insource.org>) As Indiana's federally funded parent training and information center, IN\*SOURCE provides parents, families and service providers with the information and training necessary to assure effective educational programs and appropriate services for students with disabilities.
- PASS – Promoting Achievement for Students with Sensory Loss (<http://www.indstate.edu/blumberg/pass/>) This center provides statewide support, technical assistance and professional development opportunities for educators designed to improve instructional quality, promote academic achievement, and foster successful post-secondary transition outcomes for students with sensory loss.
- PBIS Indiana – Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Resource Center (<http://www.indiana.edu/~pbisin/about>) PBIS Indiana supports a statewide network of culturally responsive schoolwide PBIS sites and provides technical assistance and professional development to increase educators' knowledge and understanding of how PBIS impacts student achievement, family engagement, dropout rate, and least restrictive environment placement.

As part of its effort to ensure students with disabilities have access and successfully transition to the college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014), IDOE's Office of Special Education added a seventh TA resource center to its existing network. Project SUCCESS was added to the IRN in April 2013.

(<http://www.projectsuccessindiana.com>) Project SUCCESS is a TA resource center developed

and managed by Public Consulting Group (PCG) in collaboration with the Office of Special Education. To further its goal of supporting higher academic achievement for students with disabilities, Project SUCCESS helps LEAs build local capacity to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and leave high school ready for post-secondary options. Project SUCCESS supports teams of teachers and administrators in Indiana as they work to implement academic standards into instruction for students with disabilities, providing current, research-based resources related to content standards, instructional design, and student outcomes specifically designed to meet the needs of students with disabilities. In addition, the resource center will also provide assistance in the transition to the new alternate assessment. Project SUCCESS maintains a resource center that provides support and technical assistance to teachers throughout the state through on-site visits, webinars, and by the dissemination of useful information via email and social media.

During the summer of 2014, Project SUCCESS is providing regional trainings to LEA personnel on instruction based on the new academic standard and assessments using National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) resources. (1B Attachment 26, 27, 28). In addition Project SUCCESS makes the following resources available to all LEA personnel:

Professional Development Modules	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;id=16&amp;Itemid=484">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;id=16&amp;Itemid=484</a>
NCSC Resources	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;id=17&amp;Itemid=501">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=category&amp;id=17&amp;Itemid=501</a>
2014 Summer Training Resources	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=57:summer-training-june-decatur&amp;catid=21:events&amp;Itemid=504">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=57:summer-training-june-decatur&amp;catid=21:events&amp;Itemid=504</a>
PS Did you Know (Tip of the Week)	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=48:p-s-did-you-know&amp;catid=22&amp;Itemid=507">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=48:p-s-did-you-know&amp;catid=22&amp;Itemid=507</a>
Webinars	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=featured&amp;Itemid=435">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=featured&amp;Itemid=435</a>

In addition to utilizing the IRN to ensure that LEA personnel and parents are prepared to successfully transition students with disabilities to the new academic standards, IDOE will conduct the following activities:

#### Needs Assessment Survey

As mentioned previously, IDOE aims to be 100% responsive to field needs. As educators implement the new standards, we expect emerging needs for support to arise over time. The 1,835 respondents to the needs assessment survey that closed on May 10<sup>th</sup> indicated that resources for teachers of special populations are highly needed. IDOE specialists have been researching what resources other states provide to support standards implementation for students with disabilities. Information collected from this research will inform a second survey aimed at honing in on specific and meaningful resource options for special education and general education teachers. This survey will be launched in late July. Results will inform (1) the identification and prioritization of IDOE developed resources in August and

September, (2) the identification and prioritization of resources to be developed over the longer term by external partners hired by the IDOE, (3) role-based breakout sessions during the ten regional professional development sessions in the fall, and (4) targeted technical assistance during the remainder of the 2014-2015 school year.

#### Regional Professional Development

The ten Regional Professional Development Sessions (described in the previous paragraph) anticipated in August and September will offer a plenary session for all attendees, including special education practitioners, as well as role-based opportunities to dig deeper into the standards and apply them to a classroom tool. These professional development sessions will be hosted and facilitated by IDOE staff, with the help of strategic partners, including members of the higher education and business and industry communities. The sessions will leverage existing networks already established statewide, including the IDOE's outreach coordinators and the Educational Service Centers. Sessions specific to standards implementation for students with disabilities will include partner facilitators from special education cooperatives and the Indiana Resource Network in order to provide outreach support for standards implementation.

#### Communities of Practice

It is the expectation that the three Special Education Communities of Practice (organized as grade levels K-5, 6-8, and 9-12) that have a combined total of 87 members as of June 26<sup>th</sup> will serve as an engine for resources powered by practitioners who know their craft and wish to share promising practices, tools, and resources they believe are effective in teaching the new standards to their students. We expect those memberships to grow over time, allowing real-time grassroots sharing that will be supported by an IDOE special education specialist who will moderate the Communities.

#### Parents

The Office of Special Education will work with IN\*SOURCE to develop and distribute resources for parents to ensure their understanding of the new academic standards and what that means for students with disabilities. In addition, parents will have access to standards information via the IDOE's parent pages on the new standards hub.

### **Transitioning to College and Career Ready Standards: Preparation for Post-Secondary Transition**

Indiana is committed to ensuring that students with disabilities are prepared to transition to appropriate post-secondary college or career opportunities. The college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014) are the foundation for successful college and career preparation.

The Secondary Transition Center, Project SUCCESS, and the Indiana IEP Resource Center work directly with LEAs to ensure that: (1) LEA personnel understand how to write appropriate standards-based and transition goals and (2) LEAs develop appropriate and compliant transition goals. Transition IEPs must contain both postsecondary transition goals, as well as annual standards based academic and/or functional goals that support and align with the

postsecondary transition goals. These technical assistance efforts will continue as the new academic standards are implemented in the 2014-15 school year.

### **Transitioning to College and Career Ready Standards: Selecting and Administering Instructional and Assessment Accommodations in the Context of the New Standards; Transition from IMAST; Students Assessed against Alternate Achievement Standards**

#### Selecting and administering instructional and assessment accommodations in the context of the new standards

Through assistance from the TA resource centers and guidance on the selection of accommodations and assessments developed by IDOE, students with disabilities will have the opportunity to access and achieve under college and career ready standards. Additionally, the assistance and guidance provide Indiana's teachers with a better understanding of how to incorporate the standards into daily curriculum to guide instruction of students with disabilities who need more than the core instruction provided to all students. As a part of this technical assistance, Indiana is committed to the analysis of the learning and accommodation factors necessary to ensure that students with disabilities have the opportunity for achievement and growth through the college and career ready standards.

For students with disabilities who are assessed against grade level standards, IDOE's Office of Special Education and the Office of Student Assessment collaborated with a variety of external stakeholders to develop a guidance resource to assist LEA personnel in making appropriate decisions about instructional and assessment accommodations, as well as in selecting the appropriate assessment. The resulting guidance resource - *Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit* - was developed and made available to LEAs in January 2013. (1B Attachment 29)

#### Transition from IMAST

With the phasing out of the Indiana Modified Achievement Standards Test (IMAST) as a statewide assessment option in the 2013-14 school year, the need for and use of the *Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit* (described in the previous section) became more critical. Students assessed on IMAST are at grade level and on a track to graduate with a traditional diploma and will transition to the college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014). *The Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit* (Resource Guide and Toolkit) provides necessary support to educators, as instructional and assessment accommodations will be in higher demand for these students in order to ensure appropriate access to the new standards and success on the new statewide assessment.

Staff from the Office of Special Education and the Office of Student Assessment reviewed the current guidance in November 2013 to ensure its continued efficacy and will ensure its availability to LEA personnel and parents during the Summer of 2014. The TA resource

centers will also utilize the Resource Guide and Toolkit in their work with individual LEAs and parents as appropriate. The Resource Guide and Toolkit will assist LEAs in making appropriate assessment decisions within the case conference committee process, and encourage parents to be an integral part of the decision-making process. These supports will ensure that case conference committees across the state consider consistent information when making student accommodation and assessment decisions and that, with the phasing out of IMAST, students have the appropriate accommodations to learn and be successful on the appropriate assessment.

In addition to the Resource Guide and Toolkit, the Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment collaborated on a series of five webinars to help inform LEA personnel and parents of the transition from IMAST and the implications of that transition. The webinar topics include: tips on the transition away from the modified assessment, online resources, resources for parents, standards-based IEPs, and Universal Design for Learning. Four of the webinars have been completed and are posted for viewing. The fifth is scheduled to be completed and posted in the Summer of 2014.

<http://www.doe.in.gov/specialed>

#### Students assessed against alternate achievement standards

For students who are assessed against alternate achievement standards, Indiana has implemented the National Alternate Assessment Center's (<http://www.naacpartners.org/>) professional development and guidance on the assessment and instruction of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The objective of this guidance is to: (a) assess and align grade level content for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, (b) identify instructional activities that relate to the college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014) for this population of students, while embedding communication, motor, and social skills into curriculum, and (c) identify appropriate supports to ensure success.

Indiana participates in the General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) through the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) which focuses on creating a new alternate assessment to replace Indiana's current alternate assessment (approved by State Board of Education 6/23/14, <http://www.in.gov/sboe/2550.htm>). The NCSC is dedicated to providing substantive professional development on appropriately and effectively teaching students with cognitive impairments. It centers on how to provide appropriate instruction in English/Language Arts and Math. The professional development will involve curriculum, the standards of which will be the 'core content connectors' which are linked to the Indiana Academic Standards for English/Language Arts and Mathematics (2014).

Examples of some of the technical assistance that has and will continue to be provided by Project SUCCESS are: regional content area trainings using NCSC materials, webinars, tip of the week, and/or consultation at the school, LEA or special education administration level.

(<http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/>) (1B Attachments 26, 27, 28 & website)

Indiana will continue to inform parents and the community of waiver commitments such as the new alternate assessment. In the Summer and Fall of 2014 the Office of Special Education will provide the NCSC Parent FAQ and other resources created by NCSC in which to inform parents of the change in assessments and standards. <http://www.ncscpartners.org/resources> (1B Attachment 30) The Office of Special Education will work with IN\*SOURCE to develop and distribute resources for parents to ensure their understanding of the new alternate assessment and what that means for students with disabilities.

### **Transitioning to College and Career Ready Standards: Monitoring Implementation**

Monitoring for local alignment of curriculum and instruction to the new standards as delivered to students with disabilities will be embedded in existing desktop and onsite cycle monitoring as preciously described in Principle 1B – Monitoring of Implementation of Newly Adopted College and Career Ready Standards. Monitoring questions and protocols for collecting relevant and meaningful evidence will be developed by a Special Education Specialist working with Grants Management Specialists in the Fall of 2014. Questions and protocols will be differentiated to monitor the delivery of standards to students with disabilities in general education classrooms and in less-inclusive educational settings (e.g., resource rooms, self-contained classrooms, separate facilities).

### **Family and Community Engagement and Outreach**

For family and community engagement and outreach, the TA resource centers utilize parents on their advisory boards, as well as offer trainings and workshops to parents on a variety of topics. These boards include parents of students with disabilities in a variety of ways. Some boards encourage traditional participation, while the Indiana IEP Resource Center incorporates parent participation in its advisory work groups based on specific topics. All of the resource centers partner and collaborate with IN\*SOURCE, ARC of Indiana, and/or other parent information and advocacy groups in various ways.

Indiana’s Director of Special Education and staff from the Office of Special Education regularly report out to groups on a variety of educational issues, including standards and assessments. The various groups include parents of students with disabilities, community members, general and special education personnel, and special education interest groups, e.g., Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE), State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities (SAC), IN\*SOURCE, and the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Stakeholder Group.

The Director of Special Education will request that all TA resource centers ensure that their advisory boards are informed of the new standards and assessments and include the information in any newsletters or similar communications. Below is a chart indicating communication activities.

Office of Special Education TA Resource Center	Activity	Date	
Project SUCCESS	Quarterly Advisory Board meetings	Quarterly	
Project SUCCESS	Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education (ICASE) conference presentation	February 2014	
IEP Resource Center	IN*SOURCE (transition)	September 2014	
IEP Resource Center	FIEP Advisory group-ARC and IN*SOURCE	April 2014	
Office of Special Education	Meeting with IRN members	June 2014	
Office of Special Education	Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education	Fall 2013 Spring 2014 Fall 2014	
Office of Special Education	Indiana Council of Administrators of Special Education Regional Roundtable meeting (Special Education and Assessment Specialists)	March 2014	
Office of Special Education	Presentation at semi-annual training for IN*SOURCE staff	Fall 2014	
Office of Special Education	Included in presentation to State Advisory Council on the Education of Children with Disabilities	March 2014 June 2014 September 2014	
Office of Special Education	State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Stakeholders meeting	April 2014 Fall/Winter 2014	
Office of Special Education	Training for new special education directors	July 2014	
Office of Special Education	Indiana Association of School Psychologists presentation	Fall 2014	
Office of Special Education	Presentation to Education Committee of ARC of Indiana	to be scheduled	
Office of Special Education	Monthly meeting with IN*SOURCE liaison	Ongoing	
Secondary Transition Center	7 Transition Cadres include IN*SOURCE and parents	Ongoing	
Secondary Transition Center	Trainings on the transition IEP and best practices in the transition planning process trainings (includes parents)	Ongoing	
Secondary Transition Center	Statewide Transition Policy Workgroup (includes parent)	3-4 times a year	
PATINS	Family Resources: parent trainings, summer programs, etc.	Ongoing	
IN*SOURCE	Quarterly newsletter	Quarterly	



(1B Attachments 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 26, 40, 21, 27, 28, 41, 22, 24)

### English Learners

In 2011, for English learners, IDOE leveraged the work of Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center/American Institutes for Research to conduct an analysis of the correspondence between Indiana Kindergarten English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards and the linguistic demands of the Common Core State Standards. The analysis was completed and shared with educators across the state at the end of 2011.

Additionally, IDOE worked with GLE to develop a definitive timeline of activities to support Indiana in the development and dissemination of new ELP standards aligned to the CCSS. The timeline was complete by the end of April, 2012. In addition to supporting teachers of EL students in the transition to the new ELP standards, correlations were drawn to the CCSS for English/language arts so that both EL teachers and general classroom teachers understand the relationship between these standards, as well as their interdependence in the success of EL students. In 2012, training focused around how the teachers, especially classroom teachers, use the standards to plan instruction for EL students. By effectively supporting teachers in knowing how to plan meaningful instruction for their EL students related to the CCSS in English/language arts, as a result IDOE additionally supported teachers in preparing their EL students for the transition to the new assessment.

Indiana provided professional development and other supports to prepare teachers to teach all students, including English Learners, to the CCSS. The Great Lakes Comprehensive Center and The Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) served as a partner in this work. The initial focus was to help teachers understand how teaching reading to English Learners is different than teaching reading to native speakers. This support was provided to general classroom and EL teachers as a means of supporting EL students in all educational settings. In 2013-2014, IDOE continued the partnership with Great Lakes Comprehensive Center and the Center for Applied Linguistics to provide Train the Trainer Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) training for a cohort of LEAs across the state. The participating LEAs will conduct local SIOP training and implement in 2014-2015. The participants of this first cohort were eligible for an additional professional development grant that provided dollars to conduct SIOP training at the local level. The SIOP Train the Trainer professional development will continue during the 2014-2015 school year with an additional cohort and continued support for implementation for the first cohort.

IDOE monitored the work of a consortium of 28 states participating in World-class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA). In early November of 2011, WIDA released a draft of the 2012 English Language Development standards.

IDOE received a white paper (1B Attachment 42) in the Fall of 2012 from the Indiana

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (INTESOL) indicating that IDOE should join the WIDA consortium in order to use the WIDA English language development standards and the ACCESS assessment. IDOE leveraged the work of the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center, the WIDA consortium, INTESOL Leadership Group, an internal key stakeholder group, and external work groups to evaluate the 2003 Indiana English Language Proficiency standards in order to make a recommendation on college and career ready English language development standards (1B Attachments 43, 44, 45). The consensus among all of the work groups was to adopt the WIDA English Language Development Standards. After the recommendation was made, the standards were posted for public comment. Information was disseminated through the DOE Dialogue, INTESOL leadership listserv, and the Title III/NESP Learning Connection community. The comments spanned from all regions of the state and came from educators, administrators, parents, and community members. The overall approval score was 4.43 out of 5 possible points. The internal key stakeholder group then met to review and discuss the public comments. The group made an official unanimous recommendation for Indiana to adopt the WIDA English Language Development Standards. (1B Attachments 46,47,48,49) The standards were officially launched in October 2013 for implementation in the 2014-2015 school year. Information was disseminated through formal announcements in the DOE Dialogue, Learning Connection listservs, IDOE website, newsletters, conference presentations, and leadership meetings. (1B Attachment 50)

After the adoption of the new standards, the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education began providing technical assistance and professional development to all educators and administrators on the transition to the new standards. Throughout the 2013-2014 school year, 25 professional learning events were held throughout the state focusing on new standards and specifically discussing the ESEA flexibility and how it impacts English learners. Additional training will be held throughout the Summer of 2014. Feedback was solicited to offer input on the additional trainings (1B Attachment 51, 52). After consider the feedback it was determined the summer training will consist of 7 specific WIDA trainings (1B Attachment 53) and 19 Indiana Academic Standards trainings where the WIDA standards information will be embedded. Materials and supplies for all trainings are expected to be approximately \$60,000. Representation from the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education has been present and in leadership position throughout the development of the professional learning and will also be leading the efforts for the scheduled events.

To continue the professional development for the WIDA standards implementation, IDOE developed a WIDA implementation guide (1B Attachment 54). In addition, IDOE will develop a series of on demand WIDA webinars on the overview of WIDA, the support materials and resources, transition expectations, and standards alignment. In addition, the summer training workshops will be recorded and posted for viewing at any time. This will allow for access for all Indiana educators that were not able to make one of the summer workshops. This will also provide continued opportunities for professional learning at the local level and ensure information and clarity for a smooth transition.

IDOE has created a WIDA standards and assessment implementation guide. The

implementation guide has been completed with input from the Office of Assessment and the INTESOL K-12 Leadership Group. The implementation guide includes an overview of the standards framework, specific Indiana and federal law and policies regarding the implementation, transition guidance, exemplary models, and tools for implementation and planning at the local level. This is a living document and is designed as a reference for LEA and school personnel working with English learners.

Train the Trainer professional development by WIDA will begin in the 2014-2015 school year. This will develop a cadre of regionally trained experts that can assist districts in the local training, professional development, and sustainability practices of the implementation. Professional development by the official trainers and IDOE's Office of English Learning and Migrant Education staff will continue on an ongoing basis throughout the 2014-2015 school year as needed and as requested by LEAs.

In order to facilitate all WIDA training, IDOE is providing opportunities for interaction and feedback through an online interactive mechanism. This will afford participants the opportunity to ask questions, receive answers, collaborate, and provide feedback on the trainings. This feedback is being used to inform technical assistance and improve future trainings (1B Attachment 55, 56, 57). IDOE will also solicit feedback from the INTESOL Leadership Group at the summer and fall meetings. This feedback is providing qualitative data that will drive the technical assistance and future trainings.

Additionally, the Office of English Learning and Migrant education has offered a supplemental professional development grant (1B Attachment 58, 59) to all Title III recipients for WIDA standards implementation. The total amount of this grant opportunity will be approximately \$200,000. The supplemental dollars can be utilized to ensure WIDA implementation through activities such as purchasing WIDA materials and conducting professional development.

Indiana will fully implement the WIDA standards in the 2014-2015 school year. In preparation for the 2014-2015 school year, the Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment will work with WIDA to conduct an alignment study of the current Indiana Academic Standards and the WIDA standards in the Fall of 2014. This study will evaluate the relationship between the WIDA English language proficiency standards and the state's academic content standards: linking and alignment (U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, February 2003). The study will produce a report that will be made available to all stakeholders on IDOE's website. Similar work in other states puts the approximate cost at \$25,000. The obstacle to this work is the tight timeline. Since the new Indiana Academic in English/Language Arts and Mathematics were officially approved in April 2014, and the contract to join the consortium is currently to be completed by the end of June 2014, the alignment study will have to begin as soon as possible in the Fall of 2014.

In order to monitor the implementation of WIDA, the Office of English Learning has

collaborated with Office of Grants Management, the Office of Educator Effectiveness and Leadership, and the Office of Data Collection and Reporting. To ensure implementation and so that IDOE can provide additional technical assistance and monitoring, the following actions have occurred or will occur:

- The Title III and Non English Speaking Programs Grant (NESP state grant for English learners) applications include an assurance for WIDA implementation that is signed by the LEA’s superintendent. The vast majority of LEAs apply for at least one of these supplemental grants. A copy of this grant can be found in (1B Attachment 60).
- The Title III and NESP application include a narrative requirement describing the LEA’s implementation plan.
- The Language Minority collection is being designed to potentially include a data field that will indicate the percentage of staff trained by individual school. The Language Minority collection is a required data collection for all Indiana school districts to report enrolled English learners and immigrant students.
- Professional learning on WIDA has occurred across multiple offices so that IDOE staff members are able to embed WIDA monitoring in various site visits and through desktop monitoring.
- IDOE will conduct informal, formative surveys on implementation throughout the school year.
- The Title III and NESP Annual Performance Reports will include WIDA implementation data.
- The Office of Grants Management and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education will monitor the implementation through onsite and desktop monitoring processes.

#### Family and Community Engagement and for Outreach English Learners

The Office of Early Learning and Intervention consistently disseminates ESEA flexibility information and provides outreach to LEAs, parents, and other stakeholders (1B Attachment 61). The foundation for this outreach is the collaborative nature and cross-division training with the offices of Outreach, Special Education, eLearning, Migrant, Early Learning, Title I, non-public and Choice schools, as well as the collaboration with Indiana’s nine Educational Service Centers (1B Attachment 62). The Office of Early Learning and Intervention includes specific waiver information in many monthly newsletters from Title I, Title III, Migrant, and Early Learning (1B Attachments 63, 64, 65, 66). Waiver updates and relevant information is included in all professional development activities that are led by the Office (1B Attachment 67, 68, 69,). For the 2013-2014 school year, over 70 opportunities were held throughout Indiana that included vital ESEA flexibility English learner information. In addition to IDOE events, IDOE participated in the two largest English learner conferences - the INTESOL conference and the Wabash Valley English Learning Conference - and presented relevant English learner information in the ESEA flexibility waiver to stakeholders, educators, and administrators.

IDOE has established a streamlined approach to communicating with the educators and administrators of English learners. All information is posted online and sent through Learning Connection updates. The Title III/NESP Learning Connection page is used daily as a means of disseminating information. All questions are reviewed and answered on the day they are received.

IDOE has also established the Online Communities of Practice for the newly adopted Indiana Academic Standards. This online community includes specific space for educators and stakeholders of English learners to share and collaborate. All Title III staff members are members of this community and contribute on a regular basis.

It is the expectation that the English learners Communities of Practice (organized as grade levels K-5, 6-8, and 9-12) will serve as an engine for resources powered by practitioners who know their craft and wish to share promising practices, tools, and resources they believe are effective in teaching the new standards to their students. IDOE expects those memberships to grow over time, allowing real-time grassroots sharing that will be supported by an IDOE English learner specialist who will moderate the Communities

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education hosts an EL Leadership Group that is sponsored by INTESOL. (1B Attachment 70, 71) The group consists of over 50 members and includes representation of more than 60% of English learners in the state. This group meets three to four times per semester to discuss the implementation of ESEA flexibility waiver principles for English learners. This group is currently working collaboratively on effective communication and training strategies to provide information to local LEAs as well as provide outreach to stakeholders, parents, and community members.

In order to reach diverse stakeholders, parents, and community members, IDOE's Office of English Learning and Migrant Education will create model reader-friendly information guides and a short presentation video that will be accessible for families that may speak a language other than English. These materials will be translated and made available to the public on the website and will also be utilized in local LEA outreach efforts. The purpose and design of these tools and resources has been discussed with the leaders from around the state to ensure effectiveness. The purpose of this strategy is to empower and partner with the local LEAs in effective outreach and information dissemination so that all parts of the state of Indiana can be reached.

The Office of Early Learning and Migrant Education will also reach out to diverse stakeholders, community members, and parents through the migrant PAC (parent advisory committee) meetings and through potential parent outreach breakout sessions at the statewide conferences.

### **Technical assistance for English Learners**

Technical assistance for the implementation of the ESEA Flexibility Waiver for English learners has a specific four-method approach. The first method focuses on communication with administrators, educators, community members, and other stakeholders through regular updates, printable communication, and resources. The Office of Early Learning and Intervention releases monthly newsletters for Title III, Title I, Title I part C, and Early Learning. The newsletters include vital updates and relevant ESEA flexibility waiver information (1B Attachments 72, 73). The newsletters include a section called “The Waiver Corner.” This section highlights relevant waiver components that address English learners.

The second method is through digital content for all stakeholders. The Office of Early Learning and Migrant utilizes the IDOE webpage, online surveys, webinars, Learning Connection communities, and the online communities of practice to regularly and effectively communicate with the field. The Learning Connection Title III/NESP community has 2,433 members. This community provides stakeholders with the ability to pose questions to a forum. The forum is moderated by the IDOE Office of English Learning staff and all inquiries are regularly responded to within the day that the inquiry is posted. These communities and tools allow for specific and timely professional development and communication with all stakeholders.

English Learning and Migrant Education Webpage: <http://www.doe.in.gov/elme>

The third method is workshops and resources aimed at equitable and effective core instruction for English learners. IDOE launched the “Success with English Learners” professional development series. This initiative includes statewide Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) trainings, RTI for English learners, and WIDA training. These trainings ensure equity for all English learners in the core content and promote key elements of ESEA flexibility waiver. During the 2013-2014 school year, 20 LEAs participated in the Train-the-Trainer model for SIOP and 12 of the LEAs received supplemental professional development grants to train local teachers. IDOE also conducted regional workshops on vital areas of English learner compliance and success programs in the fall of 2014 for district leaders.

The ten Regional Professional Development Sessions anticipated in August and September will offer a plenary session for all attendees, including English learner practitioners, as well as role-based opportunities to dig deeper into the standards and apply them to a classroom tool. These professional development sessions will be hosted and facilitated by IDOE staff, with the help of strategic partners, including members of the higher education and business and industry communities. The sessions will leverage existing networks already established statewide, including the IDOE’s Outreach Coordinators and the Educational Service Centers. Sessions specific to standards implementation for English learners will include how all teachers can make the Indiana Academic Standards accessible for all limited English proficient students.

IDOE WIDA Resources Website: <http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/wida-english-language->

development-eld-standards-framework

EL Guidebook: <http://www.doe.in.gov/sites/default/files/elme/el-guidebook-10-29-13.pdf>

Success with English learners: <http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/english-learner-resources>

The fourth method is leadership development. The Office of Early Learning and Intervention has partnered with INTESOL and state universities to provide leadership development (1B Attachment 74, 75). The cadre of local English learner leaders meets 3 to 4 times per semester to build leadership capacity in the areas such as program design, culture, community, data, compliance, ESEA Flexibility Waiver and equity. IDOE will ensure that stakeholders, including educators, community members, families of English learners, and parents with limited English proficient are appropriately informed of Indiana’s ESEA flexibility waiver and have opportunity to share input at the LEA and SEA levels.

Migrant Education

To support Indiana’s migrant students, IDOE created a resource center in late 2012 to provide technical assistance to LEAs throughout Indiana. IDOE began preliminary work in fall of 2011, by identifying and reserving sufficient federal migrant education funding to create and provide this technical assistance. The Migrant Education Regional Service Center is an IDOE support structure for the Indiana Migrant Education Program (1B Attachment 76, 77). The Indiana Migrant Education program has successfully secured seven regional centers to help carry out and maintain equitable educational opportunities for migrant students while closing the achievement and opportunity gap. Through the creation of seven migrant centers, the Indiana Migrant Education program aims to successfully identify and serve 100 percent of the migrant population. (1B Attachment 78)

Charged with the vision and mission of “100% identified, 100% served,” the Migrant regional centers will provide educational and supportive services to eligible migrant students (1B Attachment 79). All migrant students will receive the services they are entitled to regardless of their geographic location. In order to facilitate high quality services, migrant regional centers will support LEAs with the development and implementation of professional development related to the education of migrant children. Professional development opportunities will be extended to teachers, administrators, and other educational personnel that focus on the unique educational needs of migrant children.

Migrant regional service centers collaborate with stakeholders to promote the Indiana Migrant Education Program and identify ways that IMEP can work with stakeholders to better support Indiana’s Migrant students. In addition, they disseminate and provide technical assistance for federal and IDOE guidance related to Title I Part C regulations, Indiana’s Comprehensive Needs Assessment, and Service Delivery Plan.

IDOE is committed to providing equitable educational and supportive services to all migrant students.




**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**1.B – Transition to College-and Career-Ready Standards**

**Key Components**

1. Review, evaluation, and adoption of college and career ready standards Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).
2. Technical assistance for transition and implementation of college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).
3. Monitoring of local implementation of college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).

**Key Component #1**

Review, evaluation, and adoption of college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Multi-tiered groups of K-16 Indiana educators, parents, business and industry representatives and community partners developed Indiana’s own college and career ready standards.	September of 2013-April of 2014	K-16 Indiana educators facilitated by IDOE staff in earlier phases and IDOE and SBOE staff for the standards evaluation phase	Final set of standards deemed college and career ready by College and Career Ready panelists	Common Core Standards; Former Indiana Academic Standards; other states’ standards; NCTE standards; and NCTM standards; human and financial resources	No current obstacles

Indiana Education Roundtable reviewed the standards	April 21	Roundtable members	Final set of standards that were reviewed and recommended for adoption by the Indiana Education Roundtable	Roundtable Resolution recommending the State Board of Education adopt the new standards	No current obstacles
Indiana State Board of Education adopted the new standards	April 28, 2014	State Board of Education members	Final set of standards that were published in the IDOE website	State Board of Education adoption of the new standards	No current obstacles
The Commissioner for Higher Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction certified that Indiana had completed its work in adopting college and career ready standards	May 28, 2014	Superintendent Ritz and Commissioner Lubbers	Joint letter to Secretary Arne Duncan	CCR evaluators; CCR Panel	No current obstacles
<p><b>Key Component #2</b></p> <p>Technical assistance for transition and implementation of college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% Responsiveness</li> <li>• 100% Awareness</li> <li>• 100% Support</li> <li>• 100% Engagement</li> </ul>					

Key Milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party Responsible	Evidence	Reources	Significant obstacles
IDOE presentation to SBOE on statewide implementation plan for technical assistance to LEAs	March 12, 2014	Superintendent Ritz, Dep. Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent, Director of Assessment, Director of eLearning	PowerPoint presentation	Human resources	No current obstacles
IDOE established a cross functional standards planning team with a project manager	March 2014 and ongoing	Asst. Superintendent of Student Achievement and Improvement	Project management tracking sheet; institutional knowledge captured on IDOE-wide drive	Staff drawn from CCR, Assessment, Early Learning & Intervention	No current obstacles
100% Responsiveness					
IDOE issued a needs assessment survey	April 28 – May 10, 2014	Superintendent Ritz, Dep. Superintendent, Asst. Superintendent, Director of eLearning	Survey  Analysis of top three needs: (1) rubrics for lesson plan alignment; (2) model content frameworks; (3) resources for special student populations	Office of eLearning and IDOE technology staff	No current obstacles

IDOE created E/LA and math rubrics for lesson plan alignment and released rubrics	To be completed in July of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Rubrics	Office of College and Career	No current obstacles
IDOE created model content frameworks and released frameworks	To be completed in July of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Model Content Frameworks	Office of College and Career	No current obstacles
IDOE created resources for students with disabilities, English learners, and High Ability students	To be completed in July and August of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Special population-specific resources	Office of Special Education, Office of Early Learning and Intervention, Office of College and Career Readiness	No current obstacles
IDOE will launch additional needs assessments for teachers of students with disabilities and local implementation	July of 2014 and ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Needs assessments	Office of eLearning and IDOE technology staff	No current obstacles
IDOE will develop and launch additional resources based upon survey results	Ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Resources developed	Office of College and Career, Office of Special Education, and Office of Early Learning and Intervention	No current obstacles
100% Awareness					

IDOE created a new logo for the standards	March 12, 2014	Superintendent Ritz, Dep. Superintendent , Asst. Superintendent , Director of eLearning	New logo	Office of eLearning	No current obstacles
IDOE updates Learning Connection with relevant up to date standards information	April 28, 2014 and ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Updates	All Offices within Division	No current obstacles
IDOE includes standards and assessment updates in DOE Dialogues	Summer of 2013 and ongoing	Dep. Superintendent , Asst. Superintendent , Director of Assessment	Memos published in DOE Dialogue	All Offices within Division	No current obstacles
Web page hub created that includes official guidance, resources, and information and will be updated on a routine basis	Original page launched April 2014, revised June 26, 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	New web pages	All Offices within Division, IDOE technology staff	No current obstacles
19 Regional summer of eLearning conference presentations on standards	June-August, 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Agenda, PowerPoint presentation	All Offices within Division	No current obstacles

7 regional WIDA conferences aimed at meeting the needs of English learners with the new standards	June-July, 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Agenda, PowerPoint presentation	All Offices within Division	No current obstacles
IDOE presentations at the annual large scale Indiana statewide association meetings	June-October, 2014	Dep. Superintendent Asst. Superintendent	Agendas, PowerPoint presentation	Select staff drawn from CCR Office	No current obstacles
100% Support					
IDOE created and released standards correlation guides	May 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Standards Correlation Guides	CCR and Assessment staff	No current obstacles
IDOE created vertical articulations	May 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Vertical articulations	CCR and Assessment staff	No current obstacles
Educator resource toolkits were presented to the SBOE & released to the public	June 23, 2014 & June 26, 2014, respectively	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Resource toolkits	CCR and Assessment staff	No current obstacles
Mathematics toolkit was published on IDOE website	June 26, 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Mathematics toolkit	CCR and Assessment staff	No current obstacles

E/LA toolkit was published on IDOE website	June 26	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	E/LA toolkit	CCR and Assessment staff	No current obstacles
IDOE created and published the guidance for instruction and assessment	To be completed in August of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Guidance	Assessment staff	No current obstacles
SPI sent a letter to textbook vendors to encourage them to work with LEAs to supply additional aligned resources	May 28, 2014	Superintendent Ritz, Dep. Superintendent , Asst. Superintendent ,	Letter	Staff	No current obstacles
IDOE staff will make follow up calls to vendors to encourage collaboration with LEAs	To be completed by mid-July of 2014	Asst. Superintendent	Phone calls	Staff	No current obstacles
List of textbook vendors who will be supplying additional aligned resources will be shared via online communities of practice and published as available	September and ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	List of vendors	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles

100% Engagement					
IDOE established online communities of practice	June 1, 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	52 communities and 2001 members as of June 26, 2014	eLearning office	No current obstacles
10 regional professional development opportunities	August-September of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Draft agenda	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
Requested targeted technical assistance on a case-by-case basis	October of 2014 -ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Online request form	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
IDOE will develop videos and additional resources for the web page	July of 2014 and ongoing	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Videos	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
<p><b>Key Component #3</b></p> <p>Monitoring of local implementation of college and career ready Indiana Academic Standards for E/LA and mathematics (2014).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation</li> <li>• Online Community of Practice Monitoring</li> <li>• Embedded Standards Monitoring</li> </ul>					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Conventional Monitoring Methods					
IDOE collects annual assurances through its accreditation process	Annual	Director of Accreditation	Accreditation dashboard; 511IAC 6.1-5	Staff	No current obstacles



Desktop and onsite cycle monitoring	Ongoing throughout each school year	Office of Grants Management, Monitoring, and Reporting	Cycle Monitoring schedule, monitoring reports	Office of Grants Management Staff	No current obstacles
IDOE provides technical assistance based upon monitoring findings	Ongoing after monitoring reports and communication is complete	College and Career Readiness Director	TA schedule to be created	CCR office Director and staff	No current obstacles
Online Community of Practice Monitoring					
IDOE specialists moderate online communities of practice, allowing for monitoring of statewide trends	Ongoing after the start of the 2014-2015 school year	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Online communities	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
Analyze statewide trends to glean information about shared resources between peers, emerging needs, and obstacles in the field	Ongoing after the start of the 2014-2015 school year	Director of College and Career Readiness	Analysis report to be developed	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles

Analysis report will lead to IDOE action items, such as the identification & prioritization of development of new resources, PD, and TA	Ongoing after analysis report completed	Director of College and Career Readiness	Report	Specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
Embedded Standards Monitoring					
IDOE offices will design common standards monitoring protocol, questions, and evidence collection for the embedded onsite and desktop standards monitoring	September – October of 2014	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement, Office of Grants Management	Protocol, questions, evidence to be collected	Specialists in all offices of Division, Office of Grants Management Director and specialists	No current obstacles
IDOE specialists will conduct embedded standards monitoring	November of 2014 – end of 2014-2015 SY	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement, Office of Grants Management	Protocol, questions, evidence to be collected	Grants Management Specialists and specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles
Collected evidence and data will be reported to the Director of College and Career Readiness	December of 2014 – end of 2014-2015 SY	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement, Office of Grants Management	Monitoring report	Grants Management Specialists and specialists in all offices of Division	No current obstacles

Director of College and Career Readiness will meet the Director of Special Education and Director of Early Learning and Intervention to ensure local level access of students with disabilities and English Learners to new standards	December of 2014 – end of 2014-2015 SY	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Recurring meetings	Three Directors listed in 1 <sup>st</sup> column	No current obstacles
Director of College and Career Readiness will analyze collected data and report back to the cross functional standards planning team	December of 2014 – end of 2014-2015 SY	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Recurring meetings	Standards planning team and PM	No current obstacles
IDOE staff and cross functional standards planning team will utilize monitoring data for action	December of 2014 – end of 2014-2015 SY	Division of Student Achievement and Improvement	Recurring meetings	Standards planning team and PM and specialists in all offices of the Division	No current obstacles

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan-Special Education**

**1.B – Transition to College-and Career-Ready Standards: Technical Assistance to ensure transition to new standards for students with disabilities**

**Key Components**

1. Technical assistance and professional development for implementation of new standards for students with disabilities
2. Monitoring of implementation of new standards for students with disabilities

**Key Component #1**

Technical assistance and professional development for the implementation of standards for students with disabilities

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources
Project SUCCESS regional trainings to LEA personnel on instruction based on new academic standards and assessments using National Center and State Collaborative resources	Summer 2014	Project SUCCESS Office of Special Education	Training agendas, materials, and attendance sheets	Project SUCCESS expertise Office of Student Assessment
Launch survey to identify specific and meaningful resources for general and special education teachers	July 2014	IDOE Policy and Research staff with assistance from Office of Special Education	Survey instrument and results	Staff
Development of key resource documents for teachers based on needs assessment survey	August and September 2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from other IDOE offices and TA resource centers	Notes from planning and development meetings Resource documents	Staff Expertise TA resource centers
Development of informational document for parents of students with disabilities explaining new academic standards and what it means for students with disabilities	7/1/2014 through 9/1/2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from IN*SOURCE	Notes from planning and development meetings Resource document(s)	Staff Expertise IN*SOURCE
Conduct presentation in each of the ten regional professional development sessions	August and September 2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from special education cooperative staff and TA resource centers	Presentation agenda Presentation materials	Staff

Review and, if necessary, revise guidance documents (Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit)	Summer 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	Revised/final Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit)	Staff
Complete series of five webinars on Transitioning from IMAST	July 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	Webinars available on IDOE/Special Education website	Staff Expertise IEP Resou Center an PATINS
Develop and provide informational materials to parents on NCSC alternate assessment	September 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	FAQ for parents regarding NCSC alternate assessment	Staff NCSC exp Project SUCCESS expertise
<b>Key Component #2</b>				
Monitoring of implementation of new academic standards for students with disabilities				
Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resour
Desktop and onsite monitoring of implementation of new academic standards for students with disabilities implementation through Title consolidated monitoring	September 2014 – May 2015	IDOE LEAs	Monitoring reports	IDOE Gra Managem staff

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**1.B – Transition to College-and Career-Ready Standards – State will adopt English language proficiency standards that correspond to the State’s college-and-career standards and that reflect the academic language skills necessary to access and meet new college-and career- ready standards**

**Key Components**

1. Analysis and adoption of college and career ready English language development (ELD) standards
2. Technical assistance and professional development for implementation of the WIDA ELD standards
3. Monitoring of implementation of WIDA ELD Standards

**Key Component #1**

Analysis and adoption of college and career ready English language development (ELD) standards

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Partnership with INTESOL EL Leadership group and Great Lakes Comprehensive Center to deliver white paper proposal to adopt WIDA ELD standards	8/2012-11/2012	INTESOL EL Leadership; GLCC; IDOE	White Paper	INTESOL Leadership members’ expertise	No current obstacles

External Work Group, Internal Work Groups, and External Advisory Group reviewed WIDA standards and alignment from previous Indiana English language proficiency standards	7/2013-8/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Work group sign in sheets and standards report	Stipends for participants	No current obstacles
Internal Work Group met to review the work done by the other groups and provide opinion on next steps; Internal work group agreed the standards should be posted for public comment in their current form	8/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education  College and Career Readiness  Office of Student Assessment	Sign in sheets, report, public comment plan	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
WIDA ELD Standards posted for public comment	8/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Public comment	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
Internal Work Group and Advisory Group analyze and discuss public comment to determine next steps for adoption	9/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Comments and notes from work group meeting and report	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles

Adopted WIDA ELD Standards based upon alignment study and work group recommendations	11/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	WIDA license agreement	IDOE legal team	HEA 1427 language prohibited Indiana from joining a consortium.  An official Attorney General opinion was provided, that allowed movement forward.
Formal memo and announcement was released to Superintendents, Title III Directors, and other stakeholders concerning the adoption via DOE Dialogue, Learning Connection, and the ELME website.	12/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Formal memo and announcement	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
LEAs will begin implementing WIDA standards	Fall 2014 – ongoing	LEAs	Monitoring reports	WIDA website, IDOE website, and implementation materials	No current obstacles
Standards alignment study	Fall 2014	IDOE	Alignment study	Alignment study exemplars	No current obstacles



**Key Component #2**

Technical assistance and professional development for the implementation of the WIDA ELD standards

Key Milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Solicited input from INTESOL EL Leadership team regarding WIDA ELD professional development rollout	10/30/13	IDOE INTESOL EL Leadership Team	Meeting agendas	INTESOL member expertise	No current obstacles
WIDA training for INTESOL EL Leadership Group	2/28/2014	WIDA Consortium - Jesse Markow	Meeting agenda, sign in sheet	\$5,000 for 100 district leaders, coaches, principals, university professionals	No current obstacles
Technical assistance documents released: WIDA Implementation Guide, Resource Guide, and correlated lessons with Indiana Academic Standards 2014	3/2014-6/2014; ongoing	IDOE	Implementation guide, resource guide, and correlated lessons	IDOE Standards implementation team	No current obstacles
Summer 2014 WIDA Standards Training Workshops for over 800 attendees	6/2014-7/2014	IDOE	Training materials, sign in sheets	\$55,000 for WIDA Starter Packs for over 800 attendees	No current obstacles

WIDA Supplemental Professional Development Grant	6/2014-7/2014	IDOE	Supplemental grant release memo	\$200,000 for LEA implementation and planning for WIDA ELD standards	No current obstacles
In-depth WIDA ELD trainings	8/2014-12/2014; ongoing	WIDA Consortium	Training materials and sign in sheets	Included in WIDA contract	No current obstacles
Survey for LEAs for further professional development needs	12/2014	IDOE	Survey and survey results	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #3</b>					
Monitoring of implementation of WIDA ELD Standards					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	No current obstacles
Request LEA plans for WIDA implementation through Title III and state NESP grants	8/2014-10/2014	IDOE LEAs	Title III application example	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
Onsite monitoring of WIDA implementation through Title consolidated onsite visits	9/2014-5/2014	IDOE LEAs	Onsite monitoring reports	IDOE Grants Management staff	No current obstacles
Analyze percentage of LEA staff trained on WIDA ELD standards through data collection	11/2014-1/2015	IDOE LEAs	Data collection reports	IDOE Data staff	No current obstacles

Survey LEAs and alter technical assistance, further state or WIDA led professional development	8/2014-6/2015	IDOE LEAs WIDA Consortium	Survey results	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
--	---------------	---------------------------	----------------	----------------------	----------------------

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan-Special Education**

**1.B – Transition to College-and Career-Ready Standards: Technical Assistance to ensure transition to new standards for students with disabilities**

**Key Components**

- 3. Technical assistance and professional development for implementation of new standards for students with disabilities
- 4. Monitoring of implementation of new standards for students with disabilities

**Key Component #1**

Technical assistance and professional development for the implementation of standards for students with disabilities

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Project SUCCESS regional trainings to LEA personnel on instruction based on new academic standards and assessments using National Center and State Collaborative resources	Summer 2014	Project SUCCESS Office of Special Education	Training agendas, materials, and attendance sheets	Project SUCCESS expertise Office of Student Assessment	No current obstacles
Launch survey to identify specific and meaningful resources for general and special education teachers	July 2014	IDOE Policy and Research staff with assistance from Office of Special Education	Survey instrument and results	Staff	No current obstacles
Development of key resource documents for teachers based on needs assessment survey	August and September 2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from other IDOE offices and TA resource centers	Notes from planning and development meetings Resource documents	Staff Expertise from TA resource centers	No current obstacles

Development of informational document for parents of students with disabilities explaining new academic standards and what it means for students with disabilities	7/1/2014 through 9/1/2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from IN*SOURCE	Notes from planning and development meetings Resource document(s)	Staff Expertise from IN*SOURCE	No current obstacles
Conduct presentation in each of the ten regional professional development sessions	August and September 2014	Office of Special Education staff lead with assistance from special education cooperative staff and TA resource centers	Presentation agenda Presentation materials	Staff	No current obstacles
Review and, if necessary, revise guidance documents (Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit)	Summer 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	Revised/final Statewide Assessment Resource Guide and Toolkit)	Staff	No current obstacles
Complete series of five webinars on Transitioning from IMAST	July 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	Webinars available on IDOE/Special Education website	Staff Expertise of IEP Resource Center and PATINS	No current obstacles
Develop and provide informational materials to parents on NCSC alternate assessment	September 2014	Office of Special Education and Office of Student Assessment lead staff	FAQ for parents regarding NCSC alternate assessment	Staff NCSC expertise Project SUCCESS expertise	No current obstacles

**Key Component #2**

## Monitoring of implementation of new academic standards for students with disabilities

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Desktop and onsite monitoring of implementation of new academic standards for students with disabilities implementation through Title consolidated monitoring	September 2014 – May 2015	IDOE LEAs	Monitoring reports	IDOE Grants Management staff	No current obstacles

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**1.B – Transition to College-and Career-Ready Standards – Create a migrant resource center**

**Key Components**

1. Ensure 100% of all migrant students are identified and served while in Indiana through the creation migrant resource centers and the employment of full-time Identification and Recruitment Field Specialists
  
2. Collaborate with stakeholders, community members, and school districts to meet the unique needs of migrant students
  
3. Collect and analyze data through the MIDAS database

**Key Component #1**

Ensure 100% of all migrant students are identified and served while in Indiana through the creation migrant resource centers and the employment of full-time Identification and Recruitment Field Specialists

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Discuss non-RFP model for migrant including status update on Title I, Part C funds and surplus	6/2013-7/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting notes	2.5 million-Surplus 5.5 million-Allocation	No current obstacles
Complete Migrant Regional Center (MRC) proposal and present to 7 potential locations	7/2013-8/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Proposals	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles

Meet with IDOE HR to discuss, post, and hire 8 full-time Identification and Recruitment Field Specialist (ID&R) positions	7/2013-8/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	ID&R job descriptions and Knowledge Services documentation	\$750,000	No current obstacles
Release and review MRC grants to ensure alignment with mission and vision and finalize Regional Center participation for 2013-2014 school year	8/2013-10/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Grants	\$3,000,000	No current obstacles
Migrant Regional Center Kick-off event to provide professional development to newly hired team members and school districts	10/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting agenda and materials	No current resources needed	No current obstacles



<p>Create high quality materials via Migrant website to raise awareness of the newly restructured program (Recruiter bio, Directory, Regional map, Asset map, Migrant Guidebook)</p>	<p>11/2013-1/2014</p>	<p>Office of English Learning and Migrant Education</p>	<p>Material samples</p>	<p>\$5,000</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p>Provide technical assistance and support to MRC directors and staff member via conference calls, monitoring visits, webinars, and in person events)</p>	<p>1/2014-ongoing</p>	<p>Office of English Learning and Migrant Education</p>	<p>Monitoring reports</p>	<p>No additional resources needed</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p><b>Key Component #2</b></p> <p>Collaborate with stakeholders, community members, and school districts to meet the unique needs of migrant students</p>					
<p>Key milestones and activities</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Party responsible</p>	<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Resources</p>	<p>Significant obstacles</p>

Organize, plan, and execute PAC meetings around the state to ensure parents have the opportunity to provide feedback about the program (State has at least 3 each year, which smaller events held regionally)	7/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting agendas	\$5,000	No current obstacles
Collaborate with other SEAs to provide professional development and training to recruiters and migrant education staff members (Pennsylvania, Tennessee)	9/2013, 3/2014	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Materials and travel documentation	\$10,000	No current obstacles

Collaborate with migrant specific experts through consulting with META and attending national migrant conferences	7/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Meeting agendas	\$200,000	No current obstacles
Provide monthly publication to the field via current events and initiatives in the program (Migrant Musings Newsletter, Learning Connection Updates)	12/2031-ongoing	Office of English learning and Migrant Education	Monthly publications	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
Provide, plan, and facilitate professional development meetings and opportunities from the SEA to a wide range of stakeholders (contracted services, internal experts)	10/2013-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Materials and agendas	Fees through contracted consultant company META	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #3</b>					
Collect and analyze data through the MIDAS database					

Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Create new state level migrant database to ensure proper data is collected and reported	1/2014	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	<a href="https://midas.doe.in.gov/">https://midas.doe.in.gov/</a>	MIDAS technology team	No current obstacles
Analyze data on a weekly basis to make decisions that drive the instruction and opportunities provided to migrant students	2/2014-ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Data reports	MIDAS technology team	No current obstacles

## 1.C DEVELOP AND ADMINISTER ANNUAL, STATEWIDE, ALIGNED, HIGH-QUALITY ASSESSMENTS THAT MEASURE STUDENT GROWTH

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide evidence corresponding to the option selected.

<p><b>Option A</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA is participating in one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition.</p> <p>i. Attach the State’s Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) under that competition. (Attachment 6)</p>	<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The SEA is not participating in either one of the two State consortia that received a grant under the Race to the Top Assessment competition, and has not yet developed or administered statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Provide the SEA’s plan to develop and administer annually, beginning no later than the 2014–2015 school year, statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs, as well as set academic achievement standards for those assessments.</p>	<p><b>Option C</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The SEA has developed and begun annually administering statewide aligned, high-quality assessments that measure student growth in reading/language arts and in mathematics in at least grades 3-8 and at least once in high school in all LEAs.</p> <p>i. Attach evidence that the SEA has submitted these assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review or attach a timeline of when the SEA will submit the assessments and academic achievement standards to the Department for peer review. (Attachment 7)</p>
---	--	--

### Background

Per the ESEA Flexibility Waiver, states must administer assessments based on standards deemed college- and career-ready by the spring of 2015. To meet this requirement, Indiana will administer fully operational *Indiana Statewide Testing of Educational Progress-Plus* (ISTEP+) assessments based on the newly adopted Indiana Academic Standards in the spring of 2015. Although ISTEP+ is administered to students in grades 3-8 and 10, the format of the grade 10 test is End of Course Assessments. To maintain clarity within this document, “ISTEP+” will refer to the college- and career-ready assessment for grades 3-8, and “ECAs” will refer to the college- and career-ready assessment for the Algebra I and English 10 End of Course Assessments.

Indiana’s plan to develop and administer high-quality assessments addresses the following components:

- The process and timeline for development of test blueprints and item specifications;
- The review and selection of items for inclusion in the assessment (including through piloting);
- Scaling and scoring procedures to be used;
- Test administration procedures, including selection and use of appropriate accommodations;
- Data analysis proposed to document validity and reliability of the assessments;
- An independent evaluation of alignment of the assessment with the State’s college- and career-ready standards;
- The process and timeline for setting college- and career-ready achievement standards and the method and timeline to validate those achievement standards;
- Meaningful report formats to communicate results to students, parents and educators; and
- Next steps in terms of assessment in 2015-16 and beyond.

### ***Implementation 2014-15***

The table below provides an overview of the operational assessment milestones, and specific details regarding each activity are delineated in the paragraphs that follow.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>ISTEP+ Timeline</b>	<b>ECAs Timeline</b>
Specification Review Meetings and Test Blueprint Development	May/June 2014	August 2014
Passage Review Meetings	Early June 2014	September 2014
Item Development	June/July 2014	September/October 2014

Content Review and Bias/Sensitivity Review Meetings	Early August 2014	November 2014
Pilot New ECA Items During Early Winter Testing Window	N/A	December 2014 – January 2015
Form Selection and Build	Fall 2014	Late January/early February 2015
Administer Assessment	March 2015 (open-ended) May 2015 (machine-scored)	April/May 2015
Standard Setting (Cut Score Setting)	Summer 2015	Summer 2015

### Developing the Assessments (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

#### **Specification Review Meetings and Test Blueprint Development**

The fully operational assessments based on college- and career-ready standards are being designed in partnership with Indiana’s vendors, CTB/McGraw-Hill (CTB) and Questar Assessment, Incorporated (QAI). During meetings facilitated by CTB for ISTEP+ and QAI for ECAs, Assessment Content Specialists from Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) work alongside Indiana educators to establish item specifications and clarifications. (1C Attachment 1)

Depth of Knowledge (DOK) is assigned to each standard, reflecting the complexity of the standard, rather than the difficulty. In addition, each standard is assigned a “weight” in order to determine prioritization. An assignment of “3” represents essential content and skills that students must know and be able to do in order to be successful at the next level of learning—whether that is for the next grade level or course, or for the next topic within the content domain. An assignment of “2” represents important content and skills that students must learn; an assignment of “1” represents introductory content that students must be familiar with; and an assignment of “0” represents content and skills that are best assessed in the classroom.

Educators are also assigning item formats to each standard. Item formats include the following: multiple-choice, gridded-response, constructed-response, extended-response, a writing prompt and technology-enhanced items. In addition, educators are developing specifications and limits in order to clarify the intention of each standard, to describe appropriate ways in which to assess each standard, to identify appropriate language and vocabulary, to establish any content limits, and to provide examples of appropriate content and contexts.

The work on item specifications and standards prioritization is assisting IDOE in deriving the test blueprints.

**Passage Review Meetings**

During meetings facilitated by CTB and QAI, Assessment Content Specialists from IDOE work alongside Indiana educators to analyze and identify appropriate college- and career-ready reading passages. Both single- and paired-passages are selected for the item development phase of test design.

**Item Development**

Professional item writers will create items specifically aligned to Indiana’s college- and career-ready standards based on the specifications and limits identified by Indiana educators. Items will meet all interoperability requirements.

**Content Review and Bias/Sensitivity Review Meetings**

Educators and other stakeholders from across the state will attend Content Review Meetings and Bias/Sensitivity Review Meetings. Participants will verify that each item is: 1) aligned to a college- and career- ready Indiana Academic Standard; 2) accurate and appropriate for grade level and difficulty range; 3) clearly stated and unambiguous; 4) appropriate for the assigned DOK; and 5) free of bias or content that is sensitive to one or more population subgroups. (1C Attachments 2, 10)

**Form Selection and Build**

CTB and IDOE Assessment Content Specialists will work to select items and build test forms. Also, ancillary documents will be created and published, including Examiner’s Manuals, Practice Tests, and reference sheets.

**Administer the Assessments**

Indiana schools will administer ISTEP+ and ECAs based on college- and career-ready standards. Item types will include writing prompts, constructed-response, extended-response, multiple-choice, gridded-response, and technology-enhanced.

**Standard Setting (Cut Score Setting)**

Standard setting on the college- and career-ready ISTEP+ assessment and ECAs will be conducted in the summer of 2015. Establishing cut scores is a critical component in providing data that informs teaching and learning.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

***Details specific to ISTEP+:***

In terms of piloting the new test items, the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment will follow an operationalized field test design. Other states, such as Maryland and Colorado, have adopted this psychometric method of test design for which CTB has extensive experience. In Maryland, for example, all operationalized field test items have been included in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA), and in the Colorado Transitional Assessment Program (TCAP), about 25% of



the forms include operationalized items. For the ISTEP+ 2015 test design, IDOE and CTB will carefully consider students' testing time, the number of test forms, and required number of items per form for score reporting and standard setting.

The Spring 2015 ISTEP+ test forms will include field test items only. IDOE Content experts, CTB Content experts, and CTB Research will analyze students' performance on these items to carefully select the operational items by considering the statistical and psychometric quality of the items and the 2015 test blueprints, based on the new college- and career-ready Indiana Academic Standards which were adopted in April 2014.

The Spring 2015 ISTEP+ field test items include new types of items that will be thoroughly reviewed and considered. Additional items of each type will be included on the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment to ensure plenty of quality items are available. All field test items will be meticulously checked by IDOE Content experts and CTB Content experts during a comprehensive item review process to ensure quality of new item types.

Beginning in late summer and extending throughout the fall, IDOE will provide professional development designed to assist teachers in understanding how the new English/Language Arts and Mathematics standards will be assessed on ISTEP+. Teacher training will focus on a variety of topics, including how to use the *Instructional and Assessment Guidance* released in August to prioritize content standards, as well as how to plan classroom assessment activities that encompass the full Depth of Knowledge (DOK) range.

Providing assessment-related resources is essential to ensuring teacher and student preparedness for the ISTEP+ assessment based on new English/Language Arts and Mathematics college-and-career ready Indiana Academic Standards.

- In September, IDOE will share sample applied skills items for classroom use. These sample items and their accompanying rubrics will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to interact with more rigorous open-ended items.
- In October, IDOE will make available a set of technology-enhanced items also for classroom use. These items will be hosted by CTB in an *Experience College-and-Career Ready Assessment* environment. Students will engage with each of the technology-enhanced item types that will be part of the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment. The answer key will enable teachers to help students make timely adjustments in their learning.
- During the 2014-15 school year, the Acuity English/Language Arts and Mathematics diagnostic/formative assessments for students in grades 3-8 will focus exclusively on the new standards in order to monitor student progress and provide teachers with meaningful feedback regarding student learning.

***Details specific to ECAs:***

As the ECAs serve as Indiana’s Graduation Qualifying Examination (GQE), the transition includes curricular and instructional alignment, with a focus on the legal and policy issues regarding a diploma as a property right. IDOE is working with QAI to supplement existing ECAs with one or more sessions to expand the content of test items, enabling Indiana to assess the full range of the college- and career-ready Indiana Academic Standards in the spring of 2015 as required by Indiana’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver.

In addition to the operational assessment milestones outlined above, Indiana will pilot new items during the Early Winter ECA retest administration to obtain preliminary statistics that will assist in item selection for administration of the Spring 2015 ECAs.

Beginning in late fall and extending through January, IDOE will provide professional development designed to assist teachers in understanding how the new English/Language Arts and Mathematics standards will be assessed on the ECAs. Teacher training will focus on providing *Opportunity to Learn* for students and on ensuring that practitioners understand the need to update current ECAs. Additionally, the professional development will include specifics on how to plan classroom assessment activities that encompass the full Depth of Knowledge (DOK) range.

Providing assessment-related resources is also essential to ensuring teacher and student preparedness for the ECA assessments based on new English/Language Arts and Mathematics college-and-career ready Indiana Academic Standards.

- In December, IDOE will share sample applied skills items for classroom use. These sample items and their accompanying rubrics will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to interact with more rigorous open-ended items.
- In January, IDOE will make available a set of technology-enhanced items for classroom use, as student engagement with these new item types is essential.
- IDOE is currently working with the Acuity vendor, CTB, regarding the potential to add college- and career-ready content experiences into the existing Acuity Algebra I and Acuity English 10 programs to support teaching and learning.

### Scaling and Scoring the Assessments (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

Item Response Theory (IRT) refers to the theory underlying a family of statistical models. The statistical model analyzes the data obtained from test questions, or items. For the ISTEP+ test, two models will be used. The three-parameter logistic (3PL) and two-parameter partial-credit (2PPC) Item Response Theory (IRT) models will be applied to scaling ISTEP+ items. The 3PL model will be used for multiple-choice (MC) items, and 2PPC model will be used for the open-ended items, such as constructed-response items, gridded-response items, and technology-

enhanced items. The two models will be used in combination with test data to characterize items and generate student scale scores. Both models use the data to determine how difficult each item is and how well each item distinguishes students who do and do not have the skill being tested by the item. The 3PL model also describes the degree to which students can guess the correct answer to each item.

The ISTEP+ assessment design will meet two primary needs for scaling multiple forms of tests across grades on a common scale via vertical linking. Vertical scaling, which is one type of linking, is a process of placing scores from two or more tests on the same score scale when those tests differ in difficulty and content but are similar in the constructs measured. Vertical linking will be accomplished using the common item design across grades. Through vertical linking, a common scale will be set up across grades 3 to 8.

The 3PL model will be used to score the ECAs, and students' scores on both ISTEP+ and ECAs will be estimated using the pattern scoring method based on IRT. IRT pattern scoring incorporates item information, such as how difficult an item is for students to formulate a correct response. In contrast, raw scoring or number-correct scoring simply notes whether the student answered the item correctly. With pattern scoring, students who have the same number correct scores can have different scale scores.

### Test Administration Procedures (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

In an effort to ensure fidelity of the administration and to build staff confidence, IDOE will provide detailed directions for the assessment. Policies and procedures will be communicated via WebEx presentations, Question and Answer sessions, and written materials. The Test Coordinator's Manual will provide guidance to district- and school-level staff responsible for the administration of the assessment. The Examiner's Manual will contain session-specific directions, as well as appropriate practices before, during, and after testing. Test Coordinators, Examiners and Proctors will be required to attend assessment-related training.

IDOE will clearly delineate roles of staff with regard to assessments, including the following:

#### Superintendent

- Oversees educational program, including assessments
- Ensures development of a *test security policy* for the corporation and each individual school
- Implements ethical testing practices and procedures
- Designates Corporation Test Coordinator (CTC) and School Test Coordinator(s) (STC)

#### Corporation Test Coordinator (District-level)

- Provides direct oversight of assessment processes
- Disseminates guidance related to assessment programs

- Develops, communicates and implements procedures, protocols and training relative to test security, test access and accommodations, custody of secure materials, and ethical testing practices
- Serves as point-of-contact for the community (i.e., parents and media) related to assessment programs
- Maintains documentation of all test-related training at the corporation level, including training for School Test Coordinators
- Communicates expectations and procedures for reporting unethical behavior
- Ensures accurate and timely reporting of results
- Facilitates communication between the corporation and IDOE

#### School Test Coordinator

- Provides direct oversight of assessment processes and disseminates guidance related to assessment programs
- Communicates and implements procedures, protocols and training relative to test security, test access and accommodations, custody of secure materials, and ethical testing practices
- Serves as the point-of-contact and ensures appropriate communication with parents, students and school community stakeholders in all matters relevant to assessments in which the school participates
- Maintains documentation of all test-related training at the school, including training for Examiners and Proctors
- Ensures implementation of appropriate assessment accommodations, per the student's IEP, ILP, Section 504 Plan or Service Plan
- Completes all school-level administrative duties required of each assessment
- Communicates expectations and procedures for reporting unethical behavior
- Ensures accurate and timely reporting, especially to parents
- Facilitates communication between the school and the Corporation Test Coordinator

#### Examiner/Proctor

- Attends required corporation and/or school assessment training
- Reviews all examiner protocols and materials and administers assessments per examiner's manual instructions
- Communicates to STC any testing irregularities or security concerns
- Ensures implementation of ethical testing practices at all times
- Monitors students throughout test sessions
- Implements appropriately assessment accommodations, per the student's IEP, ILP, Section 504 Plan or Service Plan
- Reports any unethical practices or behavior before, during, and after testing

Test security will be taken seriously, and as part of the Indiana Code of Ethical Practices, any staff member who will be associated with test administration will be required to attend test

security training and sign the *Testing Integrity and Security Agreement*. Indiana will implement a formal process for schools and districts to report testing issues and irregularities.

The Office of Student Assessment will collaborate with the Office of Special Education and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education to identify, clarify, and disseminate guidance regarding appropriate and acceptable accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners. An appendix in the Indiana Assessment Program Manual will be dedicated to providing guidance in order to maximize student access to the assessment. Accommodations policies and procedures will be communicated via WebEx presentations, Question and Answer sessions, and written materials.

### Data Analysis: Documenting Assessment Validity and Reliability (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

#### **Reliability**

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA & NCME, 1999) refer to reliability as the “consistency of [a measure] when the testing procedure is repeated on a population of individuals or groups.” A reliable assessment is one that would produce stable scores if the same group of students were to take the same test repeatedly without any fatigue or memory of the test. As detailed below, the reliability of the ISTEP+ assessment will be estimated in four ways:

- Internal consistency is assessed using Cronbach’s alpha;
- Conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM), as the reciprocal of the square root of the test information function, is assessed at each scale score point;
- Classification consistency and accuracy are estimated to assess the reliability of achievement level classifications; and
- Item Information Function (IIF) is determined for each item.

Cronbach’s alpha, CSEM, classification consistency/accuracy, and IIF provide multiple methods to examine the reliability of the assessments. Cronbach’s alpha operates at the content level and provides estimates of reliability for student scores on a test. CSEM and classification consistency/accuracy provide important information related to the achievement level classifications. IIF provides measurement error information based on the IRT model at the item level.

#### **Validity**

The *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* define validity as “The degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed uses of

tests. Validity is, therefore, the most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating tests.” (AERA, APA, & NCME, 1999, p. 9)

The purpose of test score validation is not to validate the test itself but to validate interpretations of the test scores for particular purposes or uses. Test score validation is not a quantifiable property but is an ongoing process, beginning at initial conceptualization and continuing throughout the entire assessment process. Every aspect of an assessment provides evidence in support of (or as a challenge to) its validity, including design, content specifications, item development, psychometric quality, and inferences made from the results. There are multiple sources of validity evidence, which are summarized below.

***Evidence Based on Test Content.*** Documentation of the content domain, how the content is sampled and represented, and alignment of items to content standards will be articulated in the Technical Report in the Item and Test Development section. This will illustrate how test specification documents derived from earlier developmental activities, including the optimal test assembly process, guide the final phases of test development to achieve the operational tests. It will also document the participation of Indiana educators in the item and test development process to support the content and design of the ISTEP+ assessment. The knowledge, expertise, and professional judgment offered by Indiana educators will support the content validity of the ISTEP+ test.

***Evidence Based on Response Processes.*** The Technical Report's Item and Test Development section will describe how items for the ISTEP+ test are carefully developed to measure at specific depths of knowledge so that higher levels of thinking are actually measured by items making such claims.

***Evidence based on internal structure.*** Differential item functioning (DIF) and unidimensionality will be examined and documented. DIF analyses will be conducted for two grouping factors: gender (male and female) and ethnicity (White and African American). The two kinds of DIF statistics will be Mantel-Haenszel and standardized mean difference (SMD). The unidimensionality (or essential unidimensionality) assumption, which is important to apply the IRT model, is a testable hypothesis that is commonly evaluated through Principal Components Analysis (PCA). This analysis, using the correlation matrix, seeks evidence that a single primary factor, which is the first principal component that accounts for much of the relationship among test items, exists.

#### Evaluating Assessment Alignment (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

Indiana will contract with independent evaluators to analyze the alignment of ISTEP+ and ECAs with college- and career-ready 2014 Indiana Academic Standards in English/Language Arts and Mathematics.

Setting College- and Career-Ready Achievement Standards (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) provide information to describe student performance. To help validate college- and career-ready achievement standards, PLDs are developed to describe levels of performance. Educator committees, partnering with IDOE Assessment Content Specialists, work from the standards and define the skills that typify what students can do at designated levels (e.g., Advanced, Proficient, Novice). PLDs provide additional information/descriptions to show where students are along a continuum of achieving goals in the college- and career- ready achievement standards.

A variety of assessment item types can be used to validate achievement standards as well. From traditional multiple-choice to open-ended responses to technology-enhanced items (e.g., multiple-correct response, select text, drag-and-drop format, equation and expression entry), inferences can be made about student performance based on the evidence received from the test questions. Each item type extracts evidence in unique ways to get a fuller picture of student achievement (a picture of how students are progressing toward mastering college- and career-ready goals/standards).

In terms of setting cut scores, Indiana will use the Bookmark Standard Setting procedure in the summer of 2015. Facilitated by CTB and QAI measurement experts, Indiana educators will play an important role in establishing expected student performance at designated levels.

Communicating Results to Students, Parents and Educators (ISTEP+ and ECAs)

Indiana will provide data from ISTEP+ and the ECAs in the summer of 2015 to districts, schools, teachers, students and parents in order to document student performance and to inform instruction. One copy of the Individual Student Report will be printed per student and delivered to sites for distribution to students/parents.

Online portals will provide individual student results and state, district and school summary reports to educators. An option will be provided for school/district administrators to download a test results file electronically, via the online portal. Secure access to the online portal will be provided to all appropriate stakeholders. Access to different report types will be driven by the login level privileges set, such as Administrator, User, and Teacher.

IDOE will use the data from ISTEP+ and the ECAs to design specific statewide technical support and professional development for administrators and teachers, and will provide resources for parents based on information gained from the launch of the new college- and career-ready assessments.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

***Details specific to ISTEP+:***

The ISTEP+ Group Performance Matrix report will be delivered to teachers, showing a year-to-year growth of their students by subject area. The model for this report is based on a vertical scaling approach and comparing Scale Score and Performance level across current and previous year results.

***Details specific to ECAs:***

It is important to note that student performance on the ECAs will be measured in two ways beginning in the spring of 2015:

- 1) Student performance on ECA items aligned to Indiana’s new college- and career-ready standards will be used to calculate accountability.
- 2) Student performance on the “current ECA content” that comprises Indiana’s Graduation Qualifying Examination (GQE) will determine whether the student has met the graduation examination requirement.

The ECAs will continue to serve as the GQE until a new assessment is developed in 2015-16. A phased-in approach will be utilized when Indiana implements a new GQE in order to provide students with sufficient notice regarding their graduation examination requirement.

***Implementation 2015-16 and Beyond***

Indiana will seek one or more vendors to provide high-quality assessments based on Indiana’s college- and career-ready Academic Standards for 2015-16 and beyond. Indiana will require assessments that match the depth, breadth, and rigor of Indiana’s standards; accurately measure student progress toward college- and career-readiness; and provide valid data to inform teaching and learning. Indiana will require new vendor(s) to clearly delineate the way in which they propose to build future high-quality assessments for the purposes of informing instruction and providing accountability measures.

Indiana will utilize valuable resources from CCSSO in designing the request for proposal and in analyzing responses to the RFP, including *States’ Commitment to High-Quality Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness* and *Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments*. Indiana will collaborate with CCSSO staff members throughout the procurement and implementation phases to maximize the expertise available to states while transitioning to new assessment vendor(s) as current contracts expire in the summer of 2015.

In early spring of 2014, Superintendent Ritz appointed members of the State Board of Education to serve on the Assessment Subcommittee. This group is involved in the process of selecting vendor(s) to deliver Indiana’s assessments beginning in 2015-16 and beyond. (1C)



Attachment 3) The table below provides an overview of Indiana’s plan moving forward regarding assessments.

Activity	Details
Release Response for Information (RFI) in late May (1C Attachment 4)	Deadline for responses: June 6, 2014, 3:00 p.m. Eastern
Presentations from six vendors to further explain RFI responses	Assessment Subcommittee members attended presentations on June 12, 2014.
Assessment-related resolution presented to Indiana’s Education Roundtable for review and approval (1C Attachment 5)	Staff from the Indiana Department of Education and State Board of Education collaborated on decisions that need to be made as new assessments are designed and developed.
Assessment-related resolution presented to State Board of Education for review and approval	Meeting scheduled for July 9, 2014
Release of Response for Proposals (RFP)	Staff from the Indiana Department of Education and State Board of Education will collaborate on the development of this document, and release is expected by late July/early August.
Review/evaluate RFP responses	It is anticipated that RFP responses will be due late summer/early fall. A committee of educators will review the RFP responses. A rubric based on CCSSO’s <i>Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments</i> will be used to evaluate the responses.
Vendor presentations / recommendations to Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA)	Presentations by vendor finalists will occur in the fall of 2014. Recommended vendor(s) will be submitted to IDOA for the next step in Indiana’s procurement process.
IDOA continues procurement process	Additional review of proposals from recommended vendor(s) is conducted by IDOA, applying specific criteria, including Indiana economic impact.
Vendor selection	Negotiations with selected vendor(s) occurs

Contract award(s)	One or more vendors are awarded a contract to deliver Indiana’s assessments for 2015-16 and beyond, based on negotiated contract length
-------------------	---

Indiana educators play an important role in the development of assessments. From specifications and test blueprint development, to passage review, to content and bias/sensitivity review, to standard setting, Indiana educators are an integral part of the process, and the way in which those closest to the students inform assessment work is highly valued.

Indiana’s Testing Advisory Committee is comprised of practitioners, including test coordinators, school and district leaders, and teachers. This group meets four times a year to discuss various aspects of Indiana’s assessment system. These dedicated professionals provide feedback regarding implementation of current assessments, as well as input for the development of new ones.

Stakeholder groups, including representatives from the principals’ association, superintendents’ association, teachers’ associations, private schools’ association, and others, are called upon to respond to current and future assessment practices. These groups provide constructive comments regarding facets of the assessment system that directly impact their colleagues.

The Office of Student Assessment hosts an “Assessment Monthly Overview” WebEx for Test Coordinators year-round. Prior to the WebEx each month, the Office of Student Assessment distributes an updated set of important information, including dates, reminders, and other pertinent details, regarding each assessment program coordinated by the Indiana Department of Education. During the WebEx, staff members from the Office of Student Assessment discuss updates, provide clarification, and respond to questions from the field regarding program implementation.

Questions we receive from participants in all of the above-mentioned activities serve to inform the guidance created and disseminated by the Office of Student Assessment. All comments, both in the form of observations and critiques, help to identify areas that lack clarity—as well as those that are most helpful—which, in turn, fosters the distribution of improved communication and guidance regarding Indiana’s assessments.

### ***Special Education Assessments***

#### **Implementation 2014-15: Grades 3-8 and 10**

Indiana Department of Education started working with the National Center and State Collaborative (NCSC) in 2011 (<http://www.ncscpartners.org/project-timeline>). On June 23, 2014, participation in the NCSC English/Language Arts and Mathematics alternate assessments were approved by the Indiana State Board of Education. NCSC is applying research on alternate

assessments based on alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS) to develop a multi-state comprehensive assessment system for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The project draws on a strong research base to develop an AA-AAS that is built from the ground up on powerful validity arguments linked to clear learning outcomes and defensible assessment results, to complement the work of the Race to the Top Common State Assessment Program (RTTA) consortia.

Indiana and NCSC’s long-term goal is to ensure that students with significant cognitive disabilities achieve increasingly higher academic outcomes and leave high school ready for post-secondary options. A well-designed summative assessment alone is insufficient to achieve that goal. Thus, NCSC is developing a full system intended to support educators, which includes formative assessment tools and strategies, professional development on appropriate interim uses of data for progress monitoring, and management systems to ease the burdens of administration and documentation. All partners share a commitment to the research-to-practice focus of the project and the development of a comprehensive model of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and supportive professional development. These supports will improve the alignment of the entire system and strengthen the validity of inferences of the system of assessments (TA/PD information mentioned in Section 1.B). The Office of Special Education initiated its own focus on supports for teachers of students with significant cognitive abilities by funding a resource center in 2013, Project SUCCESS. Project SUCCESS supports teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. This includes providing critical background information and access to instructional and resource materials developed by NCSC. (IC Attachments 6,7,8)

As of Summer 2014, Indiana is one of 24 partner states involved with the NCSC Alternate Assessment work (<http://www.ncscpartners.org/about-states>). The overall timeline consists of four phases and the Operational Administration:

Year 1 (2011): Content Model Phase	Define model of domain learning in math/ELA for these students, Identify prioritized content for assessment, establish a Community of Practice (CoP) (IC Attachment 9)
Year 2 (2012): Principled Design Phase	Design patterns, Task templates, Curriculum/Instruction/PD design and pilot; Technology architecture design
Year 3 (2013): Item and Test Development Phase	Task template tryouts, Item specifications/item development/item reviews, Student Interaction Studies (SIS), Draft grade level Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs), Finalize pilot and field test design, Technology build
Year 4 (2014): Pilot Items, Field Test Forms, and Research Phase	Winter/Spring 2014: Pilot Phase 1: National sample, generate item

	statistics Finalize blueprints, revise items, assemble forms Fall 2014: Phase 2: Field Test Forms Finalize administration training and supports
Year 5 (2015): Operational Administration of NCSC Assessments	Summer 2015: Standard setting complete Fall 2015: Technical reporting complete

The table below provides a more detailed overview of the most recent operational assessment milestones provided in the NCSC GSEG grant:

Activity	Timeline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalized Reading Task Templates</li> <li>• Developed Mathematics and Reading Item Specifications and Items</li> <li>• Prioritized Writing CCCs</li> <li>• On-Site Passage Reviews</li> <li>• NCSC Graphics Style Guide</li> <li>• Task Template Tryouts: Reading</li> <li>• Draft PLDs</li> </ul>	January/May 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 Mathematics On-Site Item Reviews for Content/Bias and Sensitivity and revisions</li> <li>• 3 Reading On-Site Item Reviews for Content/Bias and Sensitivity; and revisions</li> <li>• Writing Item Development</li> </ul>	June/September 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Culminating Item Reviews: Mathematics and Reading</li> <li>• Accommodations Manual Development</li> <li>• Test Administration Manual Development</li> <li>• Finalize Performance Level Descriptors</li> <li>• Task Template Tryouts: Writing</li> </ul>	September 2013
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On-Site Writing Item Review for Content/Bias and Sensitivity</li> <li>• Culminating Item Reviews: Mathematics and Reading</li> <li>• Finalize Pilot Design: Phases 1 and 2</li> <li>• Pilot Phase 1: Sample Acquisition, Communication and Recruitment</li> <li>• Schools Prepare for Pilot Phase 1: Item Tryouts; National Sample</li> <li>• Test Administrator Professional Development Modules</li> </ul>	October/December 2013

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Interaction Studies</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schools Prepare for Pilot Phase 1: Item Tryouts</li> <li>• Test Administrators Complete Professional Development</li> </ul>	February/March 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot All Mathematics and ELA Items (Phase 1)</li> </ul>	March/May 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology requirements workshops with Breakthrough and CTB</li> </ul>	May/July, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generate Item Statistics</li> <li>• Item Data Review with SEAs</li> <li>• Finalize Blueprints, Revise Items, Assemble Forms</li> </ul>	June/August, 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot Test Forms for Operational Administration (Phase 2)</li> </ul>	October/November 2014
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training for Test Administrators</li> <li>• Alignment Study for Items Selected for Operational Forms</li> </ul>	Winter 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administer Operational NCSC Assessment</li> <li>• Hand Score Writing Items</li> </ul>	Spring 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct Standard Setting</li> <li>• Release Scores for Operational Assessments</li> <li>• Standard Setting Study</li> </ul>	Summer 2015
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complete Technical Manual</li> <li>• Complete NCSC Alternate Assessment Validity Argument</li> </ul>	Fall 2015

### Science, Social Studies, Functional Skills

Indiana will continue to use Indiana Standards Tool for Alternate Reporting (ISTAR) for Science and Social Studies. In addition, teachers may choose to monitor student progress related to functional skills utilizing ISTAR.

### English Language Proficiency Assessment

At the time of the visit for Part B monitoring in August 2013, IDOE had not joined the WIDA consortium. Since then, IDOE has received an official Attorney General opinion that joining the consortium will not violate HEA 1427 (1C Attachment 10). IDOE has also secured an approved sole source to contract (1C Attachment 11) with the Wisconsin Center for Education Research. Currently, IDOE is at the final stages of the contract work to join the WIDA consortium in order to use the ACCESS test for English language proficiency. This is expected to be completed Summer of 2014.

ACCESS will be fully implemented in Spring of the 2014-2015 school year. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education and the Office of Student Assessment have developed a high

quality plan for a smooth transition and implementation. IDOE has reached out to various other states that have made the transition from LAS Links to ACCESS. This has provided IDOE with particular insights and strategies for a smooth transition. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education has also been in close contact with the Title III federal program officer to ensure compliance throughout the transition. The offices will continue to work with WIDA, stakeholders, and English learner leaders on the transition. This work has already begun and will continue during the summer of 2014 and throughout the 2014-2015 school year. The plan includes webinars, workshops, technical assistance, updates, and timelines to the field. IDOE will then transition to ACCESS 2.0 in the school year 2015-2016. IDOE will coordinate with the WIDA Consortium to determine the implementation of the ACCESS 2.0 assessment which will include training for administrators, technology needs for the online assessment, grade level specifications, and needed support. Technical assistance and professional learning for the transition to ACCESS 2.0 will be based upon stakeholder feedback and lessons learned from the transition to ACCESS.

Monitoring of the implementation of the assessments will occur through five methods. First, testing information will be collected through the Language Minority (LM) data collection in November. This collection will allow IDOE to analyze how many students have participated in the new W-APT placement test. This collection will also indicate how many students should be participating in the annual ACCESS assessment. Second, IDOE will monitor through the Corporation Test Coordinator's registration and assessment management via the WIDA access system. This will allow IDOE to calculate who is and who is not accessing the system. Third, IDOE will monitor through the Title consolidated monitoring visits, Title III monitoring visits, and desktop monitoring. Fourth, IDOE will monitor through implementation surveys. The surveys will provide data on implementation and additional support and technical assistance that may need to occur. Fifth, data will be analyzed after the completion of the 2015 ACCESS assessment. Currently, IDOE has a data share agreement with Purdue University to analyze all previous LAS Links data. The expected analysis of ACCESS will be conducted in a similar format so that conclusions can be drawn that informs practice, policy, and procedures.

The Office of Student Assessment and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education will also work with WIDA on conducting an alignment study during the Fall of 2014 to analyze the WIDA standards in comparison to Indiana's new Academic Standards in English/Language Arts. In addition, a bridge study will be conducted in the Spring 2015 to compare LAS Links assessment expectations with those of the WIDA ACCESS assessment. The bridge study will provide information and guidance on transitioning to accountability measures using the ACCESS assessment.

### **Federal Flexibility for EL Students in Grades 3-8**

While LEAs are required to administer ISTEP+ math, science and social studies assessments to limited English proficient (LEP) students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year, LEP students who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year may be exempt from the reading/language arts assessment for one year. Students who are considered newly enrolled are those who enrolled in schools within the United States after March 1, 2013

or have been enrolled for less than 12 cumulative months. Federal flexibility is an LEA-level decision for grades 3-8 and may not be based on individual students or schools.

LEP students who first enrolled in a U.S. school prior to March 1, 2013 and have frequently moved in and out of the U.S. might be eligible for this flexibility if their cumulative length of enrollment in U.S. schools has been less than 12 months. In order to be eligible, a student must have never utilized the federal flexibility in the past. The LEA needs to review the student's past educational record, including schooling in Indiana and other U.S. states, to determine whether a student is eligible.

For students who are provided this flexibility by their LEA, **data submission is required in early May through the LEP/ISTEP+ collection.** Information is available through the STN community on Learning Connection.

### **Federal Flexibility for 10th Grade Cohort**

While LEAs are required to administer Algebra 1 and Biology 1 ECAs to 10<sup>th</sup> grade limited English proficient (LEP) students who are enrolled in those courses and who have been enrolled in U.S. schools for less than one year, LEP students who have been enrolled in U.S. school for less than one year may be exempt from the English 10 ECA . Students who are considered newly enrolled are those who enrolled in schools within the United States after March 1, 2013 or have been enrolled for less than 12 cumulative months. LEAs may choose from the scenarios provided on page 3 when determining federal flexibility for their 10<sup>th</sup> grade cohort students. LEP students who first enrolled in a U.S. school prior to March 1, 2013 and have frequently moved in and out of the U.S. might be eligible for this flexibility if their cumulative length of enrollment in U.S. schools has been less than 12 months. In order to be eligible, a student must have never utilized the federal flexibility in the past. The LEA needs to review the student's past educational record, including schooling in Indiana and other U.S. states, to determine whether a student is eligible.

Since the English 10 ECA is high stakes and associated with future graduation, careful consideration must be given to determine the best option for these students as they work towards fluency in English. In order to graduate, a student must pass the English 10 and Algebra 1 ECAs OR fulfill the requirements of the GQE evidence-based or work-readiness waivers. Both the GQE evidence-based and work-readiness waivers require a student to attempt to take an ECA at every available opportunity after the completion of the second year of English credit course.

### **Accountability:**

For accountability purposes, recently arrived LEP students must take:

- 1) the ISTEP+ math, science and social studies assessments; **AND**
- 2) the E/LA ISTEP+/English 10 ECA **OR** the LAS Links English Language Proficiency Assessment.

**Important Note:** For students who are provided this flexibility by their LEA, **data submission is required annually in early May through the LEP/ISTEP+ collection.** Information is available through the STN community on Learning Connection.

If federal flexibility is utilized for students, ISTEP+ reports will indicate that the student’s score is undetermined (UND) as these students would not have completed the E/LA portion of ISTEP+. However, through the LEP/ISTEP+ data collection, accountability calculations will account for corporations exercising federal flexibility.

Federal flexibility does not apply to IREAD-3. IREAD-3 is a state required assessment and there is no flexibility regarding LEP students’ participation. However, these students are still provided accommodations according to their Individual Learning Plans (ILP) and qualify for the Good Cause Exemption in accordance with the decision of an ILP committee.

### **What are the key provisions of this flexibility?**

- Only students who are found to be limited English proficient (either via the LAS links placement or LAS Links annual exam) AND have been enrolled U.S. schools after March 1, 2013 or for less than 12 cumulative months qualify for this flexibility.
- The flexibility can only be used once in a student’s educational career in the U.S.
- The time in U.S. school is cumulative and does not have to be 12 consecutive months. If an LEP student moves in and out of the country, the school must use the total amount of time in U.S. schools to determine whether the student has been enrolled less than 12 months.
- “U.S. schools” includes schools in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. It does NOT include schools in Puerto Rico, the outlying areas, or the freely associated states. Students who come to the United States from Puerto Rico, for example, where Spanish is the primary language of instruction, would not be considered to have been enrolled in U.S. schools while in Puerto Rico. Thus, LEP students from Puerto Rico would be included in the definition of recently arrived LEP students for purposes of these regulations. PLEASE note that this differs from the immigrant status of a student, as a student from Puerto Rico is not considered an immigrant.
- A student must have first taken the LAS links placement test and considered limited English proficient to be eligible. The student must take the next LAS links annual administration in order to qualify for this federal flexibility. Indiana may exempt a student from one annual administration of the E/LA portion only. The LEP student will still participate in other state content area assessments including math, science, and social studies, if applicable.
- Nothing about the flexibility regarding assessment or accountability for LEP students included in these regulations relieves SEAs, LEAs, or schools from their responsibilities to serve LEP students. The regulations in no way diminish the responsibility for schools to provide appropriate instruction to recently arrived LEP students so that they can gain English language skills and master content knowledge in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science



**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High-Quality Plan for Assessments: ISTEP+ for Grades 3-8 and End of Course Assessments**

**1.C Develop and Administer Annual, Statewide, Aligned, High-Quality Assessments that Measure Student Growth**

Indiana will ensure implementation of a high-quality plan that details the steps IDOE will take to administer in the 2014-2015 school year high-quality assessments, as defined in the USED ESEA Flexibility document.

**Key Components**

1. The process and timeline for development of test blueprints and item specifications
2. The review and selection of items for inclusion in the assessments
3. Scaling and scoring procedures to be used
4. Test administration procedures, including selection and use of appropriate accommodations
5. Data analyses proposed to document validity and reliability of the assessments
6. An independent evaluation of alignment of the assessments with the State’s college- and career-ready standards
7. The process and timeline for setting college- and career-ready achievement standards and the method and timeline to validate those achievement standards
8. Meaningful report formats to communicate results to students, parents, and educators
9. Next steps in terms of 2015-16 assessment

**Key Component #1**

The process and timeline for development of test blueprints and item specifications

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
The fully operational assessments based on college- and career- ready standards are being designed in partnership with Indiana’s vendors, CTB/McGraw-Hill (CTB) and Questar Assessment, Incorporated (QAI). During meetings facilitated by CTB for ISTEP+ and QAI for ECAs, Assessment Content Specialists from the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) work alongside Indiana educators to establish item specifications and clarifications. The work on item specifications and standards prioritization is assisting the IDOE in deriving the test blueprints.	ISTEP+: May/June 2014 ECAs: August 2014	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Meeting invitations and secure specification documents	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles
Depth of Knowledge (DOK) is assigned to each standard, reflecting the complexity of the standard, rather than the difficulty. In addition, each standard is assigned a “weight” in order to determine prioritization. An assignment of “3” represents essential content and skills that students must know and be able to do in order to be successful at the next level of learning—whether that is for the next grade level or course, or for the next topic within the content domain. An	ISTEP+: May/June 2014 ECAs: August 2014	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Meeting invitations and secure specification documents	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles

assignment of “2” represents important content and skills that students must learn; an assignment of “1” represents introductory content that students must be familiar with; and an assignment of “0” represents content and skills that are best assessed in the classroom.					
Educators are also assigning item formats to each standard. Item formats include the following: multiple-choice, gridded-response, constructed-response, extended-response, a writing prompt and technology-enhanced items. In addition, educators are developing specifications and limits in order to clarify the intention of each standard, to describe appropriate ways in which to assess each standard, to identify appropriate language and vocabulary, to establish any content limits, and to provide examples of appropriate content and contexts.	ISTEP+: May/June 2014 ECAs: August 2014	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Meeting invitations and secure specification documents	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles
During meetings facilitated by CTB and QAI, Assessment Content Specialists from the IDOE work alongside Indiana educators to analyze and identify appropriate college- and career-ready reading passages. Both single- and paired-passages are selected for the item development phase of test design.	ISTEP+: Early June 2014 ECAs: September 2014	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw- Hill; Questar Assessment	Meeting invitations and secure passage selection documents	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Expert	No current obstacles
Professional item writers will create items specifically aligned to Indiana’s college- and career-ready 2014 Indiana Academic Standards based on the specifications and limits identified by Indiana educators. Items will meet all interoperability requirements.	ISTEP+: June/July 2014 ECAs: September/ October 2014	CTB/McGraw- Hill; Questar Assessment	Secure items provided for IDOE review	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #2</b>					
The review and selection of items for inclusion in the assessments (including through piloting)					
Key milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Educators and other stakeholders from across the state will attend Content Review Meetings and Bias/Sensitivity Review Meetings. Participants will verify that each item is: 1) aligned to a college- and career- ready Indiana Academic Standard; 2) accurate and appropriate for grade level and difficulty range; 3) clearly stated and unambiguous; 4) appropriate for the assigned DOK; and 5) free of bias or content that is sensitive to one or more population subgroups.	ISTEP+: Early August 2014 ECAs: November 2014	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw- Hill; Questar Assessment	Meeting invitations and secure specification documents	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles
Indiana will pilot new items during the Early Winter ECA retest administration to obtain preliminary statistics that will assist in item selection for administration of the Spring 2015 ECAs.	ECAs: December 2014 – January 2015	Office of Student Assessment; Questar Assessment	Secure test forms	Office of Student Assessment staff; Questar Assessment staff	Technology availability in schools
CTB and IDOE Assessment Content Specialists will work to select items and build test forms. Also, ancillary documents will be created and published, including Examiner’s Manuals, Practice Tests, and reference sheets.	ISTEP+: Fall 2014 ECAs: Late January/ early February	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw- Hill; Questar Assessment	Secure test maps and forms	Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts	No current obstacles

	2015				
Beginning in late summer and extending throughout the fall, the IDOE will provide professional development designed to assist teachers in understanding how the new English/Language Arts and Mathematics standards will be assessed on ISTEP+. Teacher training will focus on a variety of topics, including how to use the <i>Instructional and Assessment Guidance</i> released in August to prioritize content standards, as well as how to plan classroom assessment activities that encompass the full Depth of Knowledge (DOK) range.	ISTEP+: Late Summer/ Fall 2014	Office of Student Assessment	Professional development materials	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
Providing assessment-related resources is essential to ensuring teacher and student preparedness for the ISTEP+ assessment based on new English/Language Arts and Mathematics college-and-career ready Indiana Academic Standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In September, the IDOE will share sample applied skills items for classroom use. These sample items and their accompanying rubrics will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to interact with more rigorous open-ended items.</li> <li>In October, the IDOE will make available a set of technology-enhanced items also for classroom use. These items will be hosted by CTB in an <i>Experience College-and-Career Ready Assessment</i> environment. Students will engage with each of the technology-enhanced item types that will be part of the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment. The answer key will enable teachers to help students make timely adjustments in their learning.</li> <li>During the 2014-15 school year, the Acuity English/Language Arts and Mathematics diagnostic/formative assessments for students in grades 3-8 will focus exclusively on the new standards in order to monitor student progress and provide teachers with meaningful feedback regarding student learning.</li> </ul>	ISTEP+: September 2014 – June 2015	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill	Practice materials, sample items, formative assessments	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
In terms of piloting the new test items, the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment will follow an operationalized field test design. Other states, such as Maryland and Colorado, have adopted this psychometric method of test design for which CTB has extensive experience. In Maryland, for example, all operationalized field test items have been included in the Maryland School Assessment (MSA), and in the Colorado Transitional Assessment Program (TCAP), about 25% of the forms include operationalized items. For the ISTEP+	ISTEP+: Spring 2015	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw- Hill	Secure test forms	Office of Student Assessment staff; CTB/McGraw-Hill staff	Technology availability in schools

<p>2015 test design, IDOE and CTB will carefully consider students’ testing time, the number of test forms, and required number of items per form for score reporting and standard setting.</p>					
<p>The Spring 2015 ISTEP+ test forms will include field test items only. IDOE Content experts, CTB Content experts, and CTB Research will analyze students’ performance on these items to carefully select the operational items by considering the statistical and psychometric quality of the items and the 2015 test blueprints, based on the new college- and career-ready Indiana Academic Standards which were adopted in April 2014.</p>	<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill</p>	<p>Secure test forms</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff; CTB/McGraw-Hill staff</p>	<p>Technology availability in schools</p>
<p>The Spring 2015 ISTEP+ field test items include new types of items that will be thoroughly reviewed and considered. Additional items of each type will be included on the Spring 2015 ISTEP+ assessment to ensure plenty of quality items are available. All field test items will be meticulously checked by IDOE Content experts and CTB Content experts during a comprehensive item review process to ensure quality of new item types.</p>	<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill</p>	<p>Secure test forms</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff; CTB/McGraw-Hill staff</p>	<p>Technology availability in schools</p>
<p>Beginning in late fall and extending through January, the IDOE will provide professional development designed to assist teachers in understanding how the new English/Language Arts and Mathematics standards will be assessed on the ECAs. Teacher training will focus on providing <i>Opportunity to Learn</i> for students and on ensuring that practitioners understand the need to update current ECAs. Additionally, the professional development will include specifics on how to plan classroom assessment activities that encompass the full Depth of Knowledge (DOK) range.</p> <p>Providing assessment-related resources is also essential to ensuring teacher and student preparedness for the ECA assessments based on new English/Language Arts and Mathematics college-and-career ready Indiana Academic Standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In December, the IDOE will share sample applied skills items for classroom use. These sample items and their accompanying rubrics will provide an opportunity for teachers and students to interact with more rigorous open-ended items.</li> <li>• In January, the IDOE will make available a set of technology-enhanced items for classroom use, as student engagement with these new item types is essential.</li> </ul>	<p>ECAs: November 2014 – March 2015</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment; Questar Assessment</p>	<p>Practice materials, sample items, formative assessments</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IDOE is currently working with the Acuity vendor, CTB, regarding the potential to add college- and career-ready content experiences into the existing Acuity Algebra I and Acuity English 10 programs to support teaching and learning.</li> </ul>					
<p>As the ECAs serve as Indiana’s Graduation Qualifying Examination (GQE), the transition includes curricular and instructional alignment, with a focus on the legal and policy issues regarding a diploma as a property right. The IDOE is working with QAI to supplement existing ECAs with one or more sessions to expand the content of test items, enabling Indiana to assess the full range of the college- and career-ready Indiana Academic Standards in the spring of 2015 as required by Indiana’s ESEA Flexibility Waiver. Indiana will pilot new items during the Early Winter ECA retest administration to obtain preliminary statistics that will assist in item selection for administration of the Spring 2015 ECAs.</p> <p>Student performance on the ECAs will be measured in two ways beginning in the spring of 2015:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) Student performance on ECA items aligned to Indiana’s new college- and career-ready standards will be used to calculate accountability.</li> <li>4) Student performance on the “current ECA content” that comprises Indiana’s Graduation Qualifying Examination (GQE) will determine whether the student has met the graduation examination requirement.</li> </ol> <p>The ECAs will continue to serve as the GQE until a new assessment is developed in 2015-16. A phased-in approach will be utilized when Indiana implements a new GQE in order to provide students with sufficient notice regarding their graduation examination requirement.</p>	<p>ECAs: Early Winter 2014-15; Spring 2015</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment; Questar Assessment</p>	<p>Secure test forms</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff; Questar Assessment staff</p>	<p>Technology availability in schools;</p> <p>Clear communication regarding the Algebra I and English 10 End of Course Assessments as the graduation examination and as accountability assessments</p>
<p><b>Key Component #3</b></p> <p>Scaling and scoring procedures to be used</p>					
<p>Key Milestones and activities</p>	<p>Detailed Timeline</p>	<p>Party Responsible</p>	<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Resources</p>	<p>Significant obstacles</p>
<p>Item Response Theory (IRT) refers to the theory underlying a family of statistical models. The statistical model analyzes the data obtained from test questions, or items. For the ISTEP+ test, two models will be used. The three-parameter logistic (3PL) and two-parameter partial-credit (2PPC) Item Response Theory (IRT) models will be applied to scaling ISTEP+ items. The 3PL model will be used for multiple-choice (MC) items, and 2PPC model will be used</p>	<p>Summer 2015</p>	<p>CTB/McGraw-Hill</p>	<p>Scaling and scoring procedures in Technical Report</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>

for the open-ended items, such as constructed-response items, gridded-response items, and technology-enhanced items. The two models will be used in combination with test data to characterize items and generate student scale scores. Both models use the data to determine how difficult each item is and how well each item distinguishes students who do and do not have the skill being tested by the item. The 3PL model also describes the degree to which students can guess the correct answer to each item.					
The ISTEP+ assessment design will meet two primary needs for scaling multiple forms of tests across grades on a common scale via vertical linking. Vertical scaling, which is one type of linking, is a process of placing scores from two or more tests on the same score scale when those tests differ in difficulty and content but are similar in the constructs measured. Vertical linking will be accomplished using the common item design across grades. Through vertical linking, a common scale will be set up across grades 3 to 8.	Summer 2015	CTB/McGraw-Hill	Scaling and scoring procedures in Technical Report	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
The 3PL model will be used to score the ECAs, and students' scores on both ISTEP+ and ECAs will be estimated using the pattern scoring method based on IRT. IRT pattern scoring incorporates item information, such as how difficult an item is for students to formulate a correct response. In contrast, raw scoring or number-correct scoring simply notes whether the student answered the item correctly. With pattern scoring, students who have the same number correct scores can have different scale scores.	Summer 2015	CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Scaling and scoring procedures in Technical Report	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #4</b>					
Test administration procedures, including selection and use of appropriate accommodations					
<b>Key Milestones and activities</b>	<b>Detailed Timeline</b>	<b>Party Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence</b>	<b>Resources</b>	<b>Significant obstacles</b>
Indiana schools will administer ISTEP+ and ECAs based on college- and career-ready standards. Item types will include writing prompts, constructed-response, extended-response, multiple-choice, gridded-response, and technology-enhanced.	Spring 2015	Office of Student Assessment; Office of Special Education; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Test materials, examiner's manuals, test coordinator manual, WebEx trainings	Office of Student Assessment Staff; Office of Special Education Staff	No current obstacles
In an effort to ensure fidelity of the administration and to build staff confidence, the IDOE will provide detailed directions for the assessment. Policies and procedures will be communicated via WebEx presentations, Question and Answer sessions, and written materials. The Test Coordinator's Manual will provide guidance to district- and school-level staff responsible for the administration of the assessment. The Examiner's Manual will contain session-specific directions, as well as appropriate practices before,	Spring 2015	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Test materials, examiner's manuals, test coordinator manual	Office of Student Assessment Staff	No current obstacles

during, and after testing. Test Coordinators, Examiners and Proctors will be required to attend assessment-related training.					
The Office of Student Assessment will collaborate with the Office of Special Education and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education to identify, clarify, and disseminate guidance regarding appropriate and acceptable accommodations for Students with Disabilities and English Learners. An appendix in the Indiana Assessment Program Manual will be dedicated to providing guidance in order to maximize student access to the assessment. Accommodations policies and procedures will be communicated via WebEx presentations, Question and Answer sessions, and written materials.	July 2014 – February 2014	Office of Student Assessment; Office of Special Education	Test materials, examiner’s manuals, test coordinator manual, WebEx trainings	Office of Student Assessment Staff; Office of Special Education Staff	No current obstacles
Test security will be taken seriously, and as part of the Indiana Code of Ethical Practices, any staff member who will be associated with test administration will be required to attend test security training and sign the <i>Testing Integrity and Security Agreement</i> . Indiana will implement a formal process for schools and districts to report testing issues and irregularities.	August 2014 – June 2015	Office of Student Assessment	WebEx trainings, Indiana Assessment Program Manual	Testing issues and irregularities report forms	No current obstacles
The IDOE will clearly delineate roles of staff with regard to assessments, including the following: Superintendent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oversees educational program, including assessments</li> <li>• Ensures development of a <i>test security policy</i> for the corporation and each individual school</li> <li>• Implements ethical testing practices and procedures</li> <li>• Designates Corporation Test Coordinator (CTC) and School Test Coordinator(s) (STC)</li> </ul>	August 2014 – June 2015	Office of Student Assessment	WebEx trainings, Indiana Assessment Program Manual	Roles and responsibilities document	No current obstacles
Corporation Test Coordinator (District-level) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides direct oversight of assessment processes</li> <li>• Disseminates guidance related to assessment programs</li> <li>• Develops, communicates and implements procedures, protocols and training relative to test security, test access and accommodations, custody of secure materials, and ethical testing practices</li> <li>• Serves as point-of-contact for the community (i.e., parents and media) related to assessment programs</li> <li>• Maintains documentation of all test-related</li> </ul>	August 2014 – June 2015	Office of Student Assessment	WebEx trainings, Indiana Assessment Program Manual	Roles and responsibilities document	No current obstacles

<p>training at the corporation level, including training for School Test Coordinators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communicates expectations and procedures for reporting unethical behavior</li> <li>Ensures accurate and timely reporting of results</li> <li>Facilitates communication between the corporation and the IDOE</li> </ul>					
<p>Examiner/Proctor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attends required corporation and/or school assessment training</li> <li>Reviews all examiner protocols and materials and administers assessments per examiner’s manual instructions</li> <li>Communicates to STC any testing irregularities or security concerns</li> <li>Ensures implementation of ethical testing practices at all times</li> <li>Monitors students throughout test sessions</li> <li>Implements appropriately assessment accommodations, per the student’s IEP, ILP, Section 504 Plan or Service Plan</li> <li>Reports any unethical practices or behavior before, during, and after testing</li> </ul>	August 2014 – June 2015	Office of Student Assessment	WebEx trainings, Indiana Assessment Program Manual	Roles and responsibilities document	No current obstacles
<p><b>Key Component #5</b></p> <p>Data analyses proposed to document validity and reliability of the assessments</p>					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
<p><b>Reliability</b></p> <p>The <i>Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> (AERA, APA &amp; NCME, 1999) refer to reliability as the “consistency of [a measure] when the testing procedure is repeated on a population of individuals or groups.” A reliable assessment is one that would produce stable scores if the same group of students were to take the same test repeatedly without any fatigue or memory of the test. As detailed below, the reliability of the ISTEP+ assessment will be estimated in four ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Internal consistency is assessed using Cronbach’s alpha;</li> <li>Conditional standard error of measurement (CSEM), as the reciprocal of the square root of the test information function, is assessed at each scale score point;</li> <li>Classification consistency and accuracy are estimated to assess the reliability of achievement level classifications; and</li> </ul>	Summer 2015	CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Validity and reliability components in Technical Report	Office of Student Assessment staff (time to review validity and reliability statements/arguments)	No current obstacles



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Item Information Function (IIF) is determined for each item.</li> </ul> <p>Cronbach’s alpha, CSEM, classification consistency/accuracy, and IIF provide multiple methods to examine the reliability of the assessments. Cronbach’s alpha operates at the content level and provides estimates of reliability for student scores on a test. CSEM and classification consistency/accuracy provide important information related to the achievement level classifications. IIF provides measurement error information based on the IRT model at the item level.</p>					
<p><b>Validity</b>  <i>The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing</i> define validity as “The degree to which evidence and theory support the interpretations of test scores entailed by proposed uses of tests. Validity is, therefore, the most fundamental consideration in developing and evaluating tests.” (AERA, APA, &amp; NCME, 1999, p. 9)          The purpose of test score validation is not to validate the test itself but to validate interpretations of the test scores for particular purposes or uses. Test score validation is not a quantifiable property but is an ongoing process, beginning at initial conceptualization and continuing throughout the entire assessment process. Every aspect of an assessment provides evidence in support of (or as a challenge to) its validity, including design, content specifications, item development, psychometric quality, and inferences made from the results. There are multiple sources of validity evidence, which are summarized below.  <b>Evidence Based on Test Content.</b> Documentation of the content domain, how the content is sampled and represented, and alignment of items to content standards will be articulated in the Technical Report in the Item and Test Development section. This will illustrate how test specification documents derived from earlier developmental activities, including the optimal test assembly process, guide the final phases of test development to achieve the operational tests. It will also document the participation of Indiana educators in the item and test development process to support the content and design of the ISTEP+ assessment. The knowledge, expertise, and professional judgment offered by Indiana educators will support the content validity of the ISTEP+ test.  <b>Evidence Based on Response Processes.</b> The Technical Report’s Item and Test Development section will describe how items for the ISTEP+ test are carefully developed to measure at specific depths of knowledge so that higher levels of thinking are actually measured by items making such claims.</p>	<p>Summer 2015</p>	<p>CTB/McGraw-Hill;          Questar Assessment</p>	<p>Validity and reliability components in Technical Report</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment staff (time to review validity and reliability statements/arguments)</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>

<p><b>Evidence based on internal structure.</b> Differential item functioning (DIF) and unidimensionality will be examined and documented. DIF analyses will be conducted for two grouping factors: gender (male and female) and ethnicity (White and African American). The two kinds of DIF statistics will be Mantel-Haenszel and standardized mean difference (SMD). The unidimensionality (or essential unidimensionality) assumption, which is important to apply the IRT model, is a testable hypothesis that is commonly evaluated through Principal Components Analysis (PCA). This analysis, using the correlation matrix, seeks evidence that a single primary factor, which is the first principal component that accounts for much of the relationship among test items, exists.</p>					
<p><b>Key Component #6</b> An independent evaluation of alignment of the assessments with the State’s college- and career-ready standards</p>					
<p><b>Key Milestones and activities</b></p>	<p><b>Detailed Timeline</b></p>	<p><b>Party Responsible</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p><b>Resources</b></p>	<p><b>Significant obstacles</b></p>
<p>Indiana will contract with independent evaluators to analyze the alignment of ISTEP+ and ECAs with college- and career-ready 2014 Indiana Academic Standards in English/Language Arts and Mathematics.</p>	<p>Summer 2015</p>	<p>Independent third-party</p>	<p>Alignment Report</p>	<p>Indiana Academic Standards</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p><b>Key Component #7</b> The process and timeline for setting college- and career-ready achievement standards and the method and timeline to validate those achievement standards</p>					
<p><b>Key Milestones and activities</b></p>	<p><b>Detailed Timeline</b></p>	<p><b>Party Responsible</b></p>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p>	<p><b>Resources</b></p>	<p><b>Significant obstacles</b></p>
<p>Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs) provide information to describe student performance. To help validate college- and career-ready achievement standards, PLDs are developed to describe levels of performance. Educator committees, partnering with the IDOE Assessment Content Specialists, work from the standards and define the skills that typify what students can do at designated levels (e.g., Advanced, Proficient, Novice). PLDs provide additional information/descriptions to show where students are along a continuum of achieving goals in the college- and career-ready achievement standards. A variety of assessment item types can be used to validate achievement standards as well. From traditional multiple-choice to open-ended responses to technology-enhanced items (e.g., multiple-correct response, select text, drag-and-drop format, equation and expression entry), inferences can be made about student performance based on the evidence</p>	<p>Summer 2015</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment</p>	<p>Meeting invitations and secure standard setting materials</p>	<p>Office of Student Assessment Subject Matter Experts</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>

<p>received from the test questions. Each item type extracts evidence in unique ways to get a fuller picture of student achievement (a picture of how students are progressing toward mastering college- and career-ready goals/standards).                  In terms of setting cut scores, Indiana will use the Bookmark Standard Setting procedure in the summer of 2015. Facilitated by CTB and QAI measurement experts, Indiana educators will play an important role in establishing expected student performance at designated levels.</p>					
<p>Students' scores will be tracked longitudinally to validate increasing degree of college- and career-readiness over time.</p>	Spring 2016 and beyond	Office of Student Assessment; test contractor	Longitudinal data regarding college- and career-readiness of students as measured by assessments in subsequent grade levels	N/A	No current obstacles
<p><b>Key Component #8</b></p> <p>Meaningful report formats to communicate results to students, parents, and educators</p>					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
<p>Indiana will provide data from ISTEP+ and the ECAs in the summer of 2015 to districts, schools, teachers, students and parents in order to document student performance and to inform instruction. One copy of the Individual Student Report will be printed per student and delivered to sites for distribution to students/parents.</p> <p>Online portals will provide individual student results and state, district and school summary reports to educators. An option will be provided for school/district administrators to download a test results file electronically, via the online portal. Secure access to the online portal will be provided to all appropriate stakeholders. Access to different report types will be driven by the login level privileges set, such as Administrator, User, and Teacher.</p>	Summer 2015	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill; Questar Assessment	Feedback regarding utility of assessment results from schools, districts, and parents	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
<p>The IDOE will use the data from ISTEP+ and the ECAs to design specific statewide technical support and professional development for administrators and teachers, and will provide resources for parents based on information gained from the launch of the new college- and career-ready assessments.</p>	Fall 2015	Office of Student Assessment	Professional development materials; parent-based resources	Office of Student Assessment staff	No current obstacles
<p>The ISTEP+ Group Performance Matrix report will be delivered to teachers, showing a year-to-year growth of their students by subject area. The model for this report is based on a vertical scaling approach and comparing Scale Score and Performance level across current and previous</p>	Spring 2015	Office of Student Assessment; CTB/McGraw-Hill	Report copies	Data collection to match teachers with students	No current obstacles

year results.					
<b>Key Component #9</b>					
Next steps in terms of 2015-16 assessment					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
<p>Indiana will seek one or more vendors to provide high-quality assessments based on Indiana’s college- and career-ready Academic Standards for 2015-16 and beyond. Indiana will require assessments that match the depth, breadth, and rigor of Indiana’s standards; accurately measure student progress toward college- and career-readiness; and provide valid data to inform teaching and learning. Indiana will require new vendor(s) to clearly delineate the way in which they propose to build future high-quality assessments for the purposes of informing instruction and providing accountability measures.</p> <p>Indiana will utilize valuable resources from CCSSO in designing the request for proposal and in analyzing responses to the RFP, including <i>States’ Commitment to High-Quality Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness</i> and <i>Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments</i>. Indiana will collaborate with CCSSO staff members throughout the procurement and implementation phases to maximize the expertise available to states while transitioning to new assessment vendor(s) as current contracts expire in the summer of 2015.</p>	July 2014 – December 2014	Office of Student Assessment	Meeting agendas	Background on Indiana’s current assessment system; information regarding assessments moving forward	No current obstacles
In early spring of 2014, Superintendent Ritz appointed members of the State Board of Education to serve on the Assessment Subcommittee. This group is involved in the process of selecting vendor(s) to deliver Indiana’s assessments beginning in 2015-16 and beyond. The information below provides details of Indiana’s plan moving forward regarding assessments.	July 2014 – November 2014	Office of Student Assessment	Request for Proposals document	Rubric created to use in analyzing and evaluating responses	No current obstacles
Release Response for Information (RFI) in late May	Deadline for responses: June 6, 2014, 3:00 p.m. Eastern	Office of Student Assessment	Indiana Department of Administration documentation	CCSSO publications, <i>States’ Commitment to High-Quality Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness</i> and <i>Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments</i>	No current obstacles

Presentations from six vendors to further explain RFI responses	Assessment Subcommittee members attended presentations on June 12, 2014.	Office of Student Assessment	Secure RFI responses	List of questions for Assessment Subcommittee members to ask during presentations	No current obstacles
Assessment-related resolution presented to Indiana's Education Roundtable for review and approval	Staff from the Indiana Department of Education and State Board of Education collaborated on decisions that need to be made as new assessments are designed and developed for resolution presented on June 23, 2014.	Office of Student Assessment	Meeting minutes	Resolution	No current obstacles
Assessment-related resolution presented to State Board of Education for review and approval	Meeting scheduled for July 9, 2014	Office of Student Assessment	Meeting minutes	Resolution	No current obstacles
Release of Response for Proposals (RFP)	Staff from the Indiana Department of Education and State Board of Education will collaborate on the development of this document, and release is expected by late July/early August.	Office of Student Assessment	Indiana Department of Administration documentation	CCSSO publications, <i>States' Commitment to High-Quality Assessments Aligned to College- and Career-Readiness</i> and <i>Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments</i>	No current obstacles
Review/evaluate RFP responses	It is anticipated that RFP responses will be due late summer/early fall. A committee of educators will review the RFP responses. A rubric based on CCSSO's <i>Criteria for Procuring and Evaluating High-Quality Assessments</i> will be used to evaluate the responses.	Office of Student Assessment	Meeting agendas; evaluation forms	Rubric created to use in analyzing and evaluating responses	No current obstacles
Vendor presentations / recommendations to Indiana Department of Administration (IDOA)	Presentations by vendor finalists will occur in the fall of 2014. Recommended vendor(s) will be submitted to IDOA for the next step in Indiana's procurement process.	Office of Student Assessment	Meeting agendas; evaluation forms	Rubric created to use in analyzing and evaluating responses	No current obstacles
IDOA continues procurement process	Additional review of proposals from recommended vendor(s) is conducted by IDOA, applying specific criteria, including Indiana economic impact, in	Office of Student Assessment	Indiana Department of Administration documentation	RFP responses	No current obstacles

	mid- to late-fall.				
Vendor selection	Negotiations with selected vendor(s) occurs in late fall.	Office of Student Assessment	Indiana Department of Administration documentation	RFP responses and Indiana Department of Administration forms/documents	No current obstacles
Contract award(s)	One or more vendors are awarded a contract to deliver Indiana’s assessments for 2015-16 and beyond, based on negotiated contract length. Award(s) are anticipated in late fall.	Office of Student Assessment	Indiana Department of Administration documentation	RFP responses and any additional addendums from vendor(s)	No current obstacles

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**1.C – Alternate Assessment**

**Key Components**

1. Develop and administer no later than the 2014-15 school year, alternate assessments based on grade-level academic achievement standards or alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities that are consistent and aligned with State’s college- and career-ready standards

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Community of Practice (CoP)	6/2011 – 4/2013	NCSC staff, Office of Student Assessment and Office of Special Education	NCSC- Newsletter- Volume-1 (Alternate Assessment 1)	Staff	No current obstacles
Subject matter experts worked with NCSC staff on Design patterns, Task templates, Curriculum/Instruction/PD design and pilot; Technology architecture design.	9/2011 - 3/14	NCSC staff and IDOE state leads	The information is secure and is posted on the NCSC shared drive. <a href="http://www.ncscpartners.org/resources">http://www.ncscpartners.org/resources</a>	Staff	No current obstacles

New Indiana Resource Network is created - Project SUCCESS. It supports teachers and administrators in the design and implementation of Indiana Academic Standards in curriculum and instruction for students with significant cognitive disabilities. This includes providing critical background information and access to instructional and resource materials developed by NCSC.	4/2013 - ongoing	Office of Special Education	Project Success website and resources ( <a href="http://project-successindiana.com/">http://project-successindiana.com/</a> )	Staff and funding	No current obstacles
State leads worked on item specifications/item development/item reviews, Draft grade level Performance Level Descriptors (PLDs).	2/2012-8/2013	NCSC staff, Office of Student Assessment and Office of Special Education	The information is secure and is posted on the NCSC shared drive. <a href="http://www.ncscpartners.org/resources">http://www.ncscpartners.org/resources</a>	Staff	No current obstacles
Project SUCCESS Summer Regional Trainings.	6/2013 – 8/2013	Project Success staff and Office of Student Assessment and Office of Special Education	Agenda and application (Alternate Assessment 2 & 3)	Staff and funding	No current obstacles



Pilot Phase 1: 221 teachers volunteered and assessed 717 students.	4/2014 – 5/2015	NCSC and Office of Student Assessment	List (Alternate Assessment 4)	Staff	No current obstacles
Project SUCCESS Regional Training Sessions.	6/2014 – 7/2014	Project Success staff and Office of Student Assessment and Office of Special Education	<a href="http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=57:summer-training-june-5-decatur&amp;catid=21:events&amp;Itemid=484">http://projectsuccessindiana.com/content/index.php?option=com_content&amp;view=article&amp;id=57:summer-training-june-5-decatur&amp;catid=21:events&amp;Itemid=484</a>	Staff and funding	No current obstacles
National sample, generate item statistics Finalize blueprints, revise items, assemble forms	6/2014 – 10/2014	NCSC and Office of Student Assessment	The information is secure and is posted on the NCSC shared drive.	Staff	No current obstacles
Pilot Phase 2: Representative Sample	10/2014 – 11/2014	NCSC and Office of Student Assessment	TBD	Staff	No current obstacles

Online trainings for operational assessment	Fall 2014-Winter 2015	NCSC staff, Office of Student Assessment	Online training (currently under development)	Staff	No current obstacles
Operational Alternate Assessment for Spring 2015	TBD	NCSC staff, Office of Student Assessment and Office of Special Education	TBD	Staff	No current obstacles

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**1.C – Develop and Administer Annual, Statewide, Aligned, High-Quality Assessments that measure Student Growth - State will develop and administer ELP assessments aligned with the State’s ELP standards**

**Key Components**

1. Analysis and adoption of college and career ready English language proficiency assessment
2. Technical assistance and professional development for implementation of ACCESS for the 2014-2015 school year
3. Monitoring of the implementation of ACCESS

**Key Component #1**

Analysis and adoption of college and career ready English language proficiency assessment

Key Milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Partnership with INTESOL EL Leadership group and Great Lakes Comprehensive Center to deliver white paper proposal to adopt WIDA ELD standards	8/2012-11/2012	INTESOL EL Leadership; GLCC; IDOE	White Paper	INTESOL Leadership members’ expertise	No current obstacles

Sole Source approved to contract with the Wisconsin Center for Education Research	7/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Sole Source	IDOE Legal team	No current obstacles
Contract submitted to join WIDA consortium and was denied due to HEA 1427	7/2013	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Contract documents	IDOE Legal team	HEA 1427 language prohibited Indiana from joining a consortium.  An official Attorney General opinion was provided, that allowed movement forward.
IDOE submitted request to Attorney General in regards to the ability to join a consortium outside of PARCC	11/2013	IDOE Legal Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Official request	IDOE Legal team	No current obstacles

LAS Links Meeting to discuss new changes to assessments and WIDA alignment with CTB McGraw-Hill	2/28/2014	IDOE Assessment and Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	CTB presented and provided materials	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
IDOE request for further data analysis from CTB McGraw-Hill	2/18/2014	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	CTB Response	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
Attorney General Final Approval	4/2014	IDOE Legal	IDOE received official notice that joining consortium will not violate 1427	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
Contract and consortium work is handed over to IDOE office of assessment	5/2014	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education and the Office of Assessment	IDOE office of assessment will take over to complete the contract	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
Contact multiple states to discuss process and what to include and do – lessons learned	5/2014-6/2014	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	IDOE contacted Nevada, Wyoming, and Virginia on process and lessons learned	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles

Contract completed to join the WIDA consortium	Summer 2014	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, WIDA	Completed contract	IDOE Office of Student Assessment and IDOE Office of Finance	No current obstacles
LEAs will administer the W-APT placement test	8/1/2014 - ongoing	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, LEAs	Training participation reports	IDOE Office of Student Assessment and Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	No current obstacles
Alignment study	Fall 2014	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, LEAs	Alignment report	IDOE Office of Student Assessment and Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	No current obstacles

LEAs will administer ACCESS	1/2015-3/2015	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, LEAs	ACCESS reports	WIDA, other states' lesson learned	No current obstacles
Bridge study	Spring 2015	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, LEAs	Completed Bridge Study	WIDA, other state reports	No current obstacles
LEAs will administer ACCESS 2.0	1/2016-3/2016	IDOE Office of English Learning and Migrant Education, Office of Assessment, LEAs	ACCESS 2.0 reports	WIDA	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #2</b>					
Technical assistance and professional development for the implementation of the WIDA ELD standards					
Key milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles

Launch timeline to the W-APT and ACCESS to LEAs through various communication mechanisms	6/2014-8/2014	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	IDOE ELME, Assessment, and WIDA	No additional resources needed	No current obstacles
ACCESS - WIDA Assessment WebEX to include information on W-APT, ACCESS, and transition	Summer 2014	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Posted on Learning Connection and announced with a memo. Recorded and posted for later review at viewers convenience.	Assessment is working on the contract with WIDA for the ACCESS assessment.	No current obstacles
ACCESS training Webinars	8/14 – 10/14 (multiple sessions and dates during the month)	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Karen currently announces and completes Webinars for EL assessment training. (See attached memo as further evidence of how we will proceed with proper training of EL staff).	IDOE technology staff	No current obstacles



Provide regional assessment training for ACCESS	Fall 2014	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Training materials and sign in sheets	10 days are provided through WIDA consortium. Additional days can be considered.	No current obstacles
On-going WIDA professional development	8/14 - ongoing	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment, WIDA	Technical assistance materials and sign in sheets	LEAs can use the jotform to request a visit from our office <a href="http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/request-idoe-expertise">http://www.doe.in.gov/elme/request-idoe-expertise</a>	No current obstacles
IDOE technical assistance	7/14 – on-going	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment, WIDA	Technical assistance samples	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles
<b>Key Component #3</b>					
Monitoring of implementation of WIDA ELD Standards					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles

Monitor through the LM collection	11/2014 - ongoing	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	LM data reports	Office of Technology and Data	No current obstacles
Monitor the Corporation Test Coordinator's registration and assessment management via the WIDA access system	Fall 2014 - ongoing	Office of English Learning and Migrant Education	Monitoring reports	WIDA	No current obstacles
Consolidated monitoring visits, Title III monitoring visits, and desktop monitoring	Fall 2014 - ongoing	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Monitoring reports	Offices of Grants Management, Title III, and Title I	No current obstacles
Surveys of implementation of the W-APT, ACCESS, and training	Fall 2014 - ongoing	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Survey results	Jotform and IDOE technology team	No current obstacles

Data analysis of 2014 ACCESS	Spring 2015	IDOE Offices of English Learning and Migrant Education and Assessment	Test data and analysis	Office of Accountability	No current obstacles
------------------------------	-------------	---	------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

## PRINCIPLE 2: STATE-DEVELOPED DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

### 2.A DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT A STATE-BASED SYSTEM OF DIFFERENTIATED RECOGNITION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUPPORT

- 2.A.i Provide a description of the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system that includes all the components listed in Principle 2, the SEA’s plan for implementation of the differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system no later than the 2012–2013 school year, and an explanation of how the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

*“To evaluate schools, it has to be wedded to a simple, clear measurement – A, B, C, D, F.”*

*– Indiana Governor Mitch Daniels*

#### Description of A-F

Indiana’s state accountability framework uses traditional A to F letter grades to give parents, educators, and students an easy-to-understand system for understanding student performance. At the same time, letter grades provide a heightened awareness of school performance in local communities throughout the state.

Prior to the 2010-11 school year, Indiana’s framework used an inscrutable labeling system illustrated in the table below:

Current Labels	Old Labels (Prior to 2010-11)
A	Exemplary Progress
B	Commendable Progress
C	Academic Progress
D	Academic Watch
F	Academic Probation

When IDOE initially introduced letter grades, many schools and school districts that previously gave no pause to being labeled under the old system became vehemently vocal about the new one. As an example, a school could have been in “Academic Progress” for years without protestation, yet once that same school was labeled a “C,” the outcry was fervent and immediate. A stunning ripple effect has occurred in local communities throughout the state as parents and civic groups have begun coalescing around and taking a greater interest in the quality of their schools. The amplified attention to school and student performance would have never happened without the shift to letter grades. The impact has been profound, prompting all stakeholders to ask difficult questions about increasing academic achievement and raising instructional quality within Indiana’s schools.

Beginning with the 2011-12 school year, the A-F grading system will utilize an enhanced methodology that offers a more comprehensive analysis of school performance. This new analysis lends itself to a more meaningful accountability system that is better designed to differentiate, recognize, and support schools across the state. The new methodology reflects several core principles:

- All students can and should learn at least a year’s worth of knowledge in a year’s time.
- Student growth is a better measure of effectiveness than is absolute performance. Growth is also the best way to provide for the differentiated recognition of teachers and schools.
- Student achievement and school performance, including the closing of achievement gaps, are strongly correlated to effective teaching and leadership.
- Effective teaching makes a difference in how much a student learns, and how much a student learns is a measure of effective teaching.
- A heavy emphasis on accountability is necessary to create a system that supports the increase in the quality of instruction for students.

Indiana’s A-F system is comprised of an elementary/middle schools model and a high schools model. Both models look at the performance and progress of students over time for all students and all subgroups. A key component of the model is a newer and more efficient way to track the proficiency and progress of traditionally underperforming subgroups and other low performing students by creating a super subgroup that analyzes the bottom 25% of students throughout the state. Focusing on this super subgroup coupled with utilizing Indiana’s revolutionary Growth Model is far more effective at shining a light on exactly where the achievement gaps are occurring and for whom than was the case for subgroups as traditionally contemplated. Indiana believes this bold approach to subgroup identification (i.e. *all* schools have a bottom 25%) promises to directly attack the intractable issue of achievement gaps in a way many states would be more hesitant to utilize. That said, Indiana’s proposed approach does not abandon the value provided by traditional ESEA subgroups. In fact, the state intends to leverage traditional subgroups as a transparent “check” to further ensure no students slip through the cracks (this new check is described later in this section).

Moreover, Indiana’s demographic outlay is such that hundreds of schools have significant traditionally underperforming student populations but too often those same schools have multiple subgroups that do not meet the 30 student count threshold to allow for accountability (e.g. 25 Hispanic students, 28 Black students, 18 Special Education students). As a result, too many underperforming students are slipping through the cracks and falling off the accountability grid. This oversight by the traditional, static definition of subgroups is simply unacceptable. In fact, utilizing the current AYP accountability system under NCLB has resulted in a very modest narrowing of the achievement gaps in Indiana:

Cumulative Percentage Change (Narrowing) of the Achievement Gap in the Past Five Years Under Current NCLB Methodology		
	Change in E/LA Gap	Change in Math Gap
Top 75% Subgroup vs. Bottom 25% Subgroup	-4%	-3%
White Students vs. Minority Students	-3%	-2%
Paid Lunch vs. Free/reduced Lunch Students	-2%	-1%
General Education vs. Special Ed Students	-4%	-5%
Not ELL vs. ELL Students	-4%	-3%

Indiana’s accountability model is designed with greater ambition to demonstrably narrow the achievement gaps of traditionally underrepresented students with more pronounced effect. The backbone of the state’s solution couples the benefits of both the bottom 25% super subgroup *and* ESEA subgroups.

Working under the new AMOs, Indiana expects to have the following narrowing of achievement gaps by 2020:

Cumulative Percentage Change (Narrowing) of the Achievement Gap over the Next Eight Years Under Indiana’s New Accountability System		
	Change in E/LA Gap	Change in Math Gap
Top 75% Subgroup vs. Bottom 25% Subgroup	-24%	-34%
White Students vs. Black Students	-12%	-13%
White Students vs. Hispanic Students	-9%	-10%
Paid Lunch vs. Free/reduced Lunch Students	-13%	-15%
General Education vs. Special Ed Students	-14%	-15%
Not ELL vs. ELL Students	-12%	-9%

The shift from a singular focus on traditional ESEA subgroups to now include the bottom 25% subgroup is necessary to achieve the goal of NCLB. The original intent of NCLB was to ensure that all students, regardless of race, background, or any educational disadvantages are performing at high levels and that the persistent achievement gaps that exist between different student populations are closed. Unfortunately, little progress has been made with the sole emphasis on traditional ESEA subgroups. The time has come for a more aggressive approach.

Rather than solely focusing on traditional subgroups, Indiana proposes to use them as a transparent safeguard to ensure Special Education students, English Language Learners, and other subgroups that have historically been marginalized are not permitted to slip through the cracks. To be clear, schools and LEAs will still be held accountable for the performance and improvement of their students that fall into traditional ESEA subgroups. Indiana will continue to report the progress these individual subgroups make towards meeting the state’s AMO and require schools and LEAs to provide targeted interventions (outlined in the School Improvement Plan) for any ESEA subgroup that is not meeting the AMO and closing the achievement gap on each metric (E/LA, math, graduation rate, and college and career

readiness), ensuring no children are left behind.

Indiana's new and dynamic super subgroup enables the state to ensure every student is now calculated in each school's accountability because every school has a bottom 25%. Data show that traditionally underperforming students in Indiana comprise a majority of that bottom 25% population. Indiana schools must improve the proficiency levels and demonstrate significant growth for the new super subgroup, without ignoring ESEA subgroups, to receive an acceptable mark on the state's new A-F grading scale. Notably, IDOE has run data, shown later in this section, that illustrate the strong potential for a dramatic narrowing of Indiana's achievement gaps as a result of this focus on the bottom 25%.

More information about the details of the A-F models is included as Attachments 13 and 14. Please note that some information located in Attachment 14 relating to student exclusions has been updated since Indiana's original ESEA Flexibility request was submitted. That piece of the attachment is no longer reflective of this request.

*Creating incentives for a focus on the students who need the most support*

A cursory glance at Indiana's new A-F model shows the system awards equal points for significantly high student growth in either the bottom 25% or top 75% student subgroups. However, it is three times more difficult to receive the grade point bonus for exhibiting high growth for the top 75% subgroup than it is to receive the bonus for the bottom 25% subgroup. The model is intentionally built to provide an incentive for schools and LEAs to focus on the success of their bottom 25% student population, including ESEA subgroups. This incentive is described below.

Initially, schools receive preliminary E/LA and math scores (grades) based on the total number of students scoring proficient on the annual mandatory assessments (ISTEP+, ISTAR and IMAST). Next, the bottom 25% and top 75% subgroups are equally weighted as potential bonuses to augment a school's proficiency score (grade) on E/LA or math.

For example, if 40% of students in either subgroup (bottom 25% or top 75%) show high growth, the school receives a 1.00 point (one grade level) increase on its preliminary E/LA or math proficiency score. In a school of 100 students, it has 25 students in the bottom 25% and 75 students in the top 75%.

- i. 40% of 25 = 10
- ii. 40% of 75 = 30

This sample school must have ten of its bottom 25% students show high growth to receive the 1.00 point increase, or it must have thirty of its top 75% students show high growth to receive the increase (or it may achieve high growth for both subgroups and receive 2.00 points in increases). Which subgroup would a principal or superintendent target first?

In Indiana’s Growth Model, every student’s state assessment result on ISTEP+ is compared to every other student in the state that scored at the same scale score from the prior year, and then each student is plotted in one of three norm-referenced categories (low, typical, or high) based on relative growth to his/her academic peers. Regardless of whether a student is low performing (e.g. 200 scale score) or high performing (e.g. 780 scale score), it is equally challenging for students at every proficiency score to achieve high growth. It is three times more difficult to earn the high growth bonus for the school’s top 75% population (in the example provided above, 30 students hitting the target) than it is to earn it for the bottom 25% population (in the example provided above, 10 students hitting the target). This 3:1 ratio exists at all schools with four or more students assessed for growth.

With this ratio in mind, an administrator would likely focus more attention and resources on the bottom 25% subgroup. The rational focus on the bottom 25% has the added bonus of moving more students over the proficiency bar, which improves the school’s overall grade.

Additionally, if this sample school neglects its bottom 25% and enough of those students show low growth on the state assessments (compared to their academic peers) along with some of the top 75% group showing low growth, the school would receive a 1.00 point reduction in its E/LA or math score.

In sum, Indiana’s new accountability model creates an incentive for all schools and LEAs to focus greater attention and energy on the bottom 25% subgroup, without ignoring ESEA subgroups. This incentive is designed to engender a dramatic increase in proficiency rates across all of Indiana’s traditionally and non-traditionally underperforming populations, especially Special Education students and English Language Learners that may have been overlooked under the old AYP model.

#### Description of the Indiana Growth Model

Notably, the Elementary and Middle School model is built on the trailblazing Indiana Growth Model, which [the State Superintendent](#) described as the “game-changer” with regard to school accountability. Indiana has been at the nation’s forefront in ensuring that student progress, or growth, over time provides the foundation for recognizing and supporting student and school performance.

Based on the innovative work initiated in Colorado and developed in partnership with the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA), the Indiana Growth Model is a statistical model used to calculate student progress, or growth, on state assessments. The Indiana Growth Model fundamentally re-conceptualizes the state’s accountability system in two key ways:

1. Growth shines a spotlight on the closing of achievement gaps
2. Growth promotes a focus on all students and not just the “bubble kids”



Moreover, the Indiana Growth Model allows for an unprecedented level of public disclosure of information about individual student, school, and district performance. IDOE is committed to focusing educational reform and school improvement efforts around the Growth Model to raise student achievement for every student and close achievement gaps.

The Growth Model also enables parents, teachers and administrators to understand how individual students are progressing from year to year. This capability is not insignificant, as prior to the implementation of the Growth Model, classroom teachers were the only ones who knew anything about a student’s progress. Now, for the first time, student progress is being made transparent to a broader array of education stakeholders in an easy and readily accessible format. Based on where each individual student begins, IDOE expects all students to achieve at least one grade level of growth in an academic year.

More information about the Indiana Growth Model is included as Attachment 15.

During the 2014-15 school year, Indiana will transition to a new college and career ready assessment. The transition will present challenges in the Accountability A-F system, specifically concerning the Growth component. The Department of Education, in collaboration with the Governor’s Center of Education and Career Innovation and national growth experts, has reviewed a comprehensive list of potential growth measures to assess the availability and challenges of each solution. After careful consideration, the Department recommends that the Accountability A-F system continue to use a component of the Indiana Growth Model in 2015 to establish the percent of students achieving Low growth and High growth in the defined sub-group categories. Growth status designations will be achieved using the Indiana Growth Model analyses in conjunction with an equi-percentile concordance to establish a link between the scale on the old assessment and the scale on the new assessment. The resulting status aligns with both Indiana Administrative Code and NCLB Flexibility. Utilizing a component of Indiana Growth Model in 2015 Accountability A-F also provides a level of consistency to the system and eliminates frequent substantive changes which could ultimately undermine confidence in the accountability system.

#### Implementation Plan

Indiana is on track to implement its accountability plan way ahead of the 2012-13 school year. In fact, the A-F category labels were implemented with the 2010-11 school year and will be updated with the following metrics for 2011-12:

##### Elementary and Middle Schools

- Student achievement (English/Language Arts and Mathematics)
- Student growth
  - The growth of students in the bottom 25%
  - The growth of the remaining 75% of students

##### High Schools

- Student performance and improvement on the mandatory End-of-Course Assessments
  - English 10
  - Algebra I
- Graduation rate
  - Four-year
  - Five-year
- College and career readiness
  - Advanced Placement (AP) exams
  - International Baccalaureate (IB) exams
  - Dual/Concurrent Enrollment college credits
  - Industry Certifications

The targets, or cut scores, for each of these metrics is aligned with “90-25-90” goals, established in 2009:

- 90% of students pass the Mathematics and English/Language Arts portion of the state’s annual assessments (*ISTEP+ and ECAs*)
- 25% of graduates pass an AP or IB exam or earn college credit during high school
- 90% of students graduate with a meaningful diploma

The points awarded for each of the targets (indicators of achievement) are as follows:

#### E/LA and Math Assessments

90.0 – 100.0%	=	4.00 points
85.0 – 89.9%	=	3.50 points
80.0 – 84.9%	=	3.00 points
75.0 – 79.9%	=	2.50 points
70.0 – 74.9%	=	2.00 points
65.0 – 69.9%	=	1.50 points
60.0 – 64.9%	=	1.00 points
0.00 – 59.9%	=	0.00 points

#### College and Career Readiness

25.0 – 100%	=	4.00 points
-------------	---	-------------

18.4 – 24.9%	=	3.00 points
11.7 – 18.3%	=	2.00 points
5.0 – 11.6%	=	1.00 points
0.0 – 4.9%	=	0.00 points

Graduation Rates:

90.0 – 100.0%	=	4.00 points
85.0 – 89.9%	=	3.50 points
80.0 – 84.9%	=	3.00 points
75.0 – 79.9%	=	2.50 points
70.0 – 74.9%	=	2.00 points
65.0 – 69.9%	=	1.50 points
60.0 – 64.9%	=	1.00 points
0.00 – 59.9%	=	0.00 points

As described earlier in this application, the development of Indiana’s A-F accountability model was an eighteen-month process that incorporated input from numerous educational stakeholders. The state’s rule-making process for A-F was initiated by the State Board of Education on November 7, 2011. The final rule was published in spring 2012, which provides sufficient time for 2011-12 implementation.

***The bottom 25%: the new “Super Subgroup”***

Indiana’s accountability system is designed to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students. Based on research conducted by IDOE, Indiana is confident that this bold new system recognizes top performers, targets support to those who struggle, and provides a renewed focus on addressing achievement gaps.

The accountability system’s attention to the bottom 25%, while incorporating the benefits of ESEA subgroups, reflects the state’s commitment to bridging the gap between the highest and lowest performers. Addressing these stubborn achievement gaps is a precondition to significantly raising student achievement and school performance across the state. IDOE has been able to identify the traits of students that makeup the bottom 25% of student achievement on the state’s annual assessment (*ISTEP+*) as defined by scale score at each grade level. IDOE has examined a combination of one-year and three-year results of both the lowest performers in English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics to be sure our system directly attacks this problem.

Key characteristics of the bottom 25% include the following:

- 40% minority, compared to 12% of the total student population
- 70% receive free or reduced priced meals, compared to 47% of the total student population
- 28% receive Special Education services, compared to 15% of the total student

population

- 10% are Limited English Proficient (LEP), compared to 5% of the total student population

Additionally, nearly 60% of all Special Education and LEP students fall into this bottom 25% subgroup. The remaining 40% of these students that fall into the top 75% subgroup are Special Education students with high cognitive functions and LEP students who are nearly classified as English Proficient; these students have proficiency rates on the state assessments that are dramatically higher than their traditional subgroup peers and exceed the state average.

It is important to note that *every* school in the state of Indiana has a bottom 25%.

The bottom 25% students historically pass the state assessment at a rate 50% lower than the top 75% population. Students in the traditional subgroups that are not included in the bottom 25% population, though still included as part of the state’s overarching accountability framework, have a cumulative proficiency rate of 90%:

	% of Subgroup in Bottom 25%	Proficiency Rate	% of Subgroup in Top 75%	Proficiency Rate
American Indian	34%	8%	66%	90%
Asian	19%	11%	81%	98%
Black	51%	11%	49%	91%
Hispanic	43%	13%	57%	93%
White	20%	14%	80%	94%
Free or Reduced Lunch	36%	12%	64%	92%
Special Education	59%	7%	41%	70%
English Language Learners	57%	13%	43%	83%

These data reaffirm Indiana’s assertion that subgroups should be targeted based on performance rather than just demographics. The relentless focus on performance reflects how serious Indiana is about not just closing achievement gaps but eliminating them outright. It would be accurate and compelling to observe that Indiana’s proposed system leverages the bottom 25% super subgroup and the traditional ESEA subgroups to vigorously attack the gaps for historically marginalized populations, especially Special Education students and English Language Learners.

More information about the bottom 25% is included as Attachment 16.

#### *Merging State (P.L. 221) and Federal (AYP) Accountability Systems*

Since 2009, student performance on the statewide assessment has steadily risen each year. At the same time, state and national expectations continue to rise for our schools and students. Within the context of heightened accountability, Indiana has shifted to an A-F system as part of an ongoing effort to align the state’s accountability measures with twenty-first century demands and to ensure all Indiana students graduate from high school well-prepared for college or career.

Public Law 221-1999 (P.L. 221) is Indiana’s comprehensive accountability system for K-12 education. Passed by the Indiana General Assembly in 1999 – prior to the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 – the law aimed to establish major educational reform and accountability statewide. To measure progress, P.L. 221 places Indiana schools (both public and accredited non-public) into one of five categories (A, B, C, D or F) based upon student performance and growth data from the state’s mandatory ISTEP+ and End-of-Course Assessments (ECAs), graduation rates, and college and career readiness indicators. Student performance and improvement on Indiana’s alternative assessments, ISTAR and IMAST, are also included in the calculations of school and LEA results.

Schools in the lowest P.L. 221 category (“F”) face a series of interventions designed to provide the additional support needed to improve student achievement. IDOE is pushing an amendment to P.L. 221 this current legislative session to include “D” schools as well. A chart describing these interventions (current and proposed) is located in 2.D.iii. These interventions become more serious the longer schools remain in the bottom category. Moreover, Indiana’s proposal contemplates a series of supports for struggling schools to be provided far ahead of the more severe sanctions prescribed under state law. These supports are described in greater detail in 2.D.iii.

One of the key obstacles to student achievement and school performance in our state has been the confusion between P.L. 221 and AYP (i.e. state versus federal accountability). While there is some overlap in the metrics utilized, the two systems are unique enough that it has become customary for the State Superintendent to make “two announcements” each year with regard to school performance – one about how schools fared under P.L. 221 and a separate announcement about AYP status.

Indiana is seeking approval of the state’s new accountability system – transparent letter grades coupled with an aggressive timeline for state support and intervention – to fulfill federal accountability requirements. This flexibility would allow Indiana to make one annual announcement about school performance, thereby providing clearer information to schools and educational stakeholders while eliminating any conflicting messages about state or federal expectations for schools and educators.

2.A.ii Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding information, if any.

**Option A**

The SEA only includes student achievement on reading/language arts and mathematics assessments in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools.

**Option B**

If the SEA includes student achievement on assessments in addition to reading/language arts and mathematics in its differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system and to identify reward, priority, and focus schools, it must:

	<p>a. provide the percentage of students in the “all students” group that performed at the proficient level on the State’s most recent administration of each assessment for all grades assessed; and</p> <p>b. include an explanation of how the included assessments will be weighted in a manner that will result in holding schools accountable for ensuring all students achieve college- and career-ready standards.</p>
--	--

Insert text for Option B here.

## 2.B SET AMBITIOUS BUT ACHIEVABLE ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Select the method the SEA will use to set new ambitious but achievable annual measurable objectives (AMOs) in at least reading/language arts and mathematics for the State and all LEAs, schools, and subgroups that provide meaningful goals and are used to guide support and improvement efforts. If the SEA sets AMOs that differ by LEA, school, or subgroup, the AMOs for LEAs, schools, or subgroups that are further behind must require greater rates of annual progress.

<p><b>Option A</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the “all students” group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The SEA must use current proficiency rates based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p><b>Option B</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Set AMOs that increase in annual equal increments and result in 100 percent of students achieving proficiency no later than the end of the 2019–2020 school year. The SEA must use the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year as the starting point for setting its AMOs.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p>	<p><b>Option C</b></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Use another method that is educationally sound and results in ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups.</p> <p>i. Provide the new AMOs and an explanation of the method used to set these AMOs.</p> <p>ii. Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below.</p> <p>iii. Provide a link to the State’s report card or attach a copy of the average statewide</p>
---	--	---

		proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010–2011 school year in reading/language arts and mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups. (Attachment 8)
--	--	---

**Explanation for Option C**

Indiana elected option ‘C’ to create “ambitious but achievable AMOs for all LEAs, schools, and subgroups.” Indiana’s proposed AMO would greatly increase proficiency rates across the state while holding more schools accountable for more students in traditional subgroup populations than option ‘A’ or ‘B’ would have allowed.

By selecting option ‘C,’ Indiana will have a proficiency rate that is 10% higher than under option ‘B,’ while also greatly increasing the state’s graduation and college and career readiness rates, which would have otherwise been unaffected by the AMO under the alternative options. Indiana’s AMO will also lead to more accountability for traditional subgroups while concentrating efforts on all historically underperforming students.

Indiana proposes a model that provides grades and targets for each of the following groups: overall, bottom 25%, top 75%, and ESEA subgroups as described in NCLB 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II). Each school and LEA will receive an overall grade for each of these subgroups and a breakdown of the results on each of the variables measured in the grade. Consequences and rewards will be associated with the outcomes of each of those subgroups meeting the annual measures of achievement based on the letter grade, improvement to proficiency on the statewide targets (90-25-90) for each metric (E/LA, math, graduation rates, and college and career readiness), and closure of achievement gaps.

With a concerted focus on a new super subgroup, the bottom 25%, Indiana will see a greater impact (20% increase in proficiency rates and 20% decline in the achievement gap), touch more students (see table below), and target additional resources to the students that need them the most. Indiana’s proposed AMO is the only option that specifically addresses the lowest achieving students and promotes high student growth and proficiency improvement from this population. As a result, Indiana’s AMO will have a greater impact than any of the alternatives.

<b>Comparison of percentage of Indiana schools held accountable for student performance by traditional subgroup: Option ‘A’ or ‘B’ vs. Indiana’s New AMO</b>		
Traditional ESEA Subgroup	Under Option ‘A’ and ‘B’	Under Indiana’s

		AMO
American Indian	0%	16%
Black	23%	62%
Asian	3%	31%
Hispanic	22%	71%
White	91%	97%
Free/Reduced Priced Lunch	90%	99%
Limited English Proficient	19%	59%
Special Education	57%	99%

As an example, in 2011, 57% of all schools were assessed in AYP in the special education subgroup. Under Indiana’s proposed AMO, 99% of all schools in 2011 would have had special education students captured in the bottom 25% super-subgroup. This translates into an additional 42% of schools that would have been held accountable for their special education students. Indiana’s proposed AMO represents a far more aggressive approach to identifying and eliminating achievement gaps for all subgroups.

Indiana knows that focusing on the bottom 25% super subgroup will produce far greater results than the current AYP, previous state model, or Options ‘A’ or ‘B’ would produce. However, to ensure no students slip through any cracks, Indiana will continue to report the progress ESEA subgroups make towards meeting the state’s AMO and require schools and LEAs to provide targeted interventions for any subgroup that is not meeting the AMO and closing the achievement gap.

#### AMO Methodology

Indiana’s accountability model encompasses not only state assessment proficiency levels but also a number of other school and district level indicators to ascertain a clear and comprehensive view of performance. As a result, Indiana has outlined the following AMO that defines a proficient school:

**Each Indiana school, LEA, and subgroup within each school must receive an ‘A’ or improve by two letter grades by 2020** in each component of Indiana’s state accountability model **and hit the proficiency targets outlined below for each ESEA subgroup** for each metric.

Additionally, each school and LEA must show dramatic progress in the closure of the achievement gap for each ESEA subgroup (see the chart in 2.D.iv titled, *Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System: Synergy of State and Federal*). Each school and LEA must meet Indiana’s 90-25-90 goals or improve by two letter grades in English, Math, College & Career Readiness, and Graduation Rate for the overall group and each subgroup. This is an ambitious and achievable goal that reflects the state’s commitment to ensuring more students are on track for college and careers.



A school or LEA assigned a grade other than an ‘A’ for the 2011-12 school year must do the following:

- Receive a school grade of an ‘A’ or improve at least one letter grade in each area over the next three ensuing years; AND
- Improve by two letter grades by 2020

Every school and LEA must do the following:

- Make adequate annual progress on each measurable objective for each metric for each subgroup as outlined in the state targets and demonstrate closure of achievement gaps

#### Timeline

- 2012 – A new baseline grade will be established for each school and LEA, and the subgroups within each school and LEA, based on the grade received for the 2011-12 school year.
- 2015 – Each school is expected to receive an ‘A’ or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline grade for all students (overall) and each subgroup within the school or LEA and meet or exceed the state proficiency targets for each subgroup for each metric.
- 2020 – Each school and LEA is expected to receive an ‘A’ or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline grade for all students (overall) and each subgroup within the school or LEA and meet or exceed the state proficiency targets for each subgroup for each metric.
- Annually – Each school and LEA is expected to meet or exceed the state targets for each subgroup for each metric and demonstrate closure of achievement gaps.

The table below illustrates the expected distribution of school grades across the state based on the new methodology.

Expected School Grades Statewide based on AMO			
	2012	2015	2020
A	28%	58%	73%
B	19%	16%	16%
C	26%	16%	11%
D	16%	5%	0%
F	12%	5%	0%

Notably, Indiana has set a goal of significantly reducing the number of ‘D’ and ‘F’ schools. If the AMO is met by 2020, Indiana could expect a 20% decline in the achievement gap. Additionally, Indiana would expect to have at least 90% of all students passing the state

assessment – consistent with the “90-25-90” goals Dr. Bennett has established.

Although Indiana has realized steady improvement on ISTEP+ scores since 2009, the passage rate is currently at 71%. Through the proposed AMO, that rate will increase by 20% by 2020. Indiana is switching the focus from static subgroup performance and the accompanying limitations to the performance of each school’s bottom 25% student population while still holding each school and LEA accountable for the performance of students belonging to traditional ESEA subgroups (as outlined in Indiana’s AMO). Specifically, ESEA subgroups will serve as a transparent check against the bottom 25% – and schools and LEAs will be required to address any gaps in their School Improvement Plans – to ensure subgroup performance is not masked in instances where the bottom 25% as a whole may show solid growth.

Indiana believes this shift is essential to unleash the potential of schools and school districts to close the gap between the highest and lowest performers. Indiana’s bold and aggressive approach provides incentive for schools not only to increase their proficiency levels but also to reward individual student growth. Indiana’s AMO and state accountability model encourages schools to continue to grow each student in the school regardless of proficiency level by rewarding schools for getting high achievers to achieve even higher, low achievers to grow more quickly, and all students to grow at or above grade level. This differentiated strategy allows Indiana students and schools to increase proficiency, graduation, and college and career readiness rates at a faster pace than in previous years. Moreover, Indiana believes this formula could serve as a national model for increasing student performance and tackling the persistent gaps in student achievement.

According to the model, when all Indiana schools achieve the stated AMO of earning an ‘A’ or improving at least two letter grades by 2020, Indiana will see the following aggregate student achievements statewide:

- A proficiency rate of over 90% on the E/LA mandatory assessment
- A proficiency rate of over 90% on the math mandatory assessment
- 40% of all graduates receive postsecondary credit (through AP, IB, or dual credit courses)
- A graduation rate of over 90%

In addition to earning an ‘A’ or improving by two letter grades by 2020, each school and LEA must demonstrate adequate annual progress on each measurable objective for each metric, or meet the state 2020 target of 90% proficiency, 25% college and career ready, and 90% graduation goal, by each ESEA subgroup as outlined in the state targets in the tables below:

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **overall** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
-------------	-----------	----------------	--	------------	-------------	---	-------	-----------------------------	-------------

2011-12	Baseline			77%	78%		29%		84%
2012-13			Increase by 2 percentage points	79%	80%	Increase by 2 percentage points	31%	Increase by 2 percentage points	86%
2013-14			Increase by 2 percentage points	81%	82%	Increase by 1 percentage point	32%	Increase by 2 percentage points	88%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 2 percentage points	83%	84%	Increase by 1 percentage point	33%	Increase by 2 percentage points	90%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points	85%	86%	Increase by 2 percentage points	35%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points	87%	88%	Increase by 2 percentage points	37%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%
2017-18			Increase by 1 percentage point	88%	89%	Increase by 1 percentage point	38%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2018-19			Increase by 1 percentage point	89%	90%	Increase by 1 percentage point	39%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 1 percentage point	90%	91%	Increase by 1 percentage point	40%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the new **bottom 25%** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
-------------	-----------	----------------	--	------------	-------------	---	-------	-----------------------------	-------------

2011-12	Baseline			36%	40%		1%		63%
2012-13			Increase by 8 percentage points in ELA and 7 percentage points in Math	44%	47%	Increase by 1 percentage point	2%	Increase by 2 percentage points	65%
2013-14			Increase by 8 percentage points in ELA and 7 percentage points in Math	52%	54%	Increase by 1 percentage point	3%	Increase by 2 percentage points	67%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 8 percentage points in ELA and Math	60%	62%	Increase by 2 percentage points	5%	Increase by 3 percentage points	70%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	62%	64%	Increase by 1 percentage point	6%	Increase by 2 percentage points	72%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	64%	66%	Increase by 1 percentage point	7%	Increase by 2 percentage points	74%
2017-18			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	67%	69%	Increase by 2 percentage points	9%	Increase by 2 percentage points	76%
2018-19			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	70%	72%	Increase by 2 percentage points	11%	Increase by 2 percentage points	78%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	73%	75%	Increase by 2 percentage points	13%	Increase by 2 percentage points	80%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the new top **75%** subgroup

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			91%	92%		37%		91%
2012-13			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%	92%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	38%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%
2013-14			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%	92%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	39%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%	93%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	41%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2015-16			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%	93%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	42%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%
2016-17			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%	93%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	43%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%
2017-18			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%	94%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	44%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%
2018-19			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%	94%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	46%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%	94%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	48%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **Asian** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			80%	86%		49%		89%
2012-13			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 2 percentage points in Math	83%	88%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	51%	Increase by 1 percentage point	90%
2013-14			Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and 3 percentage points in Math	87%	91%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	53%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Maintain 90% in Math	91%	94%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	55%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2015-16			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%	95%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	56%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%
2016-17			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%	95%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	57%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%
2017-18			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%	96%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	58%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%

2018-19			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%	96%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	59%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	<b>Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline</b>	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%	97%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	59%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	95%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **Black** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			57%	56%		9%		72%
2012-13			Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	61%	60%	Increase by 2 percentage points	11%	Increase by 2 percentage points	74%
2013-14			Increase by 5 percentage points in ELA and Math	66%	65%	Increase by 2 percentage points	13%	Increase by 2 percentage points	77%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 5 percentage points in ELA and Math	71%	70%	Increase by 3 percentage points	16%	Increase by 3 percentage points	80%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	73%	72%	Increase by 2 percentage points	18%	Increase by 2 percentage points	82%

2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	75%	74%	Increase by 2 percentage points	20%	Increase by 2 percentage points	84%
2017-18			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	77%	76%	Increase by 2 percentage points	22%	Increase by 2 percentage points	86%
2018-19			Increase by 5 percentage points in ELA and Math	79%	78%	Increase by 2 percentage points	24%	Increase by 2 percentage points	88%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	<b>Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline</b>	Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	82%	81%	Increase by 2 percentage points	26%	Increase by 2 percentage points	90%

The table below represents Indiana's new statewide AMO for the **Hispanic** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			68%	70%		11%		76%
2012-13			Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	72%	74%	Increase by 3 percentage points	14%	Increase by 1 percentage point	77%



2013-14			Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	76%	78%	Increase by 3 percentage points	17%	Increase by 2 percentage points	79%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	80%	82%	Increase by 3 percentage points	20%	Increase by 2 percentage points	81%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	82%	84%	Increase by 1 percentage point	21%	Increase by 2 percentage points	82%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	84%	86%	Increase by 1 percentage point	22%	Increase by 2 percentage points	84%
2017-18			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	86%	88%	Increase by 2 percentage points	24%	Increase by 2 percentage points	86%
2018-19			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	88%	90%	Increase by 2 percentage points	26%	Increase by 2 percentage points	88%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math Maintain 90% and continue to improve in Math	90%	92%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	28%	Increase by 1 percentage point	90%

The table below represents Indiana's new statewide AMO for the **White** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			81%	83%		32%		86%
2012-13			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	84%	86%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	33%	Increase by 1 percentage point	87%
2013-14			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	87%	89%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	35%	Increase by 1 percentage point	88%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 2 percentage points in Math	90%	91%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	37%	Increase by 2 percentage points	90%
2015-16			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	90%	91%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	38%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	90%
2016-17			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%	92%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	39%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%
2017-18			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%	93%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	40%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	91%
2018-19			Maintain 90% and continue to improve	93%	94%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	41%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	94%	95%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	43%	Maintain 90% and continue to improve	92%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **Free/Reduced Lunch** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			66%	68%		11%		75%
2012-13			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 4 percentage points in Math	69%	72%	Increase by 3 percentage points	14%	Increase by 2 percentage points	77%
2013-14			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 4 percentage points in Math	72%	76%	Increase by 3 percentage points	17%	Increase by 2 percentage points	79%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	76%	80%	Increase by 3 percentage points	20%	Increase by 2 percentage points	81%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	78%	82%	Increase by 1 percentage point	21%	Increase by 2 percentage points	83%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	80%	84%	Increase by 1 percentage point	22%	Increase by 2 percentage points	85%

2017-18			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	82%	86%	Increase by 2 percentage points	24%	Increase by 2 percentage points	87%
2018-19			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	84%	88%	Increase by 2 percentage points	26%	Increase by 2 percentage points	89%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	<b>Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline</b>	Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	86%	90%	Maintain 25% and continue to improve	28%	Increase by 1 percentage point	90%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **Limited English Proficient** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			50%	60%		8%		68%
2012-13			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and Math	53%	63%	Increase by 1 percentage point	9%	Increase by 2 percentage points	70%
2013-14			Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	57%	67%	Increase by 2 percentage points	11%	Increase by 2 percentage points	72%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012	Increase by 4 percentage points in ELA and Math	61%	71%	Increase by 2 percentage points	13%	Increase by 2 percentage points	74%

		baseline							
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	63%	73%	Increase by 1 percentage point	14%	Increase by 3 percentage points	77%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	65%	75%	Increase by 1 percentage point	15%	Increase by 3 percentage points	80%
2017-18			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	67%	77%	Increase by 1 percentage point	16%	Increase by 3 percentage points	83%
2018-19			Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 2 percentage points in Math	70%	79%	Increase by 1 percentage point	17%	Increase by 3 percentage points	86%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	<b>Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline</b>	Increase by 3 percentage points in ELA and 2 percentage points in Math	73%	81%	Increase by 2 percentage points	19%	Increase by 4 percentage points	90%

The table below represents Indiana’s new statewide AMO for the **Special Education** subgroup:

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment Proficiency Goal	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			44%	54%		4%		61%
2012-13			Increase by 5	49%	57%	Increase by 1	5%	Increase by 3 percentage	64%

			percentage points in ELA and 3 percentage point in Math			percentage point		points	
2013-14			Increase by 5 percentage points in ELA and 4 percentage point in Math	54%	61%	Increase by 1 percentage point	6%	Increase by 3 percentage points	67%
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 6 percentage points in ELA and 4 percentage point in Math	60%	65%	Increase by 1 percentage point	7%	Increase by 3 percentage points	70%
2015-16			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	62%	67%	Increase by 1 percentage point	8%	Increase by 2 percentage points	72%
2016-17			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	64%	69%	Increase by 1 percentage point	9%	Increase by 2 percentage points	74%
2017-18			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	66%	71%	Increase by 1 percentage point	10%	Increase by 2 percentage points	76%
2018-19			Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	68%	73%	Increase by 1 percentage point	11%	Increase by 2 percentage points	78%
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 2 percentage points in ELA and Math	70%	75%	Increase by 1 percentage point	12%	Increase by 2 percentage points	80%

Additionally, Indiana would also see the following:

- A third of all graduates receive an honors diploma
- A 50% decline in the high school dropout rate, for an estimated 2020 dropout rate of only 3%

The table below projects Indiana’s improvement trend along other key indicators:

	Current	2015	2020
% Receiving Honors Diplomas	29%	30%	32%
Dropout Rate	6%	5%	3%

The following table illustrates the number of expected Academic Honors Diplomas:

Students Earning Academic Honors Diplomas			
	# of Graduates	% of Graduates	Increase
2010	19,452	29%	---
2015	20,840	30%	1,388
2020	22,987	32%	3,535

These goals are ambitious but achievable and must be met if Indiana is going to ensure more students are on track for college and careers for every subgroup.

Each school’s and LEA’s annually published report card will include letter grades and proficiency results for each subgroup (overall, bottom 25%, top 75%, and ESEA subgroups). This report card will enable all stakeholders to gain a thorough understanding of where the successes and struggles for each group may lie. It will be impossible for subgroup performance to be masked as full disaggregation is part and parcel of Indiana’s proposal. With this detailed level of information, schools and LEAs will be able to target appropriate supports and interventions and celebrate successes for each group.

- Provide an educationally sound rationale for the pattern of academic progress reflected in the new AMOs in the text box below.

Indiana’s proposed AMO is based on the state’s robust accountability system. It provides an accurate pattern of LEAs’ and schools’ academic progress by focusing not only on student proficiency but also on individual student growth (i.e. Indiana’s Growth Model) and improvement (i.e. improvement in an LEA’s or school’s percent of students passing state tests from one year to the next), graduation rates, and college and career readiness indicators. Using multiple student performance variables, Indiana provides more robust accountability measures through a combination of key benchmarks and annual goals.

**Key Benchmarks**

Indiana’s plan sets both a three-year benchmark and an eight-year benchmark within its AMO. These benchmarks are illustrated in the example below for the overall school results (each school and LEA will additionally have analogous tables for each subgroup). After the first benchmark (2014-15), the expectations for improvement for the bottom 25% and each ESEA subgroup appropriately increase so as to continue a laser focus on closing achievement gaps (see the chart later in this proposal titled, *Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System: Synergy of State and Federal*). For a school or LEA to meet Indiana’s AMO, a school would have to demonstrate consistent improvement across *all* state measures. This innovative design parallels the state’s A-F accountability system and reflects Indiana’s belief that in order for accountability to be rigorous, student performance cannot be limited to solely one measure. For Elementary/Middle Schools the tables will include the E/LA and math indicators, whereas for High Schools (and combined Elementary/Middle and High Schools) the table will include four indicators - E/LA, math, college and career readiness, and graduation rate - as shown in the example below).

*Example: Hoosier High School received a 'D' in 2011-12 under Indiana's state accountability system. That 'D' grade translated into a 60% passage rate on the state assessments (ISTEP+), 5% of graduates being college & career ready (CCR), and a 60% graduation rate. Per Indiana's AMO, the school is required to improve by two letter grades or receive an "A" by 2020. In order to reach this target, Hoosier High School would need to demonstrate annual improvement as shown below.*

School Year	Benchmark	Benchmark Goal	Annual State Assessment (Proficiency Goal*)	Pass % ELA	Pass % Math	Annual College & Career Readiness (CCR) Rate Goal*	CCR %	Annual Graduation Rate Goal*	Grad Rate %
2011-12	Baseline			60.0	60.0		5.0		60.0
2012-13			Increase by 3.3 percentage points	63.3	63.3	Increase by 2.3 percentage points	7.3	Increase by 3.3 percentage points	63.3
2013-14			Increase by 3.3 percentage points	66.6	66.6	Increase by 2.3 percentage points	9.6	Increase by 3.3 percentage points	66.6
2014-15	Three-Year Benchmark	Achieve an 'A' or improve by one letter grade from the 2012 baseline	Increase by 3.4 percentage points	70.0	70.0	Increase by 2.3 percentage points	11.9	Increase by 3.4 percentage points	70.0
2015-16			Increase by 4.0 percentage points	74.0	74.0	Increase by 2.6 percentage points	14.5	Increase by 4.0 percentage points	74.0
2016-			Increase by	78.0	78.0	Increase by	17.1	Increase by	78.0



17			4.0 percentage points			2.6 percentage points		4.0 percentage points	
2017-18			Increase by 4.0 percentage points	82.0	82.0	Increase by 2.6 percentage points	19.7	Increase by 4.0 percentage points	82.0
2018-19			Increase by 4.0 percentage points	86.0	86.0	Increase by 2.6 percentage points	22.3	Increase by 4.0 percentage points	86.0
2019-20	Eight-Year Benchmark	<b>Achieve an 'A' or improve by two letter grades from the 2012 baseline</b>	Increase by 4.0 percentage points	<b>90.0</b>	<b>90.0</b>	Increase by 2.7 percentage points	<b>25.0</b>	Increase by 4.0 percentage points	<b>90.0</b>

*\*This example is for illustrative purposes only. The annual goal will vary depending on what letter grade the school receives in its baseline year and the grade levels served by the school. A school can increase its grade from the 2012 baseline using any combination of increased proficiency and high student growth/improvement over a sustained period of time. The power of Indiana’s AMO is that it differentiates and is individualized to each LEA and school.*

*If Hoosier High School achieved the annual proficiency rate increases in the table above, it would receive an “A” in 2020. This grade translates to a 90% passage rate on the state assessments, 25% of graduates being college or career ready, and a 90% graduation rate – consistent with Dr. Bennett’s “90-25-90” goals.*

In addition to hitting these overall benchmarks (as illustrated above), each school must meet the annual statewide targets for improvement for each subgroup for each metric and close any achievement gaps.

The three-year benchmark calls for each LEA and school to either receive an ‘A’ rating or to improve by one letter grade from its 2012 baseline rating. Each LEA and school will be allowed three years to show improvement due to the rigorous progress that is necessary to increase a school’s or LEA’s grade but will annually be required to implement interventions if any of the subgroups (bottom 25% or ESEA subgroups) are not meeting expectations. The three-year benchmark also requires that each subgroup in the LEA and school reach the AMO by 2015 and meet the state proficiency targets. This approach is unique in that it requires schools and LEAs to focus on each individual student within the school while placing a special emphasis on the bottom 25% and specific ESEA subgroup populations. Without substantial improvement and growth among the bottom 25% and specific ESEA subgroups, groups of students that have historically faced the most educational challenges, it would be impossible for all but a few schools to show the necessary progress within three years. Allowing only three years to reverse a decades-long trend of stagnant low performance within the bottom 25% and specific ESEA subgroup populations, while simultaneously

improving all other student proficiency levels, is not only daring but also achievable through the measures and focus Indiana’s AMO lays out.

The eight-year benchmark calls for each LEA and school to either receive an ‘A’ rating or to improve by two letter grades from its 2012 baseline rating. Each LEA and school will be allowed eight years to show the necessary improvement due to the rigorous process required but will annually be required to implement interventions if any of the subgroups (bottom 25% or ESEA subgroups) are not meeting expectations. Specifically, a two letter grade improvement translates into a twenty percentage point increase in proficiency. For LEAs and schools, this figure would also represent an unprecedented reduction in the percentage of students showing low growth and improvement. The eight-year benchmark also requires that each subgroup in the LEA and school reach the AMO by 2020 and meet the state proficiency targets for each metric. To accomplish both of these feats, students at each school and LEA must consistently show substantial improvement and growth over a sustained period of time, with the majority of that improvement and growth coming from the bottom 25% and specific ESEA subgroups. Realizing the eight-year benchmark would result in a 75% increase (from 40% proficient to 70% proficient) in the proficiency level of these students.

Both Indiana’s three-year and eight-year benchmarks are extremely ambitious given historic statewide proficiency trends. But by building in a laser-like focus on each school’s lowest achievers, the new AMO and accountability system incent a strategic allocation of resources at the local level. Students will no longer slip through the accountability cracks of the traditional subgroup structure. Instead, every school across the state will, for the first time, be held accountable for the performance of all struggling students. This strengthening and streamlining of school and district accountability will allow Indiana to race ahead of other states, put an end to a decades-long trend of poor performance among its bottom 25% subgroup and specific ESEA subgroups, and bridge the gap between the state’s highest and lowest performers.

#### Annual Goals

Even though Indiana’s AMO provides three-year and eight-year benchmarks, all schools and LEAs will still be assessed annually for progress and performance under Indiana’s state accountability system. Schools will be categorized as Focus, Priority, and Reward (and possibly Focus-Targeted) schools on a yearly basis as well. As outlined previously in this plan, Indiana has developed a rigorous state accountability system that holds schools and LEAs accountable for low growth and for poor proficiency, graduation, and/or college and career readiness rates.

#### How Indiana’s AMO will Reach Every Student and Increase Performance

Indiana’s state accountability model takes the bold approach of focusing on two new super subgroups while still taking advantage of traditional ESEA subgroups as a safeguard to ensure students do not slip through the cracks. Utilizing ESEA subgroups will also ensure that the performance of any individual student population is not masked by the aggregate

performance of any subset of students.

By elevating the focus on the bottom 25%, Indiana will not only concentrate more effort and resources to improving the proficiency of the lowest achieving students in each school and LEA but it will also hold schools accountable for each individual student. Since the inception of NCLB, numerous schools in Indiana have been able to avoid accountability for their lowest performing and most disadvantaged students due to small “n” counts. The inclusion of the bottom 25% subgroup eliminates this much utilized loophole with 99% of schools and LEAs in Indiana having both a bottom 25% and top 75% subgroup.

Indiana’s state accountability model requires that 95% of all students and students within each subgroup participate on the elementary and middle school assessments (see Attachment 13). At the high school level, the accountability model looks at the proficiency level of all students, not just those tested, in calculating the proficiency rates of each school and LEA and subgroups within them (a cohort approach). These two factors ensure that every student will be tested.

Once every student is tested, growth for elementary and middle school students and improvement for all high school students can be calculated. This growth and improvement of individual students is then incorporated back into Indiana’s accountability model and is used in conjunction with proficiency to determine a school’s or LEA’s grades in math and English/Language Arts. This methodology ensures that the growth and improvement is included in Indiana’s accountability system.

Indiana’s model also incorporates a system of “checks” (i.e. against traditional ESEA subgroups), described later in this application in 2F. These checks are designed to ensure that no student population, regardless of “n size,” is permitted to fall through the cracks. Specifically, schools will be required to modify their School Improvement Plans for any ESEA subgroup that fails to meet expectations (as defined in the chart in 2.D.iv titled, *Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System: Synergy of State and Federal*). This requirement means that the spotlight on students that have historically been marginalized will continue to be shone brightly upon them – with the goal that their needs are directly addressed.

LEAs, schools, educators, and parents can also view the growth of an individual grade, classroom, or student utilizing Indiana’s Learning Connection. The Learning Connection can be used by schools and teachers to identify where each student struggles and how they stack up against similar students, then used to turn each student’s individual weaknesses into strengths. Schools also use this information when conducting state mandated teacher evaluations, tying additional accountability to the performance of each individual student.

Indiana is unapologetic in the use of transparency as the lever for rigorous accountability, especially in driving improvement for students in underserved communities. Our state accountability model looks at the overall performance of a school and LEA, the Learning Connection provides for student growth to be easily factored into teacher evaluations, and

Indiana’s AMO clearly states that each subgroup in a school or LEA must improve by two letter grades in 2020 in English, Math, College & Career Readiness, and Graduation Rates, and meet the annual state targets for each metric. By design, accountability is intentionally woven throughout a system built to be airtight when it comes to reaching *every* student.

*Indiana’s Proposed AMO within the Context of “Putting Students First”*

Indiana is one of the country’s leaders in providing a diverse environment of quality educational options. As part of “Putting Students First,” Indiana established the most expansive school choice system in the nation’s history. For the first time, all Indiana schools – traditional public, public charter, and private or parochial – are competing for the same students and the accompanying funding. As a result, there are new pressures on the system writ large to ensure every school and LEA continues to improve both their student proficiency levels across all subgroups and their overall grade.

The Indiana State Board of Education will have the ability to increase the required proficiency levels necessary to achieve each grade. IDOE is also in the process of developing an “automatic trigger” to ensure that the proficiency bar remains rigorous for all schools. Additionally, the growth and improvement targets will be re-evaluated at least every three years. In other words, schools will need to continue to improve just to maintain their current grade.

Considering Indiana’s accountability system within the new landscape of school choice and competition and the categorization of Title I schools, Indiana schools will be operating in a climate that promotes improvement at unprecedented levels. The pressures and incentives to increase student growth and achievement will increase while the additional layer of federal accountability standards will no longer act as a barrier to improvement.

To illustrate the potency of this new context, the following are possible scenarios for schools that fail to improve or receive an ‘A’:

- The school could be subject to state intervention, including but not limited to state takeover
- The school could lose state money as a result of students transferring to higher performing public and non-public schools.
- In accordance with federal and state law, the school could have federal money withheld due to being classified as a Focus or Priority School  
(See the chart in 2.D.iv titled, *Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System: Synergy of State and Federal*, for greater details).

On the flip side, high performing schools will be celebrated in new and innovative ways, from preferred access to state grants that reward educator effectiveness to recognition ceremonies held in local communities throughout the state. Earlier this year, the Indiana General Assembly approved a two-year budget that includes \$15 million in competitively allocated state funding to drive educator effectiveness. State legislators have expressed interest continuing to purpose state dollars for the improvement of human capital within

schools; those that consistently deliver with regard to raising student performance may receive special consideration from IDOE in applying for these dollars. The expertise of high performers will also be leveraged by IDOE as the state acts to broker best practices in addressing achievement gaps and improving student outcomes.

For these reasons, Indiana schools and districts will be highly motivated to make annual progress and hit both the 2015 and 2020 benchmarks. Indiana’s proposed AMO outlines a bold, new approach toward realizing significant student performance gains by 2020. Our plan requires low-performing LEAs and schools to improve at a rate nearly double the state average while also being realistic about each school’s individual starting point or baseline.

LEAs and schools may also use a combination of proficiency level improvement and growth among their historically underperforming students to increase their grade. With Indiana’s proposal, rigorous measures are coupled with strong supports to ensure each school and district continues to progress on a yearly basis. This combination ensures that Indiana’s proposed AMO is both ambitious and achievable for every school in the state.

- ii. Provide a link to the State’s report card or attach a copy of the average statewide proficiency based on assessments administered in the 2010-2011 school year in reading/Language Arts and Mathematics for the “all students” group and all subgroups. (Attachment 8)

See Attachment 8 for a chart outlining average statewide proficiency for all subgroups in 2010-11.

Indiana’s AMO would exceed the intention of both Options A and B.

Indiana’s AMO would result in 41% of all non-proficient students becoming proficient by 2015 and 65% of all non-proficient students becoming proficient by 2020. It will also require the bottom 25% subgroup to double its proficiency rates while maintaining high growth among the subgroup population.

The AMO calls for each LEA and school to receive an ‘A’ under the state accountability system or make great progress to that end by 2020 and meet annual state targets for each metric. This target would translate into a state proficiency level of 90%. Moreover, each subgroup below that threshold would have made substantial gains and/or shown substantially high growth during that period, resulting in the greatest narrowing of the achievement gap in Indiana’s history.

As outlined in 2.A.ii, Indiana’s AMO is designed to be both ambitious and attainable. It is a bold and considered approach that does not rely on static proficiency targets based on arbitrary percentages. Rather, Indiana’s proposed system is pegged to letter grades – embedded within which is a simple yet sophisticated mechanism for examining school and student performance. The improvement levels laid out in the AMO require LEAs and schools to improve proficiency levels at an achievable rate, while also rewarding them for making substantially high growth among its subgroup populations.

By realizing Indiana’s AMO, the state could expect 12,000 additional students to be college and career ready. Indiana defines a student as college or career ready if the student earns an academic honors diploma, passes an AP or IB exam, earns transcribed college credit, or earns an approved industry certification. Students who meet one or more of these indicators are significantly less likely to require remediation than their counterparts.

Indiana’s AMO would result in 20% more graduates being college or career ready in 2020 – an unprecedented accomplishment.

## 2.C REWARD SCHOOLS

2.C.i Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying highest-performing and high-progress schools as reward schools.

### Rationale

Within a new culture of accountability in the state, Indiana proposes a differentiated recognition and reward system that engages schools and school districts in taking ownership

of their results and drives them toward ongoing improvement. This recognition system, described below, was developed in consultation with multiple stakeholders and reflects the state’s commitment to setting and keeping the bar high. As such, this system will highlight and celebrate the schools to which communities across Indiana can look to find exemplars of excellence.

#### *Highest Performing Schools*

Any Title I school that receives an ‘A’ under the state accountability model for at least two consecutive years shall be classified as a *Highest Performing School*. The Highest Performing School designation reflects a firm belief in the importance of not only recognizing schools that make significant progress within a year but also celebrating the state’s highest achievers who have performed at a remarkably high level over a sustained period of time.

Recognizing both achievement and growth will ensure that all schools, regardless of their overall performance, focus on the improvement of each individual student rather than simply those on the cusp of proficiency (i.e. the “bubble kids”).

#### *High-Progress Elementary & Middle Schools*

Any Title I elementary or middle school that shows high growth in its bottom 25% student subgroup in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics shall be designated as a *High Progress Elementary/Middle School*.

The bottom 25% student population captures the lowest performing students within a school on the state assessment (*ISTEP+*). This super subgroup encompasses each school’s lowest performers across all ethnic, socio-economic, special education, and LEP subgroups. By placing a special emphasis on the bottom 25%, High Progress Elementary/Middle Schools will close the achievement gap between top and bottom performers, leading to overall improvement in student proficiency levels.

The focus on the bottom 25%, consistent with Indiana’s state accountability model, is essential to meet Indiana’s proposed AMO by 2020.

#### *High-Progress High Schools*

Any Title I high school that shows significant high improvement within its not-proficient student population in both English/Language Arts and Mathematics shall be designated as a *High Progress High School*.

Consistent with current national trends, Indiana does not have yearly state assessments for students in grades 9-12. As a result, High Progress High Schools will be determined using the improvement made by previously not-proficient students. Any student that fails to pass the Algebra I (Mathematics) assessment or the English 10 (ELA) assessment by the completion of grade 10 is deemed to be non-proficient. Only schools that have the highest percentage (the top 25% improvement of all schools statewide) of these students passing both sections of the assessment prior to graduation will be categorized as High Progress High Schools.

Indiana will also recognize any Title I high school that makes a concerted effort to support those students who are not able to graduate within four years, but are able to graduate in five. This recognition does not lower expectations – the emphasis will remain on graduating within four years. However, schools must not give up on those who do not graduate on time and this recognition provides some incentive to keep pressing so that those students also receive a Core 40 diploma.

Indiana's Core 40 is the academic foundation all students need to succeed in college, apprenticeship programs, military training, and the workforce. More information about Core 40 is available at [http://www.doe.in.gov/core40/diploma\\_requirements.html](http://www.doe.in.gov/core40/diploma_requirements.html)

At the high school level, Indiana is placing a heightened focus on non-proficient students because research shows that students who fail to pass these assessments by the end of grade 12 are far more likely to drop out of school, less likely to graduate, and – for those that do graduate – significantly more likely to require remedial coursework if they continue on to a postsecondary institution. This focus is also consistent with Indiana's state accountability model and the state's goal to produce more high school graduates that are prepared for college and careers.

Indiana is also calling attention to fifth-year graduates as part of the High Progress High School designation, consistent with efforts to support those who do not graduate within a four-year window. This attention recognizes schools that take students who may otherwise be forgotten, endeavor to turn their performance around, and set them on course for a productive future.

The High Progress School recognition, for both elementary/middle and high schools, places a premium on supporting historically low performing students who would have otherwise been on track to drop out, not receive a high school diploma, and not been properly prepared for college or career. This recognition seeks to highlight the schools that are successful in proving what is possible with some of the most challenging student populations.

#### Reward School Inclusion

Indiana's definition of *reward schools* satisfies all conditions outlined in the ESEA Flexibility guidance. All Title I schools with the highest proficiency rates in both English and Math are identified as *highest-performing schools*. Additionally, high schools with the highest graduation rates are identified as *highest-performing schools* unless they fail to meet the AMO for all subgroups on each metric. All Title I schools that have high growth (improvement) in both English and Math are identified as *high-progress schools*. Schools can also be identified as *high-progress* if they greatly improve their graduation rate; any such school not identified is due to large achievement gaps or low proficiency rates and performance across all other areas of the school.

See Attachment 9, Table 2 for a list of Indiana's reward schools.



2.C.ii Provide the SEA’s list of reward schools in Table 2.

2.C.iii Describe how the SEA will publicly recognize and, if possible, reward highest-performing and high-progress schools.

Reward schools will be recognized in a number of ways:

- All reward schools will receive bonus rubric points on their application for the Excellence in Performance Award for Teachers. This is a state-level competitive grant of \$9M for FY12-13.
- IDOE will pursue greater funding flexibility for reward schools via the State Board of Education and the Indiana General Assembly.
- Best practices of reward schools will be highlighted and disseminated across the state.
- IDOE staff will travel to the Highest Performing Schools to give their official ‘A’ plaque in a school-wide celebration.
- Reward schools will be exempt from certain regulations, such as complying with the administrative functions of Indiana’s 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading plan.
- High Progress Schools may be honored at the State Capitol by the Governor or State Superintendent.
- High Progress Schools may be asked to present at the State Board of Education meetings as part of the monthly “Spotlight on Learning” that highlights outstanding schools and educational initiatives.

## 2.D PRIORITY SCHOOLS

2.D.i Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of lowest-performing schools equal to at least five percent of the State’s Title I schools as priority schools.

Any Title I school that receives an ‘F’ or is a persistently low-achieving school shall be classified as a *Priority School*. Schools that meet this definition are among the lowest performing schools in the state and typically have extremely high rates of low growth (improvement) among all student subgroups. In fact, between schools categorized as *Priority* and *Focus Schools*, the entire 15% of schools with the lowest performance would be facing some level of state intervention under proposed definitions. These schools also encompass all Title I schools in the state that have a graduation rate of less than 65%. In fact, these schools have an average graduation rate of less than 50%.

It is essential that these schools get back on track and increase their performance across all areas (state assessments, graduation, and college and career readiness rates). Notably, students in *Priority Schools* are 63% less likely to pass a state assessment, 55% less likely to graduate, and six times more likely to drop out of school than are students in Indiana’s ‘A’ schools.

According to ESEA flexibility guidance documents, states are required to ensure that at least the bottom 5% of the State’s Title I schools are identified as Priority Schools. Statewide, approximately 26% (261 schools) of Title I schools would be identified as Priority Schools. That Indiana’s school evaluation metrics have identified a significantly larger percentage of schools as Priority Schools reflects the state’s commitment to intervening and subsequently improving all of its lowest-performing schools. Additionally, Tier I and II schools that are under SIG to implement school intervention models are also identified as Priority Schools. See 2D Attachment 1, Table 2 for a list of Indiana’s Priority Schools. These schools were identified from the 2011-12 and 2012-13 school accountability grades and Indiana is requesting to reset the implementation timeline to 2014-15 for all non-SIG Priority Schools. During the 2013-14 school year, IDOE implemented a process to ensure strong leadership for Indiana’s Priority Schools. For the 2014-15 school year, IDOE has required intentional leadership decisions for all Priority Schools. School principals have been determined, based on evaluations aligned to the Turnaround Principles and evidence submitted to IDOE, to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and have a past track record of student success based on school data. IDOE notified school districts of the determination after reviewing evidence submitted.

2.D.ii Provide the SEA’s list of priority schools in 2D Attachment 1 Table 2.

2.D.iii Describe the meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles that an LEA with priority schools will implement.

### Background

Indiana’s current Differentiated Accountability model assigns Title I schools which fail to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) to one of three classifications based on how far away the school was from meeting AYP: comprehensive-intensive, comprehensive, and focus. Based on its classification and the number of years it has been in federal school improvement (i.e. failed to make AYP), a school is required to implement certain interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles. However, this prescriptive approach to school improvement, despite the fact that the interventions are aligned to the Turnaround Principles, does not grant LEAs and schools the flexibility and responsibility to do the following:

- Analyze student- and school-level data to pinpoint its most critical area(s) for improvement
- Based on this analysis, make data-driven decisions about which school improvement interventions are needed
- Develop specific, measurable, ambitious and relevant lagging and leading indicators of transformative school improvement intervention implementation
- Monitor closely progress towards and achievement of said lagging and leading indicators
- Based on this monitoring, modify the rigor and ways in which the intervention is being implemented and the cycle of monitoring and modifying in an iterative

manner that tracks against the lagging and leading indicators of success

At LEA- and school-levels, a less prescriptive approach to the selection of school improvement interventions will promote the following:

- Understanding and awareness of critical area(s) for improvement
- Understanding and awareness of how and why selected interventions are needed
- Ownership and a sense of responsibility for interventions
- Buy-in and intrinsic motivation to ensure interventions are implemented, monitored, and modified with fidelity

School Improvement Interventions – Selection Criteria and Parameters

Under Indiana’s proposal, Priority and Focus Schools will be provided substantive flexibility to implement scientifically-based, student-/school-based data-informed interventions. As described below, these interventions will be tied to a framework utilized by IDOE during monitoring and School Quality Reviews –and aligned with the Turnaround Principles. The LEA may propose an intervention not listed below as long as it is anchored in the Turnaround Principles.

As part of the ESEA flexibility extension, IDOE is accurately and explicitly describing the Turnaround Principles within related tools, documents, training materials and other supports.

Alignment of School Improvement Interventions with Turnaround Principles

Indiana’s Turnaround Principles	Intervention Examples
<p>Turnaround Principle 1: School Leadership Provide strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replace the school principal with one who has a past track record of student success and the ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> <li>• Provide the principal with a mentor from a high-performing school</li> <li>• Redesign school leadership structure to provide appropriate operational flexibility</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 2: School Climate and Culture Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students’ social, emotional, and health needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize a behavior interventionist</li> <li>• Establish a school-wide research based positive behavioral interventions and support system</li> <li>• School-wide program to eliminate bullying or promote tolerance</li> <li>• Create a system of wrap-around</li> </ul>

<p>Turnaround Principle 3: Effective Instruction Strengthening the school’s instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards</p>	<p>student services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 8-Step Process</li> <li>● Formative Assessment Development and Training (e.g., Acuity)</li> <li>● On-going professional development targeting best instructional practices determined by classroom walk-thru data, teacher observation data and student achievement data</li> <li>● Teachers intentionally communicate learning objectives to students which are aligned to Indiana’s college and career ready standards</li> <li>● Instructional Coaches</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 4: Curriculum, Assessment, and Intervention System Ensuring teachers have the foundational documents and instructional materials needed to teach to the rigorous college- and career- ready standards that have been adopted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School leaders verify the curriculum being delivered is aligned to the Indiana college and career ready standards by frequent classroom walk-throughs and reflective feedback to teachers</li> <li>● Conduct a Curriculum Audit</li> <li>● Interventionist</li> <li>● Instructional coach lesson modeling</li> <li>● Create an intervention plan for students who are behind academically Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, specifically for students two or more years behind academically</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 5: Effective Staffing Practices Ensure that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Replace ineffective teachers and staff</li> <li>● Ensure the school leader has the authority to hire his/her teachers and staff</li> <li>● Revise the schedule to create time for professional learning communities</li> <li>● Create hiring timelines and processes to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers able to effectively conduct turnaround work</li> <li>● Ensure ineffective teachers are not assigned or reassigned to the Priority School</li> <li>● Provide staff with appropriate</li> </ul>

	<p>professional development to enable them to reflect, revise, and evaluate their classroom practices to improve learning outcomes in both a collaborative and individual setting</p>
<p>Turnaround Principle 6: Enabling the Effective Use of Data Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize a data coach</li> <li>• Provide staff with collaborative opportunities to analyze data and respond to learning needs of students (e.g., Professional Learning Communities)</li> <li>• Create a system-wide approach to tracking school data and individual student data</li> <li>• Analyze formative and summative assessments to respond to student academic, behavioral, and social needs</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 7: Effective Use of Time Redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restructure the academic schedule to increase core content or remediation time</li> <li>• Revise the schedule to create tutoring or extended learning time</li> <li>• Ensure the schedule is designed to meet the professional development needs of staff</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 8: Effective Family and Community Engagement. Provide an ongoing mechanism for family involvement in school decision making and understanding student progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize a community or family liaison</li> <li>• Create a process to involve family members in school decision-making</li> <li>• Communicate intentionally with families on a regular basis to share data, student progress, and areas needing support</li> <li>• Utilize a method of gathering stakeholder feedback that informs goals and on-going progress monitoring</li> </ul>

***School Improvement Interventions – Expectations for Implementation***

LEAs are expected to implement interventions for each of the Turnaround Principles with fidelity for a minimum of three consecutive years, after being identified as a Priority School. Outreach Coordinators, during monitoring visits, will review the Student Achievement Plan, a

supplement to the School Improvement Plan (SIP), (2D Attachment 2), which contains an outline of interventions, data, priority areas of improvement, goals and an action plan. Outreach Coordinators were provided a robust training process to understand the requirements of monitoring Focus and Priority Schools and utilize a handbook to guide their work. (2D Attachment 3). Coordinators will examine evidence of interventions and verify implementation through classroom observations, staff interviews, document review, and formative assessment data. Coordinators will provide LEAs with an intervention status update based on the monitoring evidence, which provides LEAs with next steps. A summative monitoring rubric (2D Attachment 4 , 5) will be given to LEAs following a second monitoring visit, which will clearly define progress with interventions. A document will be maintained at IDOE which tracks the status of implementation of interventions for each priority school to ensure three years of successful implementation of interventions. (2D Attachment 6)

### School Improvement Interventions – Timeline for Priority Schools

In Year 1, Priority Schools must do the following:

- Select at least three interventions aligned to all Turnaround Principles.
- Submit information to IDOE outlining each proposed intervention and justifying the selections with evidence from student and school data, also identified from the root cause analysis from the Student Achievement Plan. All Priority Schools must complete a Student Achievement Plan, as a supplement to the SIP, and aligned with the Turnaround Principles.
- Subject to IDOE review and requests for revisions, LEAs implement the interventions during Year 1. IDOE will monitor LEAs for progress toward successful implementation and positive student performance change with a rubric aligned to the indicators in the Student Achievement Plan and the monitoring tool.
- Priority Schools will be tracked for implementation of interventions until they have successfully implemented with fidelity for a minimum of three years. (2D Attachment 7)

In Year 2, Priority Schools must do the following:

- Analyze student-/school-level data to determine necessary modifications to the interventions, and fidelity of implementation
  - The number of interventions can be adjusted based on demonstrated needs.
  - All implementation plans for proposed interventions must be aligned with the school/student level data and support the root cause analysis.
- Plan to make modifications to proposed interventions, aligned to all Turnaround Principles, based on mid-year findings from IDOE-provided Outreach Coordinator monitoring.
- Submit information to IDOE outlining each proposed intervention and justifying the selections with evidence from previous year's findings as well as SIP and/or student-/school-level data.
- Subject to IDOE review and requests for revisions, implement the interventions during

Year 2.

- Participate and comply with IDOE-provided **on-site monitoring**.
- Based on findings from the **Outreach Coordinator monitoring** and IDOE review (subject to requests for revisions), adjust interventions accordingly.

In Year 3, **Priority Schools** must do the following:

- Implement interventions, aligned to all **Turnaround Principles**, as stipulated by IDOE, based on findings from the **on-site Outreach Coordinator monitoring**.
- Consistent with 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funding, LEAs that choose not to comply with this expectation will not continue to be provided with that funding.

*School Improvement Interventions – Technical Assistance*

To ensure successful implementation of these interventions, this more differentiated, locally-driven approach must be paired with an IDOE-delivered, frequent, high-touch system of technical assistance, **monitoring** and evaluation, both when LEAs are selecting and implementing school improvement interventions aligned to all **Turnaround Principles**. To this end, the **Outreach Division of School Improvement (Outreach)** at IDOE will be restructured to ensure the necessary human capital are dedicated to working closely with LEAs and their **Priority and Focus Schools**. **Currently, Outreach consists of 13 field staff, who live in the nine regions of the state, and support and monitor the Focus and Priority Schools in their regions. Outreach also includes 4 Outreach Specialists who work internally at IDOE to support the Coordinators in the field. Outreach is led by a Director of Outreach and the Assistant Superintendent of the Outreach Division of School Improvement. (2D Attachment 8)**

**Outreach** will utilize a technical assistance approach consisting of two phases and **three** total elements to ensure LEAs with **Priority** and/or **Focus Schools** select, monitor, and modify school improvement interventions in a manner that improves student achievement and closes achievement gaps.

Phase I: Selection of School Improvement Intervention

- I. Root Cause Analysis
  - II. Data-Driven Intervention(s) Selection
- 
- I. Root Cause Analysis

LEAs with **Priority** and/or **Focus Schools** will be required to complete a “root cause analysis” prior to selecting school improvement interventions **(2D Attachment 9)**. This analysis will be reviewed, assessed, and returned to the LEA with comments and requests for modifications (if needed) by an **Outreach Specialist**. **Outreach** will provide LEAs with technical assistance to complete this “root cause analysis” through (1) guidance documents with exemplars, (2) webinars, and (3) on-site assistance. The objective of the “root cause analysis” is to ensure LEAs have identified critical areas for improvement prior to selecting school improvement

interventions that are aligned to all Turnaround Principles.

## II. Data-Driven Intervention(s) Selection

Focus and Priority School leadership teams were provided guidance in completing a root cause analysis, intervention selection, creating SMART goals, and developing action steps aligned with each of the Turnaround Principles during regional training sessions in December 2013. (2D Attachment 10, 11, 12) Additionally, Outreach Coordinators reviewed the intervention selection during the review of each Student Achievement Plan during the on-site monitoring visits and provided LEAs with technical assistance and feedback. The objective of the Student Achievement Plan with data driven interventions is to ensure selected school improvement interventions are aligned to all Turnaround Principles and an analysis of multiple school- and student-level data sources.

During the December 2013 regional meetings, in addition to IDOE Outreach and Technology staff, the MA Rooney Foundation partnered with IDOE to deliver professional development to Focus and Priority School leadership teams. The MA Rooney Foundation trainer assisted LEAs with understanding best practices for data use and how to intentionally use school-level data to improve student achievement.

Phase 2: Monitoring and Modification of School Improvement Intervention

## III. Implementation Monitoring

Outreach Coordinators will conduct at least two on-site monitoring visits to each Priority School during the academic year. These monitoring visits will utilize a mixed-methods approach to tracking the fidelity with which the intervention(s) is/are being implemented (e.g , interview with staff and school leader using guiding questions aligned to the Turnaround Principles, (2D Attachment 13 ) classroom observation, (2D Attachment 14) reviewing data analysis and intervention selection, and reviewing evidence and the written Student Achievement Plan (2D Attachment 15). Subsequent to these visits, Outreach Coordinators will provide schools with a list of evidence needed to support implementation plans and respond to requests for guidance in completing Student Achievement Plans. Progress toward plan implementation and positive changes in student achievement results from leading indicators will be provided to LEAs in monitoring reports. The feedback that is provided after the final monitoring visit and included in the Summative monitoring rubric (2D Attachment 16) of the academic year will be expected to be addressed in the LEA's next Student Achievement Plan submission if the school does not exit Priority or Focus status. All Priority Schools will continue to implement interventions for three years. IDOE will monitor implementation with on-site visits and track progress until three years of effective intervention implementation with fidelity is met. Following an Outreach Coordinator visit, LEA principals are sent an electronic survey to assist IDOE with evaluating services and support given to schools. (2D Attachment 17)

2.D.iv Provide the timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more priority schools implement meaningful interventions aligned with the turnaround principles in each



priority school no later than the 2014–2015 school year and provide a justification for the SEA’s choice of timeline.

### Current State School Improvement System

Public Law 221 (Indiana Code [IC] 20-31-8) is Indiana’s comprehensive accountability system for K-12 education. Originally passed by the Indiana General Assembly in 1999 – prior to the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 – the law aimed to establish major educational reform and accountability statewide. To measure progress, Indiana schools (public and accredited non-public and charter) are placed into one of five categories (A, B, C, D and F) based upon student performance and growth data from the state’s ISTEP+ and End-of-Course Assessments (ECAs).

Schools in the lowest accountability category (“F”) face a series of interventions designed to provide the additional support needed to improve student achievement. These consequences become more serious the longer schools remain in the bottom category.

#### Public Law 221 Timeline for “F” Schools (IC 20-31-9)

Year 1	
<b>State Action</b>	The local school board can request that the State Board of Education (SBOE) appoint an outside team to manage the school or assist in the development of a new SIP. If the SBOE appoints an outside team, the state will consider the school to be in its 4th year of “F” status. (See section on Years 4 and 5.)
<b>Local Action</b>	Local school board notifies public and conducts hearing. School improvement committee revises SIP accordingly.
Years 2 and 3	
<b>State Action</b>	SBOE appoints an outside team; the state will consider the school to be in its 4th year of “F” status.
<b>Local Action</b>	School implements revised SIP, and makes further revisions accordingly.
Years 4 and 5	
<b>State Action</b>	SBOE appoints a School Quality Review Team (SQR Team) (2D Attachment 18) to provide schools and their supporters with specific, action-focused feedback on what is working well and clear targets for improvement in order to support the school in their efforts to improve the educational outcomes for all students. The SQR rubric and report is aligned to the 8 Turnaround Principles. Based on public testimony, analysis of previous school evaluations and critiques of student- and school-level performance data, IDOE will make an intervention recommendation for state intervention to the SBOE. IDOE’s intervention recommendation and subsequent SBOE action will be made with the understanding that the LEA has been afforded the appropriate time, autonomy and technical assistance to improve its Priority School’s

	quality. In short, while there is a menu of potential intervention options, those which do not constitute a school restart (e.g., modifications to the SIP) are not viable.
<b>Local Action</b>	School considers and implements recommendations of SQR Team. LEAs can petition the SBOE for authority to implement one or more of the “Year 6 Interventions” outlined in the “State Action” section below in either year 4 or 5.
<b>Year 6</b>	
<b>State Action</b>	SBOE conducts a hearing to solicit testimony on options for the school, including merging the school with another school; assigning a special management team to operate all, or part of, the school; IDOE recommendations; other options expressed at hearing; and revising the improvement plan. If the SBOE determines that intervention will improve the school, the school must implement the intervention chosen by the State Board.
<b>Local Action</b>	Implement intervention(s) as determined by the SBOE.

#### Demonstrated Commitment to Enforcing State School Accountability System

In the fall of 2011, for the first time since P.L. 221 was signed into law, seven schools reached their sixth year of academic probation – the lowest performance category (now called “F”). At the August 29, 2011 State Board of Education (SBOE) meeting, the SBOE approved IDOE’s intervention recommendations and voted in favor of assigning a special management team to operate five of the seven schools and implementing a lead partner intervention at the remaining two schools. In March 2014, an additional school was added to the SBOE intervention schools and is utilizing an internal lead partner model, overseen by Mass Insight. Four schools, with five years of consecutive F’s, will have hearings in July 2014 to determine recommendations for potential interventions, if another F is received from the 2013-14 school data.

A clear message has been sent that the state will not stand idly by when schools continue to fail and students are permitted to languish. Perhaps more importantly, the landscape has permanently shifted to one where accountability is real.

The state’s process and strategy for intervening in the lowest performing schools is predicated upon the development of clear goals and measurable success indicators through the lens of a seminal framework developed by Mass Insight and outlined in *The Turnaround Challenge*, which U.S. Education Secretary Arne Duncan has called “the Bible of school turnaround.” Indiana is currently one of a few select states participating in Mass Insight’s School Development Network as part of a concerted effort to trailblaze cutting-edge, best-in-class turnaround policies. Indiana has continued its work with Mass Insight and is investigating the creation of networks designed to support schools with similar needs in various stages of school improvement. The attached report from Mass Insight outlines Indiana’s progress in turnaround as of April 2014, with the new model of Outreach melded

with the work initiated by the former Office of School Improvement and Turnaround. Indiana will work to implement suggestions from the Mass Insight Diagnostic report during the 2014-15 school year. (2D Attachment 19)

The special management team assigned by the SBOE is also referred to as a Turnaround School Operator (TSO). TSOs run operations for all or part of a school, using the school's per-pupil funding allocation. The TSO intervention is the most severe of the options available under state statute. It is reserved exclusively for the chronically lowest performing schools. In schools not assigned TSOs, Lead Partners (LPs) work strategically with the leadership appointed through the school district to support and implement targeted improvements. Each TSO entered into an initial one-year contract with the state, and the SBOE established aggressive benchmarks that TSOs and LPs must hit to maintain their good standing.

TSOs spent the rest of the 2011-12 academic year evaluating and preparing to assume full operational control in the 2012-13 school year. Consistent with Mass Insight's groundbreaking research, benchmarks for this transitional year included a strong focus on community and parent outreach as well as a thorough evaluation of school programs, staff and curriculum. TSOs and LPs continued their work with the identified state intervention schools through the 2013-14 school year.

LPs will also engage key stakeholder groups to establish buy-in to the support services provided. They will be held responsible for integrating their work with existing school initiatives and ensuring that the school is on track to dramatically improve. LPs will spend a few months embedding themselves into the school and assessing its needs before initiating services this year.

The TSO at Theodore Roosevelt College and Career Academy in Gary, Indiana, and LPs are under the direct oversight of IDOE and are directly accountable to the SBOE. The four TSOs in Indianapolis, Indiana, are directly supervised by the Indianapolis Mayor's Office of Education Innovation. IDOE's Outreach will conduct constant and ongoing oversight of the TSOs and LPs through quarterly meetings, attendance at key events and functions (e.g. community forums), on-site monitoring, including monthly classroom observations, and review of all deliverables, which are subject to IDOE approval. IDOE's engagement with TSOs and LPs will be "high touch," to ensure data is frequently reviewed and adjustments are made to respond to data, and progress is being made toward improved student achievement.

Limited or non-existent community engagement is one of the most frequently cited reasons for the failure of school turnaround. Consequently, IDOE intentionally built-in a transitional year that prioritizes community engagement (e.g. focus groups, community forums, partnerships) in each of the four phases of work required of TSOs during the initial year. This transition affords TSOs critical time to develop a bold and aggressive school transformation plan while building meaningful community will and coalitions that can later be leveraged to sustain ongoing improvement. LPs will also be responsible for engaging their respective communities to generate support for its school turnaround efforts.

More information about the state’s turnaround process is included as Attachment 17 and available at <http://www.doe.in.gov/outreach/turnaround>

*Description and Rationale for Accelerated Timeline in State School Accountability System*

Even though Indiana’s current school accountability law allows schools that make marginal improvement (e.g. receiving an “F” in 2010 and receiving an “D” in 2011) to reset their school accountability timeline, IDOE will require Priority Schools to maintain a C grade or better for two consecutive years or earn the status of being a Reward School for one year to exit Priority status. Section 2.D.v describes how these standards for exiting Priority status will require schools to demonstrate significant improvements for two consecutive years, or monumental improvement in one year, both in terms of student performance and growth. This significantly more rigorous accountability system will ensure that those schools exiting Priority status have demonstrated sustained and substantive improvement.

*Introduction to Proposed Synergy of State and Federal School Accountability Systems*

In Indiana, Title I-served schools are currently subject to two different (and at times dissonant) accountability systems – state and federal. The state accountability model, as defined under IC 20-31-8, ensures schools in the fourth and fifth year of “F” receive direct support, including a “quality review” (i.e. technical assistance and evaluation).

If a school receives an “F” for six consecutive years, SBOE has the authority to intervene directly, including the assignment of a special management team to operate the school.

Given that the current state accountability law focuses on evaluations of, and state-mandated interventions in, persistently low-achieving schools, IDOE has leveraged its federal school accountability model, the “Differentiated Accountability model,” to ensure meaningful district- and school-driven interventions, aligned to the Turnaround Principles, are in place in low-achieving Title I-served schools prior to the application of state-mandated interventions. Schools are assigned to the federal school improvement list based on their failure to make “adequate yearly progress” (“AYP”). The graphic below represents the model that was in place prior to the ESEA flexibility waiver.

Indiana’s School Accountability System		
	State	Federal
	“F” schools	Title-I served schools that fail to meet AYP are ranked by an index rating and assigned to comprehensive-intensive, comprehensive or focus status

Years 1-3	Modifications to the school improvement plan	Comprehensive schools are required to implement a set of school improvement initiatives aligned to the Turnaround Principles and in year three must implement corrective action. Focus Schools are required to set aside 10% of their Title I allocation for targeted professional development.
Years 4-5	Quality review and technical assistance provided by IDOE	In addition to sustaining initiatives required in years one through three, comprehensive schools are also required to restructure. Focus Schools are required to implement corrective action.
Year 6	State intervention	Comprehensive schools must sustain or modify their corrective action and restructuring plans. Focus Schools must sustain or modify their corrective action plan.

Through this flexibility request, IDOE will collapse Indiana’s two school accountability models into one. Schools in federal school improvement (i.e. Priority and Focus Schools) will be defined in a way that aligns directly to the state’s accountability model (i.e. “D” and “F” schools). In doing so, beginning in their first year of Priority or Focus status, a low-performing school will be required, as they once were under the “Differentiated Accountability Model,” to implement meaningful school improvement initiatives aligned to the Turnaround Principles.

Notably, this allows Indiana to proactively provide supports to struggling schools from the outset with the goal of obviating the need for more severe interventions later. Nevertheless, the state will not hesitate to impose more severe measures if and when they become necessary. The graphic below represents the model.

<b>Indiana’s School Accountability System – Synergy of State and Federal</b>	
	<i>Each Title I-served school earning an “F” will be defined as a Priority School; each earning a “D” will be defined as a Focus School</i>
2011-12	<i>Baseline Established</i>
2012-13	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan (SIP)</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Priority and Focus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
2013-14	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a public hearing to notify community of lack of improvement</li> </ul>

- Modify **SIP**
- May request intervention from IDOE

**Additions for *Priority and Focus*:**

- Implemented school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles
- Completed a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP
- Priority schools received on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document
- All Focus and Priority School leadership teams attended a regional meeting where requirements for schools were presented and expectations outlined
- Superintendents completed an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals, with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submitted documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success (2D Attachment 20, 21, 22,)
- After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE responded by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort (2D Attachments 23, 24, 25,26)
- Superintendents completed and submitted to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success (2D Attachment 27)
- Superintendents completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed (2D Attachment 28)
- Outreach Coordinators provided each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles.
- Focus Schools received an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2013-14

**2013-14 Ensuring Leadership Responses**

Priority School Principals removed and replaced	34
---	----

		Year 1 or 2 Principals with Assurance forms	161	
		Year 3+ or more Principals reviewed for evidence of ability to do turnaround work	66	
		Ineffective Round 1 (sent back April 15, 2014)	16	
		Ineffective Round 2 (received 2 <sup>nd</sup> no letter May 15, 2014)	2	
2014-15	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Priority and Focus:</i></p> <p>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDOE will begin full implementation of interventions in non-SIG Priority Schools in the 2014-15 school year, including a high quality plan to adjust school improvement planning and monitoring processes. Priority Schools must modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the 2013-14 summative monitoring report</li> <li>• Focus Schools must sustain or modify interventions required in 2013-2014</li> <li>• Implemented school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Completed a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools received an on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams attended a regional meeting where requirements for schools were presented and expectations outlined</li> <li>• Superintendents completed an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submitted documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success (2D Attachment 20, 21, 22,)</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE responded by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort (2D Attachments 23, 24, 25,26)</li> <li>• Superintendents completed and submitted to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of</li> </ul>			

	<p>experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success (2D Attachment 27)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed ((2D Attachment 28)</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators provided each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Focus Schools received an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2014-15</li> <li>• All Priority Schools will begin the school year with a principal determined to be intentionally placed with the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a past track record of student success</li> </ul>
<p>2015-16</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a public hearing to notify community of lack of improvement</li> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Priority and Focus:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Complete a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools will receive on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document.</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams will attend a regional meeting where requirements for schools are presented and expectations outlined</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and will submit documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success ((2D Attachment 20, 21, 22)</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE will respond by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort ((2D Attachment 23, 24, 25, 26) to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience are intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success (2D Attachment 27)</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents will complete a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced, after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed (2D Attachment 28) Outreach Coordinators will provide each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles.</li> <li>• Focus Schools will receive an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2015-16</li> </ul>
<p>2016-17</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a public hearing to notify community of lack of improvement</li> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additionally for Priority and Focus Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Complete a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools will receive on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document.</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams will attend a regional meeting where requirements for schools are presented and expectations outlined</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and will submit documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success (2D Attachment 20, 21,22)</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE will respond by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort (2D Attachment 23, 24,25, 26)</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete and submit to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience are intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success (2D Attachment 27)</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced, after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed (2D Attachment 28)</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators will provide each Focus and Priority School with</li> </ul>

a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles.

- Focus Schools will receive an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2016-17

Priority Schools must implement interventions aligned to all Turnaround Principles; Focus Schools must implement interventions aligned to Turnaround Principles most relevant for their targeted needs for improvement based on data analysis of sub-groups to ensure all students have their learning needs met. For schools with special populations, including English learners and students with disabilities, technical assistance for Focus and Priority Schools is provided through collaboration Outreach and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education and the Office of Special Education.

The collaborative efforts take many forms based on the need of the school. For example, if English learners are a particular sub-group that is identified as needing improvement, the Outreach Coordinator may work with the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education staff on data analysis, technical assistance, and potential resources. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education often works with the school after the initial monitoring to provide additional technical assistance, professional development, and resources. A sample of a presentation that was used during the 2013-2014 school year is attached. (2D Attachment 29)

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education has also partnered with Outreach coordinators throughout the entire state on joint regional professional development, monitoring, and in the development of resource documents for the subgroup of English learners.

An approved menu of professional development topics has been created. This document lists preapproved topics for schools to embed in the SIP. Although this list represents a resource of topics that address English learners, it is not exhaustive. If the LEA desires to provide research-based professional development that is not listed, the school is to contact the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education.

- 2.D.v Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement exits priority status and a justification for the criteria selected.

To exit Priority status, a school must maintain a 'C' grade or better for at least two consecutive years or earn the status of being a Reward School for one year. Carrying this out would require a school to show a combination of significant improvement on proficiency rates (between 10% to 20%) and substantially high growth over that two-year period (ranking in the top 25% of all schools in student growth). This type of movement (i.e.

grade improvement) would demonstrate that the school has made major changes in the quality of instruction provided, in how the school operates, and the methods used to teach its students. Indiana’s proposed criteria make it impossible to exit Priority status without establishing meaningful and long-term strategies that promise to put the students and the school on a path of future success.

Notably, a 10% improvement in proficiency rate and showing high student growth are required to increase a school’s grade to the next level. A school that is able to raise its letter grade by that amount for two or more consecutive years is unlikely to precipitously regress. However, a school would not be able to exit that criteria after two years if the reason they were able to obtain two consecutive scores of “C” or earn Reward status was because of the top 75% performance.

2D. vi Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Focus and Priority Schools; The SEA will have a high quality plan to ensure that all parents, including those of special populations, teachers and other stakeholders understand flexibility implications. Additionally implement a high quality plan to engage teachers, their reps and other stakeholders on an ongoing basis and use their input in flexibility implementation.

In November 2013, the Indiana Association of School Superintendents, Indiana State Teacher’s Association, Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana Association of School Principals, and Indiana School Board’s Association were invited to a meeting with the Superintendent of Public Instruction and IDOE executive team to discuss the ESEA waiver and the implications for Focus and Priority Schools. IDOE shared the guidelines and expectations in the waiver and asked for their assistance with communicating the requirements with their memberships. The professional organizations in attendance were appreciative of IDOE providing them with the information and offered input on ways to communicate most effectively with the field. These groups are contacted on an ongoing basis and their input is often used to facilitate implementation and communication of key initiatives. (2D Attachment 30)

In December 2013, six regional meetings were conducted for teacher leaders, principals and superintendents throughout Indiana to share the ESEA flexibility waiver requirements and expectations for Focus and Priority Schools. Technical assistance and guidance were provided to enable the schools to successfully meet the requirements contained in the waiver.

### Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan

#### 2.D – Priority Schools

##### Key Components

1. Accurately describing the ESEA flexibility turnaround principles within related tools, documents, training materials, and other supports
2. Aligning planning and monitoring tools to facilitate the determination of whether each school is concurrently implementing all ESEA flexibility Turnaround Principles for three years
3. Reviewing the performance and qualifications of non-SIG priority school principals at the SEA level and determining whether the current principal has demonstrated a past track record of improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort

<b>Key Component #1</b>					
Accurately describing the ESEA flexibility turnaround principles within related tools, documents, training materials, and other supports					
Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Developed Student Achievement Plan (SAP) for Priority Schools to use to supplement the School Improvement Plan. The SAP requires the use of data, a root cause analysis, SMART goals, and interventions explicitly aligned to all eight Turnaround Principles. This will be used each year.	9/2013-11/2013 Ongoing annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	The SAP was used by all Focus and Priority Schools	ESEA Flexibility FAQs and Dave English, USED	no current obstacles
Developed planning, monitoring, and training tools for LEAs which accurately describe the eight Turnaround Principles	9/2013-11/2013	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Monitoring handbook, training materials from regional meetings	ESEA Flexibility FAQs and Dave English, USED	no current obstacles
Provided professional development to Outreach Coordinators to ensure understanding of Turnaround Principles and consistent monitoring state-wide	9/2013-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement leadership	Monitoring handbook, agendas from coordinator PD dates	IDOE Outreach team, MA Rooney Foundation, Mass Insight	no current obstacles

Provided professional development and training to LEAs to ensure understanding of expectations and requirements of Turnaround Principles	12/2013 (regional meetings)- annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Outreach Division of School Improvement resource guide, PowerPoint from meetings	IDOE technology team, IDOE Outreach team, MA Rooney Foundation	no current obstacles
Monitored and conducted two on-site visits of Priority Schools using the eight Turnaround Principles and completed a summative rubric outlining progress with implementation of interventions	1/2014-6/2014 ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Summative monitoring reports, emails to LEAs with schedules, and surveys returned following visits	Outreach Division of School Improvement	no current obstacles
Provided a follow-up survey for LEAs to respond to monitoring visits and provide feedback to the SEA	2/2014-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Returned surveys	Outreach Division of School Improvement	no current obstacles
Formal memo and ongoing follow-up communication to superintendents and principals to ensure materials, tools, and expectations were clearly communicated and disseminated	12/2013-6/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Formal memo and ongoing emails	N/A	no current obstacles

<p>Contracted with Mass Insight to become a member of the State Development Network to build the capacity of our Outreach Division of School Improvement staff. IDOE will utilize the State Diagnostic Report from Mass Insight to inform our next steps and goals going forward.</p>	<p>2/2014-ongoing</p>	<p>IDOE</p>	<p>State Diagnostic Report from Mass Insight</p>	<p>Mass Insight staff</p>	<p>no current obstacles</p>
<p><b>Key Component #2</b></p> <p>Aligning planning and monitoring tools to facilitate the determination of whether each school is concurrently implementing all ESEA flexibility Turnaround Principles for three years</p>					
<p>Key milestones and activities</p>	<p>Timeframe</p>	<p>Party responsible</p>	<p>Evidence</p>	<p>Resources</p>	<p>Significant obstacles</p>
<p>Developed a rubric and priority areas of improvement feedback form to provide LEAs with technical assistance on intervention selection and implementation</p>	<p>10/2013-12/2013</p>	<p>Outreach Division of School Improvement</p>	<p>Monitoring handbook and documents provided to LEAs</p>	<p>IDOE Outreach Division and Dave English, USED</p>	<p>no current obstacles</p>
<p>Developed a tracking system internally to ensure Priority School LEAs are concurrently implementing all ESEA flexibility Turnaround Principles for three years</p>	<p>1/2014-6/2014 On-going</p>	<p>Outreach Division of School Improvement</p>	<p>Tracking Sheet</p>	<p>IDOE Outreach Division and Dave English, USED</p>	<p>no current obstacles</p>

Technical assistance documents released to LEAs during regional meetings	12/2013 Regional meetings annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Monitoring handbook and documents provided to LEAs	Outreach Division of School Improvement, MA Rooney Foundation	no current obstacles
Outreach Coordinators monitored schools for implementation of interventions and provided LEAs with feedback	1/2014-6/2014 ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Summative reports and monitoring visit feedback	Outreach Division of School Improvement	no current obstacles
Outreach Coordinators provided schools with support to select appropriate interventions aligned to the data and school needs based on a root cause analysis	12/2013-6/2014 ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Completed Student Achievement Plans and notes from monitoring visits	Outreach Division of School Improvement, Mass Insight	no current obstacles
<b>Key Component #3</b>					
Reviewing the performance and qualifications of non-SIG Priority School principals at the SEA level and determining whether the current principal has demonstrated a past track record of improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort					
Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles



Communication with LEA superintendents to ensure an understanding of the requirements for Priority School principals	11/2013-2/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	December memo, Meeting with stakeholders, Agenda from regional meetings	Outreach Division of School Improvement, Indiana State Teacher's Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana School Boards Association	no current obstacles
Provided superintendents with an evaluation tool aligned with the Turnaround Principles to facilitate the requirement of ability to do the turnaround work	1/2014-3/2014 ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Evaluating tool	Outreach Division of School Improvement Dave English, USED	no current obstacles
Provided school and district leadership teams with technical assistance and professional development to understand Turnaround Principle One: Ensuring Strong Leadership	12/2013-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Regional meeting agenda and training materials	Outreach staff	no current obstacles
Provided documents to facilitate the determination of a principal's past track record of student success and evidence requirements	12/2013-1/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Ensuring strong leadership documents	Outreach staff	no current obstacles

Provided superintendents with ensuring strong leadership documents and verification forms requiring signatures and submittal to IDOE	12/2013-2/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Evidence documents and verification forms	Outreach staff	no current obstacles
Utilized a rubric internally to evaluate the evidence submitted from LEAs to IDOE	3/2014-4/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Rubric documents	Outreach staff	no current obstacles
Provided internal IDOE staff training to effectively and consistently evaluate LEA leadership documents	3/2014-ongoing	Outreach Division of School improvement	Examples used in training of staff	Outreach and Legal staff	no current obstacles
Responded to LEAs by April 15, regarding determinations made by IDOE after reviewing evidence and allowed LEAs two weeks to resubmit missing evidence	4/2014-annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Yes and No letters	Outreach and Legal staff	no current obstacles
Provided LEAs with a final determination and ensured strong leadership for all Priority Schools prior to the 2014-15 school year	5/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Yes and No letters	Outreach and Legal staff	no current obstacles

(2D Attachment 31)

## 2.E FOCUS SCHOOLS

2.E.i Describe the SEA’s methodology for identifying a number of low-performing schools equal to at least 10 percent of the State’s Title I schools as “focus schools.”

Any Title I school that receives a ‘D’ and is not identified as a **Priority School**, or has a graduation rate under 60% for two consecutive years shall be classified as a *Focus School*.

Schools that receive ‘Ds’ under Indiana’s state accountability model also have the largest achievement gaps in the state (i.e. the 5% of schools with the largest achievement gaps). In fact, 95% of the Title I schools with the largest achievement gap between their highest performing students (top 75% subgroup) and their lowest performing students (the bottom 25% subgroup) received ‘Ds’ and would be captured under this definition. These schools contribute to Indiana’s achievement gaps across traditional subgroups as well.

Indiana’s **Focus Schools** have both low proficiency rates and significant achievement gaps. It is Indiana’s goal to reduce the number of focus schools by two-thirds (from 16% to 5%) by 2015 and to completely remove the need for this designation by 2020.

According to ESEA flexibility guidance documents, states are required to ensure that at least 10% of the State’s Title I schools are identified as **Focus Schools**. Statewide, **15% (147 schools)** of Title I schools would be identified as **Focus Schools**.

### Focus and Priority School Inclusion

Through Indiana’s use of the **Focus** and **Priority Schools**, Title I schools with the lowest 20% proficiency rate in English and Math; Title I schools with the 12% worst achievement gaps; and 100% of Title I schools with a graduation rate under 60 percent are identified for improvement.

2.E.ii Provide the SEA’s list of focus schools in Table 2.

2.E.iii Describe the process and timeline the SEA will use to ensure that its LEAs that have one or more focus schools will identify the specific needs of the SEA’s focus schools and their students and provide examples of and justifications for the interventions focus schools will be required to implement to improve the performance of students who are the furthest behind.

As part of the ESEA flexibility extension request, IDOE is submitting a high-quality plan for adjusting and aligning its School Improvement Plan (SIP) and monitoring processes to facilitate the determination of whether its Focus Schools are implementing those interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroup(s).

See Attachment 9, Table 2 for a list of Indiana’s Focus Schools.

The chart below displays how Indiana will ensure its LEAs with one or more Focus Schools will implement school improvement interventions starting in the 2012-13 school year.

<b>Indiana’s School Accountability System – Synergy of State and Federal</b>	
	<i>Each Title I-served school earning an “F” will be defined as a <b>Priority School</b>; each earning a “D” will be defined as a <b>Focus School</b></i>
2011-12	<i>Baseline Established</i>
2012-13	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for <b>Priority</b> and <b>Focus</b>:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles. For Focus Schools, the interventions and Turnaround Principles identified are directly aligned with the sub population gaps identified in student data</li> </ul>
2013-14	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify SIP</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for <b>Priority</b> and <b>Focus</b>:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Completed a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools received on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams attended a regional meeting where requirements for schools were presented and expectations outlined ((2E Attachments 1,2)</li> <li>• Superintendents completed an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals, with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submitted documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE responded by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> <li>• Superintendents completed and submitted to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the</li> </ul>

	<p>ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators provided each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Focus Schools received an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2013-14 and the Student Achievement Plan and interventions were examined to determine that data regarding gaps between sub groups of students were correctly identified and aligned to the proper Turnaround Principles to positively improve student achievement</li> </ul>
<p>2014-15</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for <b>Priority and Focus:</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority Schools must modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the 2013-14 summative monitoring report</li> <li>• Focus Schools must sustain or modify interventions required in 2013-2014</li> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Complete a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools will receive on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams will attend a regional meeting where requirements for schools are presented and expectations outlined (2E Attachments 1,2)</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals, with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submit documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE will respond by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete and submit to IDOE a verification form</li> </ul>

	<p>with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents will completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced, after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators will provide each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Focus Schools will receive an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2014-15 and the Student Achievement Plan and interventions were examined to determine that data regarding gaps between sub-groups of students were correctly identified and aligned to the proper Turnaround Principles to positively improve student achievement</li> <li>• All Priority Schools will begin the school year with a principal determined to be intentionally placed with the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a past track record of student success</li> </ul>
<p>2015-16</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a public hearing to notify community of lack of improvement</li> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for <b>Priority and Focus:</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Complete a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools will receive on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams will attend a regional meeting where requirements for schools are presented and expectations outlined (2E Attachments 1,2)</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals, with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submit documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE will respond by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents will complete and submit to IDOE a verification form with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success</li> <li>• Superintendents will completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced, after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators will provide each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Focus Schools will receive an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2015-16 and the Student Achievement Plan and interventions were examined to determine that data regarding gaps between sub-groups of students were correctly identified and aligned to the proper Turnaround Principles to positively improve student achievement</li> </ul>
<p>2016-17</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a public hearing to notify community of lack of improvement</li> <li>• Modify SIP</li> <li>• May request intervention from IDOE</li> </ul> <p><i>Additionally for <b>Priority and Focus Schools:</b></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implement school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Complete a Student Achievement Plan supplement to the SIP</li> <li>• Priority Schools will receive on-site monitoring from IDOE Outreach Coordinators two times during the school year and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from the summative monitoring document</li> <li>• All Focus and Priority School leadership teams will attend a regional meeting where requirements for schools are presented and expectations outlined (2E Attachments 1,2)</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete an intentional evaluation of Priority School principals, with 3 or more years of experience in a Priority School, and submit documentation and evidence to IDOE of a principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort and past track record of student success</li> <li>• After reviewing evidence submitted by LEAs, IDOE will respond by April 15 to LEAs with a determination regarding the principal’s ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> <li>• Superintendents will complete and submit to IDOE a verification form</li> </ul>

	<p>with supporting documentation that principals with less than 3 years of experience were intentionally evaluated and determined to have the ability to lead the turnaround effort and with a track record of student success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Superintendents will completed a Replace document for any Priority School principal replaced, after reviewing the ability to lead turnaround and determining a different leader was needed</li> <li>• Outreach Coordinators will provide each Focus and Priority School with a summative monitoring evaluation to respond to progress on intervention selection and progress with implementation of Turnaround Principles</li> <li>• Focus Schools will receive an on-site monitoring visit one time during 2016-17 and the Student Achievement Plan and interventions were examined to determine that data regarding gaps between sub-groups of students were correctly identified and aligned to the proper Turnaround Principles to positively improve student achievement</li> </ul>
--	--

Priority Schools must implement interventions aligned to all Turnaround Principles; Focus Schools must implement interventions aligned to Turnaround Principles most relevant for their targeted needs for improvement based on data analysis of sub-groups to ensure all students have their learning needs met. For schools with special populations, including English learners and students with disabilities, technical assistance for Focus and Priority Schools is provided through collaboration between the Division of Outreach for School Improvement and the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education and the Office of Special Education.

The collaborative efforts take many forms based on the need of the school. For example, if English learners are a particular subgroup that is identified as needing improvement, the Outreach Coordinator may work with the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education staff on data analysis, technical assistance, and potential resources. The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education often then continues working with the school after the initial monitoring to provide additional technical assistance, professional development, and resources. A sample of a presentation that was used during the 2013-2014 school year is attached. (2E Attachment 3)

The Office of English Learning and Migrant Education has also partnered with Outreach Coordinators throughout the entire state on joint regional professional development, monitoring, and in the development of resource documents for the sub-group of English learners.

An approved menu of professional development topics has been created. This document lists preapproved topics for schools to embed in the SIP. Although this list represents a



resource of topics that address English learners, it is not exhaustive. If the district desires to provide research-based professional development that is not listed, the school is to contact the Office of English Learning and Migrant Education.

IDOE will require LEAs with one or more Focus Schools to implement scientifically-based interventions aligned with demonstrated needs supported by quantitative and qualitative data. The process and timeline for these efforts are as follows:

School Improvement Interventions – Selection Criteria and Parameters

Under Indiana’s proposal, Priority and Focus Schools will be provided substantive flexibility to implement scientifically-based, student-/school-based data-informed interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles. As described below, these interventions will be tied to the Turnaround Principles and a framework utilized by IDOE during monitoring and School Quality Reviews –and aligned with the Turnaround Principles. The LEA may propose an intervention not listed below as long as it is anchored in the Turnaround Principles.

As part of the ESEA flexibility extension request, IDOE will submit a high quality plan for adjusting and aligning its SIP and monitoring processes to facilitate the determination of whether its Focus Schools are implementing those interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroups(s).

Alignment of School Improvement Interventions with Turnaround Principles

Indiana’s Turnaround Principles	Intervention Examples
<p>Turnaround Principle 1: School Leadership Provide strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership, or demonstrating to the SEA that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Replace the school principal with one who has a past track record of student success and the ability to lead the turnaround effort</li> <li>● Provide the principal with a mentor from a high-performing school</li> <li>● Redesign school leadership structure to provide appropriate operational flexibility</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 2: School Climate and Culture Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addressing other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students’ social, emotional, and health</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Utilize a behavior interventionist</li> <li>● Establish a school-wide research based positive behavioral interventions and support system</li> <li>● School-wide program to eliminate bullying or promote tolerance</li> </ul>

<p>needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Create a system of wrap-around student services</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 3: Effective Instruction Strengthening the school’s instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with State academic content standards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 8-Step Process</li> <li>● Formative Assessment Development and Training (e.g., Acuity)</li> <li>● On-going professional development targeting best instructional practices determined by classroom walk-thru data, teacher observation data and student achievement data</li> <li>● Teachers intentionally communicate learning objectives to students which are aligned to Indiana’s college and career ready standards</li> <li>● Instructional Coaches</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 4: Curriculum, Assessment, and Intervention System Ensuring teachers have the foundational documents and instructional materials needed to teach to the rigorous college and career ready standards that have been adopted</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● School leaders verify the curriculum being delivered is aligned to the Indiana college and career ready standards by frequent classroom walk-throughs and reflective feedback to teachers</li> <li>● Conduct a Curriculum Audit</li> <li>● Interventionist</li> <li>● Instructional coach lesson modeling</li> <li>● Create an intervention plan for students who are behind academically Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention, specifically for students two or more years behind academically</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 5: Effective Staffing Practices Ensure that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools; and (3) providing job-embedded, ongoing professional development informed by the teacher evaluation and support systems and tied to teacher and student needs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Replace ineffective teachers and staff</li> <li>● Ensure the school leader has the authority to hire his/her teachers and staff</li> <li>● Revise the schedule to create time for professional learning communities</li> <li>● Create hiring timelines and processes to effectively recruit highly qualified teachers able to effectively conduct turnaround work</li> <li>● Ensure ineffective teachers are not</li> </ul>

	<p>assigned or reassigned to the Priority School</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide staff with appropriate professional development to enable them to reflect, revise, and evaluate their classroom practices to improve learning outcomes in both a collaborative and individual setting</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 6: Enabling the Effective Use of Data Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including by providing time for collaboration on the use of data</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize a data coach</li> <li>• Provide staff with collaborative opportunities to analyze data and respond to learning needs of students (e.g., Professional Learning Communities)</li> <li>• Create a system-wide approach to tracking school data and individual student data</li> <li>• Analyze formative and summative assessments to respond to student academic, behavioral, and social needs</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 7: Effective Use of Time Redesigning the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restructure the academic schedule to increase core content or remediation time</li> <li>• Revise the schedule to create tutoring or extended learning time.</li> <li>• Ensure the schedule is designed to meet the professional development needs of staff</li> </ul>
<p>Turnaround Principle 8: Effective Family and Community Engagement. Provide an ongoing mechanism for family involvement in school decision making and understanding student progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize a community or family liaison</li> <li>• Create a process to involve family members in school decision-making</li> <li>• Communicate intentionally with families on a regular basis to share data, student progress, and areas needing support</li> <li>• Utilize a method of gathering stakeholder feedback that informs goals and on-going progress monitoring</li> </ul>

School Improvement Interventions – Expectations for Implementation

LEAs of Focus Schools are expected to implement interventions for the appropriate Turnaround Principles to address gaps between subgroups as identified during a root cause

analysis using school and student data. Outreach Coordinators, during monitoring visits, will review the Student Achievement Plan, a supplement to the SIP, which contains an outline of interventions, data, priority areas of improvement, goals and an action plan. Coordinators will examine evidence of interventions and verify implementation through classroom observations, staff interviews, document review, and formative assessment data. Coordinators will provide LEAs with an intervention status update based on the monitoring evidence, which provides LEAs with next steps. A summative monitoring rubric will be given to LEAs following the monitoring visit, which will clearly define progress with interventions.

### School Improvement Interventions – Timeline for Focus Schools

In Year 1, Focus Schools must do the following:

- Select at least three interventions aligned to the appropriate Turnaround Principles to address the sub-group population academic gaps determined by school or student data
- Submit information to IDOE outlining each proposed intervention and justifying the selections with evidence from student and school data, also identified from the root cause analysis from the Student Achievement Plan. All Focus Schools must complete a Student Achievement Plan, as a supplement to the SIP Plan, and aligned with the appropriate Turnaround Principles to intentionally address the learning needs identified for sub-groups as determined during the root cause analysis
- Subject to IDOE review and requests for revisions, LEAs implement the interventions during Year 1. IDOE will monitor LEAs for progress toward successful implementation and positive student performance change with a rubric aligned to the indicators in the Student Achievement Plan and the monitoring tool
- Focus Schools will be tracked for implementation of interventions until they exit school improvement status

In Year 2, Focus Schools must do the following:

- Analyze student-/school-level data to determine necessary modifications to the interventions, and fidelity of implementation
  - The number of interventions can be adjusted based on demonstrated needs
  - All implementation plans for proposed interventions must be aligned with the school/student level data and support the root cause analysis and selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA sub-group(s)
- Plan to make modifications to proposed interventions, aligned to all Turnaround Principles, based on mid-year findings from IDOE-provided Outreach Coordinator monitoring
- Submit information to IDOE outlining each proposed intervention and justifying the selections with evidence from previous year's findings as well as School Improvement Plans and/or student-/school-level data
- Subject to IDOE review and requests for revisions, implement the interventions during Year 2

- Participate and comply with IDOE- on-site monitoring
- Based on findings from the Outreach Coordinator monitoring and IDOE review (subject to requests for revisions), adjust interventions accordingly

In Year 3, Focus Schools must do the following:

- Implement interventions, aligned to Turnaround Principles, selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroup(s) as stipulated by IDOE, based on findings from the on-site Outreach Coordinator monitoring
- Consistent with 1003(g) School Improvement Grant funding, LEAs that choose not to comply with this expectation will not continue to be provided with that funding

### School Improvement Interventions – Technical Assistance

To ensure successful implementation of these interventions, this more differentiated, locally-driven approach must be paired with an IDOE-delivered frequent, high-touch system of technical assistance, monitoring and evaluation, both when LEAs are selecting and implementing school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles. To this end, the Outreach Division of School Improvement at IDOE was restructured to ensure the necessary human capital are dedicated to working closely with LEAs and their Priority and Focus Schools. Currently, Outreach consists of 13 field staff, who live in the nine regions of the state, and support and monitor the Focus and Priority Schools in their regions. Outreach also includes 4 Outreach Specialists who work internally at IDOE to support the Coordinators in the field. Outreach is led by a Director of Outreach and the Assistant Superintendent of the Outreach Division of School Improvement.

Outreach will utilize a technical assistance approach consisting of two phases and three total elements to ensure LEAs with Priority and/or Focus Schools select, monitor, and modify school improvement interventions in a manner that improves student achievement and closes achievement gaps.

#### Phase I: Selection of School Improvement Intervention

- I. Root Cause Analysis
  - II. Data-Driven Intervention(s) Selection
- I. Root Cause Analysis

LEAs with Priority and/or Focus Schools will be required to complete a “root cause analysis” prior to selecting school improvement interventions aligned to the Turnaround Principles. This analysis will be reviewed, assessed, and returned to the LEA with comments and requests for modifications (if needed) by an Outreach School Improvement Specialist. Outreach will provide LEAs with technical assistance to complete this “root cause analysis” through (1) guidance documents with exemplars, (2) webinars, and (3) on-site assistance. The objective of the “root cause analysis” is to ensure that LEAs have identified critical areas for

improvement prior to selecting school improvement interventions.

## II. Data-Driven Intervention(s) Selection

Outreach currently consists of 13 field staff, who live in the nine regions of the state, and support and monitor the Focus and Priority Schools in their regions. Outreach also includes 4 Outreach Specialists who work internally at IDOE to support the Coordinators in the field. Outreach is led by a Director of Outreach and the Assistant Superintendent of the Outreach Division of School Improvement. The objective of the Student Achievement Plan with data driven interventions is to ensure selected school improvement interventions are aligned to the Turnaround Principles and an analysis of multiple school- and student-level data sources.

### Phase 2: Monitoring and Modification of School Improvement Intervention

#### III. Implementation Monitoring

Outreach Coordinators will conduct at least one on-site monitoring visit to each Focus School during the academic year. These monitoring visits will utilize a mixed-methods approach to tracking the fidelity with which the intervention(s) is/are being implemented (e.g., focus group with staff, interview with school leader, classroom observation, reviewing data analysis and intervention selection, and reviewing evidence and the written Student Achievement Plan). (2E Attachment 4) Provides an example of guidance given to LEAs concerning progress towards intervention implementation, identified gaps, and adjustments needed in Student Achievement Plans. Subsequent to these visits, Outreach Coordinators will provide schools with a list of evidence needed to support implementation plans and respond to requests for guidance in completing Student Achievement Plans. Progress toward plan implementation and positive changes in student achievement results from leading indicators will be provided to LEAs in monitoring reports. The feedback that is provided after the final monitoring visit and included in the Summative monitoring rubric of the academic year will be expected to be addressed in the LEA's next Student Achievement Plan submission if the school does not exit Priority or Focus status. All Focus Schools will continue to implement interventions until they exit Focus status. IDOE will monitor implementation with on-site visits and track progress.

2.E.iv Provide the criteria the SEA will use to determine when a school that is making significant progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps exits focus status and a justification for the criteria selected.

To exit Focus status, a school must maintain a 'C' grade or better for at least two years or earn the status of being a Reward School for one year and the grade improvement or Reward status is derived by the improvement of the subgroup(s) that originally fostered the school categorization as Focus. If a school moves from being a 'D' school up to at least a 'C' for two years, this attainment means it has made significant gains in student growth and achievement. If a school can move one letter grade and sustain that level of achievement for two years, it is likely that substantive changes were made to the instructional quality at the

school.

As described in 2.D.v, carrying this out would require a school to show a combination of significant improvement on proficiency rates (between 10 to 20%) and substantially high growth over that two-year period (ranking in the top 25% of all schools in student growth).

Once a school has exited Focus status, the school is no longer required to implement interventions.

2.E. v. Family and Community Engagement and Outreach for Focus and Priority Schools; The SEA will have a high quality plan to ensure that all parents, including those of special populations, teachers and other stakeholders understand flexibility implications. Additionally implement a high quality plan to engage teachers, their reps and other stakeholders on an ongoing basis and use their input in flexibility implementation.

In November 2013, the Indiana Association of School Superintendents, Indiana State Teacher’s Association, Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana Association of School Principals, and Indiana School Boards’ Association were invited to a meeting with Superintendent of Public Instruction and IDOE executive team to discuss the ESEA waiver and the implications for Focus and Priority Schools. IDOE shared the guidelines and expectations in the waiver and asked for their assistance with communicating the requirements with their memberships. The professional organizations in attendance were appreciative of IDOE providing them with the information and offered input on ways to communicate most effectively with the field. These groups are contacted on an ongoing basis and their input is often used to facilitate implementation and communication of key initiatives. (2D Attachment 30)

In December 2013, six regional meetings were conducted for teacher leaders, principals and superintendents throughout Indiana to share the ESEA flexibility waiver requirements and expectations for Focus and Priority Schools. Technical assistance and guidance were provided to enable the schools to successfully meet the requirements contained in the waiver.

(2E Attachment 5)

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**2.E – Focus Schools**

**Key Components**

1. Adjusting and aligning IDOE School Improvement Plan to facilitate the determination of whether Focus Schools are implementing interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroup(s).
2. Adjusting and aligning IDOE monitoring processes to facilitate the determination of whether Focus Schools are implementing interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroup(s).

**Key Component #1**

Adjusting and aligning IDOE’s School Improvement Plan to facilitate the determination of whether Focus Schools are implementing interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA subgroup(s).

Key Milestones and activities	Detailed Timeline	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Created a School Improvement Plan supplement for Focus Schools, the Student Achievement Plan (SAP), which required schools to use data and perform a root cause analysis to determine subgroup performance needs	9/2013-11/2013 Ongoing annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	The SAP was used by all Focus and Priority Schools	ESEA Flexibility FAQs and Dave English, USED	no current obstacles
Developed planning, monitoring, and training tools for LEAs which accurately describe the eight Turnaround Principles and SAP alignment requirements, including intervention selection	9/2013-11/2013	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Monitoring handbook, training materials from regional meetings	ESEA Flexibility FAQs and Dave English, USED	no current obstacles



Provided professional development to Outreach Coordinators to ensure understanding of Focus School requirements, SAPs, Turnaround Principles and consistent monitoring state-wide	9/2013-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement leadership	Monitoring handbook, agendas from coordinator PD dates	IDOE Outreach team, MA Rooney Foundation, Mass Insight	no current obstacles
Provided professional development and training to LEAs to ensure understanding of expectations and requirements of Turnaround Principles and providing intervention to the lowest performing subgroup(s)	12/2013 (regional meetings annually)	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Outreach Division of School Improvement resource guide PowerPoint from meetings	IDOE technology team, IDOE Outreach team, MA Rooney Foundation	no current obstacles
Monitored and conducted one on-site visit of Focus Schools using the identified Turnaround Principles and completed a summative rubric outlining progress with implementation of interventions and the SAP	1/2014-6/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Summative monitoring reports, emails to LEAs with schedules, and surveys returned following visits	Outreach Division of School Improvement	no current obstacles
Provided a follow-up survey for LEAs to respond to monitoring visits and provide feedback to the SEA	2/2014-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Returned surveys	Outreach Division of School Improvement	no current obstacles
Formal memo and ongoing follow-up communication to superintendents and principals to ensure materials, tools, and expectations were clearly communicated and disseminated	12/2013-6/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Formal memo and ongoing emails	N/A	no current obstacles

### Key Component #2

Adjusting and aligning the IDOE monitoring processes to facilitate the determination of whether Focus Schools are implementing interventions selected based on the performance of its lowest-performing ESEA sub-group(s).

Key Milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party Responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Developed a rubric and priority areas of improvement feedback form to provide LEAs with technical assistance on intervention selection and implementation	10/2013-12/2013	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Monitoring handbook and documents provided to LEAs	IDOE Outreach Division and Dave English, USED	no current obstacles
Technical assistance and monitoring documents released to LEAs during regional meetings	12/2013-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Monitoring handbook and documents provided to LEAs	Outreach Division of School Improvement, MA Rooney Foundation	no current obstacles
Outreach Coordinators monitored Focus Schools for implementation of appropriate interventions aligned with the data to meet the needs of the lowest performing subgroup(s) and provided LEAs with feedback	1/2014-6/2014 ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Summative reports and monitoring visit feedback	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Travel and timeframe for LEA monitoring; Some regions have more Focus Schools than others and staff capacity is an issue
Outreach Coordinators provided schools with support to select appropriate interventions aligned to the data and school needs based on a root cause analysis to address the lowest performing subgroup(s)	12/2013-6/2014 annually	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Completed Student Achievement Plans and notes from monitoring visits	Outreach Division of School Improvement, Mass Insight	Districts had a short timeframe to make changes; going forward this is not an anticipated obstacle

**TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOLS**

Provide the SEA’s list of reward, priority, and focus schools using the Table 2 template. Use the key to indicate the criteria used to identify a school as a reward, priority, or focus school.

**TABLE 2: REWARD, PRIORITY, AND FOCUS SCHOOL**

LEA Name	School Name	School NCES ID #	REWARD SCHOOL	PRIORITY SCHOOL	FOCUS SCHOOL
<i>Ex. Washington</i>	<i>Oak HS</i>	<i>111111100001</i>		<i>C</i>	
	<i>Maple ES</i>	<i>111111100002</i>			<i>H</i>
<i>Adams</i>	<i>Willow MS</i>	<i>222222200001</i>	<i>A</i>		
	<i>Cedar HS</i>	<i>222222200002</i>			<i>F</i>
	<i>Elm HS</i>	<i>222222200003</i>			<i>G</i>
<b>TOTAL # of Schools:</b>					

Total # of Title I schools in the State: \_\_\_\_\_

Total # of Title I-participating high schools in the State with graduation rates less than 60%: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Key</b>	
<p><b><u>Reward School Criteria:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Highest-performing school</li> <li>B. High-progress school</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Priority School Criteria:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C. Among the lowest five percent of Title I schools in the State based on the proficiency and lack of progress of the “all students” group</li> <li>D. Title I-participating or Title I-eligible high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years</li> <li>E. Tier I or Tier II SIG school implementing a school intervention model</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Focus School Criteria:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F. Has the largest within-school gaps between the highest-achieving subgroup(s) and the lowest-achieving subgroup(s) or, at the high school level, has the largest within-school gaps in the graduation rate</li> <li>G. Has a subgroup or subgroups with low achievement or, at the high school level, a low graduation rate</li> <li>H. A Title I-participating high school with graduation rate less than 60% over a number of years that is not identified as a priority school</li> </ul>

## 2.F PROVIDE INCENTIVES AND SUPPORTS FOR OTHER TITLE I SCHOOLS

- 2.F Describe how the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system will provide incentives and supports to ensure continuous improvement in other Title I schools that, based on the SEA’s new AMOs and other measures, are not making progress in improving student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps, and an explanation of how these incentives and supports are likely to improve student achievement and school performance, close achievement gaps, and increase the quality of instruction for students.

### *Incentives and Supports*

Title I schools that are not in priority or focus status will have flexibility and autonomy to select and monitor the implementation of their selected school improvement interventions and will also have the option to receive all elements of the technical assistance IDOE provides to priority and focus Title I schools (as described in 2.D.iii and 2.E.iii).

To incent LEAs to continue to work with the IDOE to monitor the selection and implementation of school improvement initiatives in other Title I schools, the IDOE will automatically consider schools that accept technical assistance for Indiana’s Distinguished Title I Schools award. This annual competition recognizes Title I schools that demonstrate high student performance or high student growth. A winner and select group of finalists are selected for both high student performance and high student growth. All award recipients, including finalists, receive a grant award and recognition from the State Superintendent. Through this incentive, Title I schools that partner with the IDOE to ensure their school improvement interventions are selected, monitored, and modified with fidelity could potentially receive additional funding and at the very least will receive supplementary technical assistance.

### *Monitoring and Accountability for Continuous Improvement*

In addition to the integration of state and federal school improvement models (described in 2.D.iv), Indiana will also provide two additional levels of “checks” for non-priority, focus and reward Title I schools. These checks are designed to prevent any student population from slipping through the cracks – by ensuring improved student achievement and the closure of achievement gaps through the close monitoring of student performance in both the bottom 25% subgroup and in the traditional ESEA subgroups. Moreover, these checks prevent the masking of individual subgroup performance by any subset of students. Following is a chart describing these checks and their constitutive supports and interventions for other Title I schools not meeting expectations for a particular subgroup.

<b>Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System – Subgroup Checks</b>		
	<b>Bottom 25% subgroup</b>	<b>ESEA subgroups</b>
	<p><i>All Schools that receive an overall grade of “A,” “B” or “C”</i></p> <p><i>(Non Priority, Focus and Reward Title I schools subject herein to interventions are called “Focus-Targeted”)</i></p>	<p><i>All Schools that receive an overall grade of “A,” “B” or “C”</i></p> <p><i>(Non Priority, Focus and Reward Title I schools subject herein to interventions are called “Focus-Targeted”)</i></p>
2011-12	<i>Baseline Established</i>	<i>Baseline Established</i>
2012-13	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least <b>one letter grade</b> from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> </ul>
2013-14	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least one letter grade from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</p> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p>

	<p>students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> </ul>
<p>2014-15</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least one letter grade from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> </ul>

<p>2015-16</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least <b>two letter grades*</b> (note shift) from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to their school improvement plan</p> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the Overall group, or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to their school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> </ul>
<p>2016-17</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least two letter grades from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul>

<p><b>Additions for <i>Focus-Targeted</i>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additions for <i>Focus-Targeted</i>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul>
--	--



<p>2017-18</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least two letter grades from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</p> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for Focus-Targeted:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul>
<p>2018-19</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least two letter grades from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this</li> </ul>

	<p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</p> <p><i>Additions for <b>Focus-Targeted</b>:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• Receive a quality review from IDOE and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from that review</li> </ul>	<p>subgroup</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul> <p><i>Additions for <b>Focus-Targeted</b>:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• Receive a quality review from IDOE and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from that review</li> </ul>
<p>2019-20</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> If a school’s bottom 25% subgroup does not receive an “A” or increase at least two letter grades from the baseline, it must</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> </ul> <p>IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</p>	<p><i>All Schools:</i> For any ESEA subgroup** that <b>does not meet expectations</b> (i.e. <b>two letter grades</b> or greater behind the overall group or does not meet annual state targets of achievement):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify school improvement plan for IDOE review and approval to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the school improvement plan</li> </ul>

<p><b>Additions for <i>Focus-Targeted</i>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• Receive a quality review from IDOE and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from that review</li> </ul>	<p><b>Additions for <i>Focus-Targeted</i>:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LEA must send notification to all students’ parents or guardians indicating that the school did not meet expectations for this subgroup</li> <li>• Modify relevant federal grant application (e.g., Title II, Title III) to include specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• IDOE will offer technical assistance to LEAs to make the appropriate modifications to the federal grant application(s)</li> <li>• LEA must complete quarterly monitoring reports that provide evidence of progress towards goals tied to the specific intervention strategies for this subgroup</li> <li>• Receive a quality review from IDOE and must plan to modify the interventions and implementation strategies based on findings from that review</li> </ul>
---	---

\* Schools have three years to raise the bottom 25% subgroup one grade because for most schools this group is significantly below the proficiency bar (the average passing percentage is 40%, which is 20% below the threshold to earn a “D” on proficiency in the model). As such, schools will need time to dramatically improve these results. Similarly they are given the same consideration for raising this group’s performance two grades in eight years. To be clear, both of these targets reflect very high expectations.

\*\* Even if a school has fewer than thirty students in a subgroup that is not meeting expectations (as defined in the preceding chart), Indiana will still require it to fulfill the requirements and accept the technical assistance described in the chart titled, *Indiana’s Proposed School Accountability System – Subgroup Checks* to ensure that no ESEA subgroup, regardless of “n size,” is overlooked.

The subgroup checks are designed to trigger required school improvement interventions and to provide technical assistance aimed at a particular student population. As such, these interventions and technical assistance will be tailored to the specific subgroup in need of improvement. As an illustration, the chart below describes how interventions and technical assistance will be tailored if triggered as a result of English learner or special education

subgroup performance.

<b>Targeted Interventions and Technical Assistance Resulting From Triggering of Subgroup Checks – English Learners and Special Education</b>		
<i>Intervention or Technical Assistance</i>	<i>Targeted for English Learners Subgroup</i>	<i>Targeted for Special Education Subgroup</i>
Modifying school improvement plan	Must include professional development that is at least monthly, progress monitored by LEA, provided to all teachers and selected from a menu of approved topics from Title III office (these approved topics will be created with advisement from the committee of practitioners and content experts such as the Center for Applied Linguistics)	Must work with the Indiana Resource Network (i.e. nine resource centers designed to support LEAs not meeting IDEA's federal indicator targets) to complete a needs assessment and create an action plan specifying mandatory interventions for the school that triggered the special education subgroup check
Impact on Federal programs	Technical assistance offered by Title III specialists, in conjunction with assistance from Great Lakes East and the Center for Applied Linguistics, to ensure an LEA's Title III application describes at the school-level how targeted professional development will meet the criteria listed in the table cell above	For LEAs not compliant with their required corrective actions and/or continued issues with their data (i.e. from resource centers for implementation), delay of funding will be considered
Quality review from IDOE	Conducted jointly by representatives from Title III and the Office of School Improvement and Turnaround, utilizing an adapted framework for high-poverty, high-quality schools to reflect English learners' needs (adapted in collaboration with Mass Insight)	Conducted jointly by representatives from Title III and the Office of School Improvement and Turnaround, utilizing the special education program area review of indicators and support from SEA-sponsored special education resource centers

## 2.G BUILD SEA, LEA, AND SCHOOL CAPACITY TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING

- 2.G Describe the SEA’s process for building SEA, LEA, and school capacity to improve student learning in all schools and, in particular, in low-performing schools and schools with the largest achievement gaps, including through:
- i. timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools;
  - ii. holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around their priority schools; and
  - iii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under the SEA’s differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources).
- Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

- i. **timely and comprehensive monitoring of, and technical assistance for, LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools;**

To bolster IDOE’s monitoring of and technical assistance for LEA implementation of interventions in priority and focus schools, additional structures and supports will be built around the proposed interventions. For priority and focus schools, the LEA will be required to submit an intervention plan each year, which in turn will be reviewed by the IDOE and subject to necessary revisions. This additional check will provide meaningful monitoring and technical assistance to ensure the interventions selected from the menu of options are data-driven and reflective of the school’s demonstrated needs. This review and potential revision process persists for priority schools until year 3 and for focus schools until year 4, when the LEA must align its interventions to the IDOE’s recommendations based on the findings of the Technical Assistance Team Quality Review.

Rather than creating another compliance exercise, this process is designed to align federal and state improvement efforts into a singular, coherent strategy. IDOE is serious about ensuring that all plans, interventions and uses of funds (federal and state) are closely aligned. More importantly, all plans and funds must directly address the needs of the students and be firmly grounded in relevant performance data.

- ii. **holding LEAs accountable for improving school and student performance, particularly for turning around priority schools; and**

Indiana’s current school accountability law does not grant IDOE the authority to provide meaningful technical assistance to an LEA until a school’s fourth consecutive year of “F” status. It is not until a school’s sixth consecutive year of “F” status that the IDOE, in

conjunction with the SBOE, can substantively intervene to turnaround a priority school that an LEA has failed to improve.

The model proposed in this section and previously in 2.D.iii and 2.E.iii dramatically increases the urgency and degree of LEA accountability for improving school and student performance in priority and focus schools. To receive school improvement funds, LEAs must forfeit authority to select and manage the implementation of school improvement interventions when a Title I school enters into its third year of priority status or its fourth year of focus status. When schools enter into either of these stages of improvement, the IDOE will do the following:

1. Assign school improvement interventions rooted in findings from the previous academic year's Technical Assistance Team Quality Review
2. Closely monitor and adjust as needed the implementation of school improvement interventions

IDOE will also hold LEAs accountable for turning around priority schools by continuing to enforce the interventions prescribed in P.L. 221, including changing the priority school's governance structure. Specifically, if an LEA fails to utilize the resources and authority at its disposal across a six-year trajectory for turning around its priority schools, IDOE and SBOE will take the appropriate actions to ensure a dramatic course correction is applied.

As described in 2.D.iii., Indiana recently demonstrated this commitment by directly intervening in seven of the state's persistently lowest performing schools. Five of these schools are no longer a part of the LEA and are now designated "Turnaround Academies" under the auspices of the SBOE. For a Turnaround Academy to rejoin the LEA, the SBOE will need to see that the LEA has, in the time that the Turnaround Academy has been operated by a TSO, demonstrated significant improvement in its other priority and focus schools as well as made appropriate district-level changes in staffing and structure to better support its low-performing schools. When determining the next steps for a Turnaround Academy at the end of the TSO's four-year operational contract, the SBOE will have a menu of options from which to select, including renewing the TSO's contract.

The assignment of TSOs constitutes a school restart, one of the four federal turnaround models. A recent analysis of School Improvement Grant recipients identified that less than 3% of all SIG interventions utilize the restart model. The fact that IDOE and SBOE selected the restart model for over two-thirds of the schools within its jurisdiction highlights the urgency that both groups bring to the critical job of turning around Indiana's lowest-performing schools. Even the application of a lead partner intervention, certainly not a mild intervention by any means, at the remaining two schools is designed to hold the LEA accountable for improving its priority schools.

Priority schools assigned a lead partner intervention by the SBOE remain under the LEA's jurisdiction. But if the priority school does not demonstrate measured and agreed upon gains

and/or if the LEA impedes upon the LP's work, the SBOE has the authority and conviction to modify the intervention as soon as it deems necessary. As a result, the LEA is compelled to work collaboratively and support LPs to both retain LEA authority and ensure the marked improvement of priority schools.

The IDOE believes local communities and leaders are best suited to address education challenges at the local level. Individuals intertwined in the local culture, opportunities and problems are best situated for maximum influence, and systemic change is more sustainable with the support of local leaders and community members. To this end, the IDOE will provide resources where necessary to help local communities get their schools on the right track.

Pursuant to IC 20-31-9-3 and 20-31-9-4 (Public Law 221-1999), the governing body of a school corporation may petition the Indiana State Board of Education (SBOE) to immediately restructure a school where, in the third year after initial placement in the lowest category or designation, the school remains in the lowest category or designation.

The governing body may petition the SBOE by presenting a written plan setting forth the proposed intervention for the school. The petitioner may select one intervention method or a combination of methods, subject to the approval of the SBOE. Interventions are defined by IC 20-31-9-4 and include the following:

- (a) Merging the school with a nearby school that is in a higher category of school improvement under IC 20-31-8 and 511 IAC 6.2-6.
- (b) Assigning a special management team to operate all or part of the school.
- (c) Implementing the department's recommendations for improving the school.
- (d) Implementing other options for school improvement expressed at the public hearing, including closing the school.
- (e) Revising the school's plan in any of the following areas:
  - i. School procedures or operations.
  - ii. Professional development.
  - iii. Intervention for individual teachers or administrators.

As governed by IC 20-31-9-3, if the SBOE approves the petition, the school will operate under the applicable sections of IC 20-31-9.5 and will remain in the same performance category or designation where the school was placed at the time the SBOE accepted the plan.

- iii. ensuring sufficient support for implementation of interventions in priority schools, focus schools, and other Title I schools identified under IDOE's differentiated recognition, accountability, and support system (including through leveraging funds the LEA was previously required to reserve under ESEA section 1116(b)(10), SIG funds, and other Federal funds, as permitted, along with State and local resources).

Explain how this process is likely to succeed in improving SEA, LEA, and school capacity.

As a part of their proposals to the IDOE for school improvement interventions in their priority or focus schools, LEAs will be required to complete a “Funding and Intervention Alignment” worksheet (Attachment 19). The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that LEAs are leveraging appropriate available federal and state funds to support and sustain school improvement interventions.

Interventions selected by priority and focus schools will undergo a rigorous review process by the IDOE and its Office of School Improvement and Turnaround. This review process will not be compliance driven but rather rooted in high expectations that proposed interventions will be decided upon based on a theory of action and anchored in relevant quantitative and qualitative data. Moreover, IDOE will require LEAs to clearly describe its implementation plans for proposed interventions in terms of three tiers of rigor (discussed in 2.F).

If the plan is approved, IDOE specialists in the Office of School Improvement and Turnaround will conduct monitoring visits to ascertain the fidelity with which the intervention is truly being implemented. This information will in turn inform subsequent IDOE and SBOE decisions for state intervention. In the short-term, monitoring of intervention selection and implementation will inform how much flexibility LEAs are given to determine their own interventions; in the long-term, it will shape the SBOE’s recommendation for state intervention.

### Summary

IDOE has thoughtfully and carefully designed its new accountability system to differentiate recognition, accountability, and support. The A-F letter grades – built on top of a robust growth model and a bottom 25% focus that targets the achievement gap – coupled with a state accountability statute (P.L. 221) that provides for an aggressive state support and intervention mechanism fit together as part of a coherent and comprehensive system that supports continuous school improvement.

When it comes to the state’s chronically lowest performing schools, Indiana proposes a tiered intervention system aligned to the latest research and best practices in school turnaround. Working alongside the SEA, successful schools and LEAs are provided greater support, flexibility, and latitude. Conversely, those that persistently struggle will receive interventions of increasing severity, proportional to the level of need at the school.

Moreover, the efficacy of this system is promising within Indiana’s new education climate – one that promotes strong school choice and competition. As part of “Putting Students First,” parents and families can compare traditional public, public charter, and private school options because all receive letter grades as part the state’s broader effort to increase the engagement and involvement of all stakeholders.



## PRINCIPLE 3: SUPPORTING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION AND LEADERSHIP

### 3.A DEVELOP AND ADOPT GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Select the option that pertains to the SEA and provide the corresponding description and evidence, as appropriate, for the option selected.

<b>Option A</b>	<b>Option B</b>	<b>Option C</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has not already developed any guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. the SEA’s plan to develop and adopt guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year;</li> <li>ii. a description of the process the SEA will use to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines; and</li> <li>iii. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).</li> </ol>	<input type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has already developed and adopted one or more, but not all, guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. a copy of any guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students;</li> <li>ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11);</li> <li>iii. the SEA’s plan to develop and adopt the remaining guidelines for local teacher and principal evaluation and support systems by the end of the 2011–2012 school year;</li> <li>iv. a description of the process used to involve teachers and principals in the development of the</li> </ol>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If the SEA has developed and adopted all of the guidelines consistent with Principle 3, provide: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. a copy of the guidelines the SEA has adopted (Attachment 10) and an explanation of how these guidelines are likely to lead to the development of evaluation and support systems that improve student achievement and the quality of instruction for students;</li> <li>ii. evidence of the adoption of the guidelines (Attachment 11); and</li> <li>iii. a description of the process the SEA used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.</li> </ol>

	<p>adopted guidelines and the process to continue their involvement in developing any remaining guidelines; and</p> <p>v. an assurance that the SEA will submit to the Department a copy of the remaining guidelines that it will adopt by the end of the 2011–2012 school year (see Assurance 14).</p>	
--	---	--

Teacher Evaluation and Support Systems are carried out consistent with the principles and timelines in the ESEA Flexibility request. IDOE's priority with regard to improving student achievement and the quality of instruction for students is to recognize great teaching and leadership. Few states are as well positioned as Indiana to lead the way in the important work of improving teacher and principal support systems. Indiana has fully embraced this challenge and the opportunity to substantially improve the quality of feedback provided to educators and to promote evaluation systems that shine a spotlight on excellence.

Beginning with legislation in 2011, IDOE established new guidelines for holding principals and teachers accountable for their students' performance and achievement through meaningful evaluations. These guidelines are designed to assist schools and LEAs in their efforts to increase teacher and leader effectiveness, close the achievement gap and promote the equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders across the state.

Indiana's evaluation system provides a transparent way to validate the quality of a school's human capital by coupling professional accountability with school accountability. Examining the new evaluation data system relative to the new A-F accountability framework provides a unique perspective as IDOE continues to support the field in this new and innovative approach to transforming schools and developing more effective teachers and leaders. This check and balance between school accountability and educator accountability is transparent to the public; aggregate teacher evaluation results by school are posted on IDOE's website with each school's accountability grade at: [www.doe.in.gov/evaluations](http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations).

Through legislation passed during the 2011 legislative session, all LEAs were required to establish an annual evaluation system for all certificated employees (teachers and administrators) by July 1, 2012, unless the district was operating under an unexpired contract settled prior to the effective date of the statute, in which case an evaluation system is required to be adopted in conjunction with the next bargained contract. Indiana Code (IC) 20-28-11.5 detailed several clear and rigorous guardrails for evaluations that are outlined

below. Specifically, evaluations must reflect the following six priorities (3A Attachment 1)

- (1) Performance evaluations for all certificated employees, conducted at least annually.
- (2) Objective measures of student achievement and growth to significantly inform the evaluation. The objective measures must include:
  - (A) student assessment results from statewide assessments for certificated employees whose responsibilities include instruction in subjects measured in statewide assessments;
  - (B) methods for assessing student growth for certificated employees who do not teach in areas measured by statewide assessments; and
  - (C) student assessment results from locally developed assessments and other test measures for certificated employees whose responsibilities may or may not include instruction in subjects and areas measured by statewide assessments.
- (3) Rigorous measures of effectiveness, including observations and other performance indicators.
- (4) An annual designation of each certificated employee in one
  - (1) of the following rating categories:
    - (A) Highly effective.
    - (B) Effective.
    - (C) Improvement necessary.
    - (D) Ineffective.
- (5) An explanation of the evaluator's recommendations for improvement, and the time in which improvement is expected.
- (6) A provision that a teacher who negatively affects student achievement and growth cannot receive a rating of highly effective or effective.

Recognizing the importance of IC 20-28-11.5, the state legislature included funding in the state budget to provide a monetary incentive for LEAs to embrace and promote educator effectiveness. Six million dollars in pay for performance grants were competitively available to LEAs in 2011-12 to reward teachers rated effective and highly effective. An additional 10 million dollars in performance-based compensation grants were awarded for the 2012-13 school year. In 2013-14, two million dollars in grants were awarded to effective and highly effective teachers in Focus and Priority Schools (3A Attachment 2). To assess the impact of these grants, recipient LEAs from the first two rounds of grants were surveyed in May 2014 ((3A Attachment 3) IDOE will require all Excellence in Performance Grant recipients to submit end-of-grant surveys. Results will inform IDOE Educator Effectiveness staff as the application and criteria for the next round of competitive grants are developed. This round of grants will be awarded in the Fall of 2014 and will be based on 2013-14 evaluation results and will be competitively awarded to LEAs that are developing effective teachers through leadership roles. The Indiana General Assembly has also allocated 30 million dollars in School Performance Awards to be distributed by December of 2014 to effective and highly effective teachers through a formula that incorporates school performance measures. These financial

incentives reinforce the emphasis Indiana has placed on identifying and rewarding effective and highly effective teachers, increasing student learning, closing the achievement gap and promoting utilization of highly effective educators to enhance school improvement efforts.

As part of IDOE's commitment to support LEAs as they adopt evaluation systems to drive school improvement and student achievement, IDOE will continue to seek out grants and other legislative funding opportunities for LEAs to reward high performing educators. Currently, 87% of LEAs have adopted an evaluation system per requirements of IC 20-28-11.5. The IDOE will inform the approximately 40 school districts (3A Attachments 4, 5) not statutorily required to have evaluations plans under IC 20-28-11.5 --because they are operating under unexpired collective bargaining agreements-- to execute MOUs with their teacher associations to adopt and implement evaluation systems prior to contract termination. IDOE will inform these districts of the financial consequences for Highly Effective and Effective teachers in terms of ineligibility for the Excellence in Performance Grants. This will allow those districts to be eligible for future school performance awards and grant opportunities and will further the IDOE's commitment to ESEA flexibility waiver compliance.

Indiana's evaluation statute also mandates that evaluations directly support teachers by identifying areas of improvement to be targeted via professional development. The goal is to increase the frequency and quality of feedback to Indiana's educators so that they can leverage this information to improve their instructional practice and raise student performance.

While the state views actionable feedback and measurement of student growth and achievement as primary goals, IDOE understands the importance of using this information to help teachers improve their instructional practice. Thus, IDOE staff redesigned Indiana's Title II(a) application to help guide schools in leveraging their federal dollars in support of targeted professional development. Workshops and webinars were conducted in the Fall of 2011 to communicate how to shift from a highly qualified focus to a teacher effectiveness focus, and additional training to support this work was conducted in the Spring of 2012. IDOE believes professional development decisions need to be made at the local level to address needs determined by individual school corporations.

Local administrators were surveyed at the end of the 2013-14 school year regarding the highest frequency professional development needs at the local level, so that IDOE can be strategic in providing support and targeted technical assistance in the future. The survey asked what professional development teachers need to be able to be more effective in the classroom and what professional development administrators need to assist their teachers to be highly effective (3A Attachment 6). The results will be analyzed and will inform collaborative development of updated guidance and responsive professional development through IDOE's partnerships with the IU Center for Education and Lifelong Learning, Great Lakes Comprehensive Center, The Center for Great Teachers and Leaders, CCSSO and various professional educator organizations in Indiana. Utilizing administrator responses, the

Educator Effectiveness staff will also coordinate with Outreach to incorporate targeted technical assistance into the monitoring and support provided to Focus and Priority Schools.

Recognizing LEAs' statutory rights of local control, the Indiana General Assembly provided LEAs options under IC 20-28-11.5 to use the state model evaluation plan, RISE 2.0, other approved models or to develop their own models within the statutory framework. (3A Attachment 7) While the RISE model specifies that objective measures of student growth and achievement will be weighted at 50% for Group 1 teachers (teachers who teach only subjects with mandated state assessments), 40% for Group 2 teachers (teachers who teach subjects with mandated state assessments and subjects that do not have mandated state assessments) and 25% for Group 3 teachers (teachers who teach no subjects with mandated state assessments), the statute does not mandate specific weighting percentages. Rather, it specifies that objective measures of student growth and achievement will "significantly inform" a teacher's summative evaluation rating. Results from classroom observations and performance using the RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric provide additional measures used in the summative rating decisions (3A Attachment 8) The RISE principal evaluation model mirrors RISE for teachers in that it requires objective data of student growth and achievement to be weighted at 50% in the summative component (using administrative SLOs and the school accountability grade) with additional measures of professional practices provided through the Principal Effectiveness Rubric (3A Attachment 9). As additional guidance, the State Board of Education's promulgated performance evaluation rule, 511 IAC 10-6, (3A Attachment 10) requires that when growth model data for subjects with mandated state assessments is available it will be input as the primary measure of student growth and achievement in a teacher's summative rating regardless of the evaluation model used by the LEA. This focus on objective student data links student growth to teacher and school accountability yet allows districts to exercise local control in defining the summative weighting that best meets the expectations of their school communities. An explanation of how Indiana ensures that data from state mandated assessments significantly informs teacher evaluations follows later in this section.

For only the 2012-2013 school year, the IDOE release guidance to LEAs for the unintended consequences that the disruptions of ISTEP+ testing had on evaluation results and associated compensation and personnel decisions. This guidance from the SEA to the LEAs to mitigate the impact of ISTEP data for Group 1 and Group 2 teachers was optional only for evaluations conducted during the 2012-13 school year.

In accordance with IC 20-28-11.5, LEAs must report evaluation results to IDOE. At present, Indiana has data for the first year of statewide implementation of evaluations for all certificated staff (2012-13). Data collected shows that 249 districts and 1993 schools reported evaluation results to the IDOE for over 55,000 teachers, principals and superintendents, which are displayed below in aggregate. As required by statute, aggregate evaluation data by school and district is posted on the IDOE website: [www.doe.in.gov/evaluations](http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations).

**2012-2013 STATEWIDE STAFF PERFORMANCE RESULTS****TOTAL EDUCATORS**

<b>REPORTED</b>	<b>RATING</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE</b>
14658	HIGHLY EFFEECTIVE	26.43%
33909	EFFECTIVE	61.15%
1110	IMPROVEMENT NECESSARY	2.03%
218	INEFFECTIVE	0.39%
5560	NOT APPLICABLE/NOT EVALUATED	10%

**TOTAL: 55455**

EEL staff is strategically working with IDOE’s technology team to house historic evaluation rating results on the data warehouse COMPASS. Current and previous years’ evaluation ratings, per LEA and school, will be housed on COMPASS by the end of December 2014.

Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, charter schools will be submitting their evaluation plans for review and reporting their evaluation data to IDOE. Additionally, aggregate evaluation data for teachers with 1, 2 and 3 years of experience are linked to the teachers’ teacher preparation institutions and posted on IDOE’s website. School data also displays the school’s accountability grade.

To ensure first year implementation of statutorily compliant plans (2012-13), several checkpoints were in place: 1) state school standards for accreditation; 2) grant eligibility; and 3) compensation model requirements. LEAs were required, as part of Indiana’s K-12 school accreditation process, to upload their evaluation plans as Accreditation Legal Standard 12 with a Compliance Check sheet and an assurance from the local superintendent that the plan was in statutory compliance. LEAs operating under unexpired contracts indicate they do not yet have statutorily compliant evaluation plans. As those contracts expire, LEAs are required to adopt compliant plans when they next bargain. A second checkpoint was in place for LEAs wishing to apply for Excellence in Performance grants; one criterion for LEA grant eligibility was a statutorily compliant evaluation plan. A third checkpoint involved LEA compensation models. In conjunction with IC 20-28-11.5, the General Assembly set statutory guidelines to ensure student and teacher performance drive compensation (3A Attachment 11). LEAs cannot administer a compensation model/salary schedule that awards increases in compensation to teachers whose evaluation ratings are ineffective or needs improvement, which requires LEAs to have in place statutorily compliant evaluation plans. IDOE is required to annually review LEA-submitted compensation models for compliance. A high level review was conducted in 2012-13 and the first detailed review completed during the 2013-14 school year. More than 200 LEA compensation models/salary schedules were reviewed for compliance and received feedback from IDOE Educator Effectiveness staff. These plans are posted for public view on the IDOE website: [www.doe.in.gov/compensation](http://www.doe.in.gov/compensation) and are updated annually.

Indiana is one of **only eight** states with a clear approach to measuring student growth at the individual student level **and tying that data to teacher evaluations**. As part of the evaluation guidelines required by **IC 20-28-11.5**, LEAs must include objective measures of student **growth and achievement to significantly inform** their evaluation of teachers and principals. When available, LEAs **must use state-provided student growth model data as the primary measure of student learning** in a teacher’s evaluation. **(3A Attachment 10)**. Currently, growth data is available for Mathematics and English/Language Arts teachers in grades 3 through 8. Using growth model data, IDOE provides **an effectiveness** rating based on the four categories (4=highly effective, 3=effective, 2=improvement necessary, 1=ineffective) for teachers working with students with growth model data. **IDOE also defines “negative growth” and identifies educators that had a negative impact on student growth based on the growth model data. A teacher that had negative impact on student growth cannot receive a rating of effective or highly effective regardless of the tool or weighting in place at the local level. (3A Attachment 12)**

For teachers instructing subjects with mandated state assessments IDOE uses the Educator Evaluation Accountability Link (DOE-EE data collection), the effectiveness rating mentioned above. This data collection links a specific student’s ISTEP+ data with a specific teacher for the purpose of including that student’s ISTEP+ growth model data in that teacher’s performance evaluation. LEAs are responsible for determining the procedures and criteria that generate the rosters that pair individual students with a specific teacher or teachers. These rosters are reviewed and finalized at the local level and reported to IDOE through the DOE-EE data collection. IDOE then uses these rosters to calculate the individual growth measure ratings for individual teachers **(3A Attachment 13)**

Under the current state assessment system, the calculation of the individual growth measure is based on the median value of the student growth percentiles of the students linked to each teacher. The ranges for the four performance levels (4, 3, 2, 1) are reviewed annually and may be adjusted if warranted. IDOE reports individual growth measure results and ranges for the four performance levels to LEAs in the late summer or early fall to be included in the **finalization of the teachers’ summative evaluation rating from the prior school year (3A Attachment 14)** At that time, IDOE also calculates and reports to LEAs any teacher that had negative impact on student growth so that data may be included in the summative evaluation decision.

For teachers in subjects that do not have mandated state assessments, the state has developed guidelines around best assessments, which discuss levels of confidence and help LEAs make decisions on which assessments to use. Guidance has also been developed concerning other sources of data and how to utilize that information for the purposes of teacher evaluation, including examples for developing Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) for English Learner (EL) and Special Education classrooms **(3A Attachment 15, 16)** The Educator Effectiveness staff is currently collaborating with IDOE English Learner and Special Education staff to update and augment SLO guidance and SLO examples to align to the new World-class

Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) standards and assessment, as well as the new National Center and State Collaboration (NCSC) alternative assessment for special education students. These updated resources will be in place before the beginning of the 2014-15 school year. Other SLO resources, such as links to the Northern Indiana Assessment and Evaluation Consortium, a collaboration of LEAs established to pool resources and share the development of SLOs in subjects that do not have state mandated assessments, are posted on IDOE's website.

In addition to resources available via IDOE's website, educators can access guidance, FAQs and post questions and comments in professional communities and forums on the Learning Connection. *The Learning Connection IDOE Community: Developing New Indiana Evaluations* currently has 2,299 members. This Community is informed on announcements, guidance and resources. This Community also has a forum where educators can discuss concerns or questions related to the new evaluation requirements. Currently, the Community has over 26 files on different resources for educators related to the compliance and implementation of IC 20-28-11.5. These resources include WebEx recordings, RISE training modules, legal guidance on the six evaluation requirements, rubrics, and sample documents that LEAs can use to comply with the law. *The IDOE Community: Developing New Indiana Evaluations* can be found at: <https://learningconnection.doe.in.gov/UserGroup/GroupDetail.aspx?gid=1652> and is free and open to join. IDOE Communications Office shares information about ESEA waiver flexibility requirements relative to evaluations and accountability through social media and the Educator Effectiveness staff regularly present at conferences and public meetings around the state. Data and information specific to LEAs and their performance is readily accessible to parents and communities on the IDOE website. Discussions with the State Board of Education relative to the ESEA flexibility waiver and educator effectiveness are streamed live and archived on the State Board of Education website.

To gauge educators' reactions to the first year of statewide implementation for teacher and principal evaluation, IDOE surveyed educators in Fall 2013. Over 700 educators responded, providing IDOE with data used to improve guidance on the Learning Connection and the website (3A Attachment 17). Additionally, IDOE is strengthening its collaboration with the Indiana University (IU) Center for Education and Lifelong Learning on its development of the Indiana Teacher Appraisal Support System (INTASS), a tool for LEAs to use in assessing the strengths and weaknesses of their evaluation plans and their processes for involving stakeholders to improve their evaluation systems. The INTASS instrument was piloted in Spring 2014 and will be available for LEA use starting in the 2014-15 school year. (3A Attachment 18) IDOE is also helping the IU Center disseminate teacher and administrator surveys on perceptions and beliefs surrounding the evaluation process after the second year of implementation. IDOE serves as a member of the INTASS advisory council, along with IU, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana School Boards Association, Indiana Association of School Principals, and Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents. IDOE will collaborate with the advisory council members to create additional professional development and technical assistance resources based on the survey



results.

**3Ai. a description of the process IDOE used to involve teachers and principals in the development of these guidelines.**

From the beginning in 2011, Educators played an important role in the state’s efforts to develop the best possible teacher and principal evaluation legislation and model rubrics. IDOE staff traveled across the state presenting and facilitating discussions with over 30,000 teachers to help inform legislative policy and implementation plans for changes in evaluation practice. In working to develop a model tool, the state convened an Educator Evaluation Cabinet to help ensure proposed laws and tools were fair, multifaceted and comprehensive. This group met monthly for over eighteen months during the evaluation pilot year and as initial training sessions are developed. The Educator Evaluation Cabinet represented a diverse cross-section of educators and education advocates:

- *J. Matthew Walsh*: Brownsburg Community School Corporation Director of Curriculum and Professional Development, 2003 Milken National Educator
- *Keith Gambill*: President, Evansville Teachers Association
- *Steve Baker*: Indiana Association of School Principals President, Principal in Bluffton-Harrison MSD
- *Anna Shults*: IDOE Literacy Specialist, 2007 Indiana Teacher of the Year
- *Lorinda Kline*: 2009 Indiana Teacher of the Year Runner Up, District Mathematics Coach, Warsaw Community Schools
- *Alicia D. Harris*: 2001 Milken Educator, Assistant Principal in MSD Washington Township
- *Jim Larson*: Teach Plus Policy Fellow, Charles A. Tindley Accelerated School, 2009-2010 Tindley Teacher of the Year
- *Tom Keeley*: Director of Business and Personnel, Beech Grove City Schools
- *Mindy Schlegel*: IDOE Senior Policy Advisor for Educator Effectiveness

The evaluation tool developed through this process is known as RISE, which is explained in more detail later in this document. As part of early efforts to implement Indiana’s new educator evaluation law and test RISE, IDOE launched the 2011-2012 Indiana Evaluation Pilot.

The pilot did the following:

1. Established that evaluation systems (including the state model as well as other diverse models currently in use) could incorporate state priorities and are fair, accurate and feasible,
2. Gathered key lessons about systems and implementation to improve resources and outcomes in the statewide rollout, and
3. Created a community of early adopters of state priorities to share information and problem solve in real time.

IDOE recognized that there were school districts in the state already using rigorous evaluation systems. Some of these districts were also included in the pilot. As a result, the state pilot ran on two tracks:

- Track 1 was for districts interested in piloting the state model (i.e. RISE) district-wide.

- Track 2 **was** for districts interested becoming early adopters incorporating state priorities into their current district evaluation tool (e.g. annual evaluations, the use of student growth data, and summative ratings in four categories).

The pilot was deliberately structured to include evaluation tools school districts were already using. This design was intentional so the state could promote best practices and lessons learned from not only the state’s tool but also those gleaned from the best locally developed tools already in use.

Six LEAs **participated** in the pilot, reflecting two distinct cohorts. The first cohort **was** comprised of the three LEAs implementing RISE. The second constituted the three LEAs implementing their own models with adjustments **to** ensure alignment to the state priorities outlined in **IC 20-28-11.5**. LEAs were selected to reflect diversity in size/population, geographic region and socio-economic status. Qualitative and quantitative data sources **were** collected during the pilot year, culminating in mid-year and summative reports that **are** made available via the IDOE website: [www.doe.in.gov/evaluations](http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations) or **attachments Z and ZA**

Indiana’s school districts have already expressed excitement with regard to RISE implementation. For many, the need to explore a revamping of teacher and principal evaluations systems **was** long overdue. This sentiment is reflected in the sampling of quotes below, which attests to the promise of RISE and the state’s commitment to overhauling educator evaluation systems:

“We developed a process that has been effective in turning around our 11 LEAD Schools that includes a four-step support system. Because of our relationship with the state, we signed on to pilot its Teacher Effectiveness rubric that is closely aligned to the evaluation tool we are already using. This will also give us the opportunity to validate our support system to improve instruction.”

– *Dr. Wendy Robinson, Superintendent, Fort Wayne Community Schools*

“Beech Grove City Schools is excited to be part of the IDOE pilot to enhance teaching and learning in our school district. The pilot will provide the opportunity to be involved in the new model of staff evaluation from the ground floor. Our involvement will assist school districts throughout the entire state of Indiana.”

– *Dr. Paul Kaiser, Superintendent, Beech Grove City Schools*

“The goal is to carefully develop a teacher evaluation process and instrument, pilot the instrument and train the evaluators and teachers in the implementation. We are looking to develop a reliable and valid process and instrument that will provide data that can be transformed into meaningful information.”

– *Russ Mikel, Superintendent, Bremen Public Schools*

RISE represented the tip of the spear in ensuring evaluation systems across the state **were**

markedly improved. The pilot paved the path for strengthening the teaching profession, because it offered a unique opportunity to put best practices into action and enabled IDOE to further support teacher and principal improvement over time.

In an ongoing effort to develop customized guidance for school districts, IDOE identified working groups of teachers in non-state-assessed subjects to research and recommend appropriate assessments for districts to use in assessing student growth in their subject areas. In particular, the state established working advisory groups for some of the non-tested subject areas including special education, career and technical education, art, music, and physical education. These working groups produced guidance documents on assessments, quality data sources, and issues to consider specific to their content area. IDOE has continued to identify resources for assessments and SLO development in special education and non-state tested subjects. Moreover, the wisdom, knowledge and practical experience these practitioners have brought to bear to this process has been invaluable.

Teachers and principals are accountable to students and parents for employing high expectations and world-class standards to drive student achievement each day. Now, these professionals are evaluated annually and rewarded for their performance based on objective data on student learning. Working side-by-side with some of the state’s finest educators, Indiana has laid the groundwork for becoming a leader in establishing a positive culture where professional support, cultivation and training are second to none.

### 3.B ENSURE LEAs IMPLEMENT TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL EVALUATION AND SUPPORT SYSTEMS

- 3.B Provide the SEA’s process for ensuring that each LEA develops, adopts, pilots, and implements, with the involvement of teachers and principals, including mechanisms to review, revise, and improve, high-quality teacher and principal evaluation and support systems consistent with the SEA’s adopted guidelines.

As part of IDOE’s shift from a compliance-based organization to one that supports educators to lead school improvement efforts, IDOE was reorganized in July 2011 to align with the demands of “Putting Students First.” A new division, the Office of Educator Effectiveness and Leadership, was created specifically to address the new initiatives called for with the implementation of IC 20-28-11.5. With the establishment of this office, IDOE committed resources to staff the work needed to ensure successful statewide implementation.

The Office of Educator Effectiveness and Leadership supported districts as they embarked on groundbreaking work, developing training modules and support documents, and providing assessment support for areas not covered by state exams. IC 20-28-11.5 provided districts with one school year for the planning and development of tools to meet the new expectations for teacher and principal evaluation. IDOE created guidance to help LEAs understand and

implement the steps needed. Moreover, IDOE representatives presented information at each of the state’s regional superintendent meetings to ensure school districts **were** on track with the timeline and changes required.

Educator Effectiveness and Leadership representatives presented information on RISE and **IC 20-28-11.5** across the state as part of “Roadshow” communication efforts. Roadshows **were** open forum meetings held across the state. Between July and December of 2011, presentations were made to stakeholder groups by Educator Effectiveness and Leadership representatives to approximately 6,031 educators across the state.

IDOE recognized that creating a thorough process **to** identify high performing and struggling teachers **was** the first step in addressing teacher and leader quality in the state. Once identified, LEAs face the challenge of tapping into their most talented people and addressing the deficiencies of their struggling teachers. IDOE **put** three initiatives in place to help alleviate some of that burden.

- For TAP districts and schools, IDOE was awarded Teacher Incentive Fund grant in 2010. The state allocated money to districts interested in implementing TAP in their schools. These schools invest in master and mentor teachers help lead professional development for teachers throughout the building on a daily basis; identifying the needs of staff. Currently 44 schools (9 districts and 9 charters) in Indiana are involved in this project, **which is in year 4 of 5**.
- Teacher preparation programs **began incorporating principles from RISE into pre-service programs**. New standards for teacher and principal licensure programs were adopted in December 2010. These new standards are aligned to the teacher/principal effectiveness state **priorities**. A new principal assessment licensure test **was** developed aligned to the Principal Effectiveness Rubric **that became available for candidates in February 2014**. This **assessment** will assist in holding principal preparation programs accountable for meeting state expectations.
- All of the training for the state evaluation model **was** standardized. All trainers participate in a session modeled for them before they **delivered** any component. All slide decks provided to trainers **were** the same **so consistent** content **was** delivered statewide.

Regional Educational Service Centers (ESCs) offer professional development to districts throughout the state. Because of their close relationships with districts and regional placement, IDOE **partnered** with ESCs to deliver all training for the state’s model (RISE); directly building capacity statewide for continued support and professional development in years to come. **In the Summer of 2014, Education Service Centers will be offering RISE Teacher Evaluation Training between June 2014 and September 2014. Below are the scheduled dates and their registration sites:**

East Central ESC: June 25-26, 2014 (<http://www.ecesc.k12.in.us> )  
 West Central ESC: July 21-22, 2014 (<http://www.wciesc.k12.in.us> )  
 Wilson Center ESC: July 21-22, 2014 (<http://www.wesc.k12.in.us> )  
 Region 8 ESC: July 23-24, 2014 (<http://www.r8esc.k12.in.us> )  
 Northern Indiana ESC: July 29-31, 2014 (<http://www.niesc.k12.in.us> )  
 Wabash Valley ESC: July 29-30, 2014 (<http://www.esc5.k12.in.us> )  
 Southern Indiana ESC: August 27-28, 2014 (<http://www.siec.k12.in.us> )  
 Northwest Indiana ESC: September 4-5, 2014 ( <http://www.nwiesc.k12.in.us> )  
 Central Indiana ESC: September 18-19, 2014 ( <http://www.ciesc.k12.in.us> )

IDOE recognized that having effective teachers was just one piece of the equation. Schools must also have strong and effective leadership. In response to IC 20-28-11.5, principal evaluations were designed to mirror the teacher evaluation system described above. The principal evaluation system includes the same components as teacher evaluations, including objective measures of student growth and achievement. The Educator Evaluation Cabinet also developed a model principal evaluation rubric. As with the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, the Principal Effectiveness Rubric was based on exemplars from across the country.

*RISE: the state's model tool*

As described in 3.A.i., IDOE piloted the model teacher evaluation system, named RISE, in three school districts of varying sizes and geographic locations in school year 2011-12. Information on the state model is available for school districts via the IDOE's website at <http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations>.

RISE is a differentiated system of teacher evaluation that defines effective teaching in a rubric across four domains and 24 components of practice. It incorporates measures of student learning for teachers and principals. As mentioned earlier, RISE was developed in collaboration with a statewide advisory evaluation cabinet of practicing teachers and administrators. The RISE Evaluator and Teacher Handbook are included as (3A Attachment 7).

The development of RISE and the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric were informed by numerous sources, including the following:

- Charlotte Danielson's *Framework for Teachers*
- Iowa's *A Model Framework*
- KIPP Academy's *Teacher Evaluation Rubric*
- Robert Marzano's *Classroom Instruction that Works*
- Massachusetts' *Principles for Effective Teaching*
- Kim Marshall's *Teacher Evaluation Rubrics*
- National Board's *Professional Teaching Standards*
- North Carolina's *Teacher Evaluation Process*

- Doug Reeves' *Unwrapping the Standards*
- Research for Bettering Teaching's *Skillful Teacher*
- Teach For America's *Teaching as Leadership Rubric*
- Texas' *TxBess Framework*
- Washington DC's *IMPACT Performance Assessment*
- Wiggins &McTighe's *Understanding by Design*

The system was also designed with three key purposes:

- To shine a spotlight on great teaching
  - The rubric is designed to assist principals and teachers in their efforts to increase teacher effectiveness
- To provide clear expectations for teachers
  - The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective teachers use to achieve gains in student achievement.
- To support a fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness
  - The rubric provides a foundation for accurately assessing teacher effectiveness along four discrete ratings, in addition to growth data.

The breakout of how the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric is weighted in RISE in conjunction with objective measures of student growth and achievement is shown below:

Evaluations must include data from all students – no students are exempt from teacher and principal accountability based on subgroup. IDOE **has worked** to help LEAs select or develop the most appropriate assessments for different groups of students – particularly for those students who do not fit easily into subjects already tested by state assessments **and for special education students**.

Moving from the pilot to a statewide scale **required** multiple support measures to ensure smooth implementation. Training on the RISE model **took** place statewide during spring and summer 2012, prior to the beginning of the 2012-13 school year. Training **continues to be** available regionally provided by the ESCs which will be trained by the IDOE. This approach provides regional support for foundational level training as well as follow-up regional support as needed. While RISE training is more focused on training primary and secondary evaluators, IDOE is working on on-line modules targeting teachers on topics of interest. These modules are scheduled to be available in spring 2012. **IDOE's website**, <http://www.doe.in.gov/evaluations>, is an invaluable resource with the most current information available for all stakeholders.

#### Leadership Practice

The Educator Evaluation Cabinet led the development of a model principal evaluation rubric. As with the Teacher Effectiveness Rubric, the Principal Effectiveness Rubric was developed from multiple sources and for the same three key purposes:

- To shine a spotlight on great leadership
  - The rubric is designed to assist schools and districts in their efforts to increase

principal effectiveness

- To provide clear expectations for principals
  - The rubric defines and prioritizes the actions that effective principals must engage in to lead breakthrough gains in student achievement.
- To support fair and transparent evaluation of effectiveness
  - The rubric provides the foundation for accurately assessing school leadership along four discrete proficiency ratings with student growth data used as the predominant measure.

While drafting the Principal Effectiveness Rubric, the development team examined leadership frameworks from numerous sources, including:

- Achievement First’s *Professional Growth Plan for School Principals*
- CHORUS’s *Hallmarks of Excellence in Leadership*
- Clay Christensen’s *Disrupting Class*
- Discovery Education’s *Vanderbilt Assessment of Leadership in Education (VAL-ED)*
- Doug Reeves’ *Leadership Performance Matrix*
- Gallup’s *Principal Insight*
- ISLLC’s *Educational Leadership Policy Standards*
- Kim Marshall’s *Principal Evaluation Rubrics*
- KIPP’s *Leadership Competency Model*
- Mass Insight’s *HPHP Readiness Model*
- National Board’s *Accomplished Principal Standards*
- New Leaders for New Schools’ *Urban Excellence Framework*
- NYC Leadership Academy’s *Leadership Performance Standards Matrix*
- Public Impact’s *Turnaround Leaders Competencies*
- Todd Whitaker’s *What Great Principals Do Differently*

The Principal Effectiveness Rubric is comprised of two domains and thirteen individual indicators (3A Attachment 9). The student learning measures for principal evaluation include whole school growth, A-F school accountability grade, district goals, and school goals. Principals receive a summative rating in the same four categories as teachers.

### **3Bi. Indiana’s high quality plan for ensuring its teacher and principal evaluation systems informs personnel decisions**

In 2011, the Indiana General Assembly amended IC 20-28-6-7.5 (Cancellation of Teacher Contracts) and IC 20-28-7.5-1 (Probationary Teachers; Effect of Evaluations) to provide a mechanism for tying teacher evaluation results to personnel decisions. Teachers that receive a rating of Ineffective, or two consecutive ratings of Needs Improvement, assume probationary status; this change in status triggers a lesser due process requirement for non-renewing a contract than the due process required to non-renew a teacher with professional status. Professional status for contract purposes is maintained by the teacher receiving evaluation ratings of Effective or Highly Effective in three out of five years. The statute also provides that if

a Professional status teacher receives an Ineffective rating, then that teacher becomes a probationary teacher whose contract may be cancelled if the teacher receives two consecutive Ineffective ratings. (3B Attachment 1))

While administrator contracts in Indiana are based on an underlying teacher contract, there were differing interpretations as to whether IC 20-28-6-7.5 and IC 20-28-7.5-1 applied to building principals as well as to teachers. A separate chapter of the code, IC 20-28-8, is dedicated to notice provisions related to non-renewal of administrator contracts. However, after additional discussions and clarification it is clear that the statutory provisions that tie teacher evaluation results to personnel decisions also tie principal evaluation results to personnel decisions in a parallel process. (3B Attachment 2) Additionally, the statutory definition of teacher was amended during the 2013 and 2014 legislative sessions; for purposes of applicability of IC 20-28, a licensed superintendent, principal, teacher, librarian and counselor are all defined as a “teacher.” (3B Attachment 3) This link between evaluation results and personnel decisions applies to principals in all public schools except charter schools, which statutorily have more flexibility in contracts and employment decisions than other public schools.

In Indiana, personally identifiable evaluation results are confidential by statute and the rationale for personnel decisions by local school boards are kept within executive sessions. Consequently, IDOE will be monitoring the *effect* of personnel changes in its LEA monitoring process beginning in the 2014-15 school year, which is discussed in detail in the next section. In addition to evaluation results under IC 20-28-11.5, principals in Priority Schools are also evaluated on their ability to lead turnaround efforts in their schools. Priority School principals are assessed annually on the Turnaround Principles; principals identified as unable to lead the turnaround work must be reassigned to a different school or be terminated, meaning that personnel decisions for Priority School principals may be accomplished more rapidly than personnel decisions tied to evaluations under IC 20-28-11.5. This process of ensuring strong leadership in Priority Schools is described in great detail in Principle 2 of this document. Leadership change decisions in Priority Schools are already underway: 34 ineffective principals are being replaced in Priority Schools for the 2014-15 school year. Leadership changes will be tracked by both Outreach personnel assigned to the Priority School and by the Educator Effectiveness staff through the monitoring process. If gaps between evaluation results under IC 20-28-11.5 and principal evaluation results in Priority Schools are identified, targeted technical assistance in the evaluation of principals will be provided to LEAs to address the gaps.

Because Indiana’s first year of statewide evaluation implementation was 2012-13, the 2015-16 evaluation results will be the fourth year of collected data. By 2015-16 it should be possible to validate the impact of leadership changes by analysis of shifts in aggregate evaluation results by rating category and improvements in school accountability data.

**3bii. Indiana will have in place a robust monitoring, technical assistance and support process for LEA teacher and principal evaluation plan compliance and implementation that will**



**leverage the expertise and capacity of the IDOE beginning in the 2014-15 school year.**

IDOE evaluation monitoring efforts for the 2012-13 and 2013-14 school years were primarily focused on statutory compliance of LEA plans. Beginning with the 2014-15 school year, IDOE will conduct more robust multi-layered monitoring for compliance and implementation with fidelity and collaborate with internal and external partners to provide responsive support and technical assistance. (3B Attachments 4, 5).

The first layer in IDOE’s monitoring process is to review LEA plans submitted in September 2014 to meet State School Accreditation Standard 12 for basic statutory compliance. Because plans are locally bargained and adopted, modifications can be made from year to year. Educator Effectiveness staff will coordinate with Outreach and the Office of Early Learning and Intervention to review all LEA submitted evaluation plans for statutory compliance. Educator Effectiveness staff will provide feedback to LEAs within 60 days of the review. This review for statutory compliance will be repeated annually for plans that are identified at the time of submission as having been modified from the previous year. LEA plans being submitted for the first time will also receive a compliance review.

To accomplish a second layer of monitoring, IDOE’s Educator Effectiveness staff has partnered with the Great Lakes Comprehensive Center and its content center, the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders, to create a robust monitoring process to verify implementation and inform support and technical assistance. The monitoring process and tool are currently being refined; however, a draft monitoring instrument is included as 3B Attachment 6, 7. The monitoring process will again leverage expertise and capacity across IDOE and accomplish the next layer of monitoring activities with the Office of Educator Effectiveness serving as the coordinating point and clearinghouse for monitoring data collection. Educator Effectiveness staff will provide feedback to LEAs within 60 days of the completion of the monitoring activity. (attachment Risa W—draft Onsite Monitoring Tracking spreadsheet) Training and professional development has begun around the monitoring tool and the expectations for onsite visits with Outreach Coordinators and Office of Early Learning and Intervention staff that will incorporate evaluation implementation monitoring into their program monitoring responsibilities. Outreach Coordinators will verify evaluation implementation in their Focus and Priority Schools, paying particular attention to those that reported high percentages of teachers rated Effective and Highly Effective and those that reported high percentages of teachers N/A, or not evaluated. There are valid reasons why a teacher may not be evaluated, such as FMLA, resignation, mid-year retirement, etc., but a high percentage of N/As in a school may indicate high staff turnover, which presents a support and technical assistance opportunity for Outreach to address with building leaders as they work with school improvement planning. A related goal of monitoring is to ensure that certificated personnel that should receive evaluations are, in fact, being evaluated.

In addition to implementation checks in Focus and Priority Schools, the Outreach Coordinators will annually conduct LEA-level evaluation monitoring in three LEAs in their regions, including a

Focus or Priority School. The Outreach Coordinators already have strong relationships developed through their school improvement work with Focus and Priority Schools; the incorporation of LEA-level implementation monitoring can provide additional context and shine a light on technical assistance needs not discovered by school-level visits. Feedback to districts monitored by Outreach will be developed jointly by Educator Effectiveness staff and the respective Outreach Coordinator.

In a parallel process, the Office of Early Learning and Intervention and the Office of Grants Management Monitoring and Reporting (GMMR) will incorporate evaluation monitoring into their already occurring monitoring. The Office of Early Learning and Intervention monitors and evaluates Title I SIG recipients, and EL and Migrant Education programs in 20 LEAs. The Office of Grants Management Monitoring and Reporting (GMMR), monitors the Title IA Basic, Title IIA and Title IIIA grant recipients in over 130 LEAs annually; 8 to 12 LEAs are onsite monitored and around 125 LEAs are desktop monitored. The data collected during the monitoring will be coordinated through Educator Effectiveness and will be used to identify technical assistance needs for schools with high percentages of EL teachers and learners. The Title I, EL and Migrant Education staff within the Office of Early Learning and Intervention is collaborating with Educator Effectiveness to develop and post updated guidance and examples of SLOs for EL teachers around the new WIDA standards and assessments prior to the beginning of the 2014-15 school year. Feedback to those LEAs will be coordinated with the Early Learning and Intervention and Grants Management Monitoring and Reporting staffs to ensure opportunities for technical assistance are identified and leveraged. By coordinating evaluation implementation monitoring activities with Outreach and Early Learning and Intervention, IDOE anticipates 56 LEAs will be monitored annually for evaluation plan compliance, implementation and improvement with associated technical assistance needs being identified.

The third layer of IDOE's evaluation monitoring plan involves Educator Effectiveness staff conducting onsite monitoring for LEAs reporting high percentages of N/A (educators not evaluated) that are not being monitored by Outreach and Early Learning and Intervention staff. Other LEAs may be identified through related data collections as candidates for onsite visits as well. The Educator Effectiveness Evaluation Specialist will conduct on-site monitoring of two LEAs monthly from August through May. The implementation monitoring cycle will be ongoing with approximately 76 total LEAs and charter schools receiving on-site monitoring and feedback annually, with all LEAs and charter schools receiving an onsite monitoring visit at least once every four years.

Beginning in June of 2015, data collected during monitoring will be compiled, analyzed and shared with Outreach, Early Learning and Intervention and Special Education staffs, IDOE leadership and external collaborative partners including Great Lakes Comprehensive Center (GLCC), the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders, the INTASS advisory council and the professional educator organizations. Subsequent discussions will guide IDOE and its partners to identify common goals for the "what, why and where" in the development and timely delivery of effective technical assistance and will provide important feedback to IDOE to continuously

improve its monitoring process.

IDOE has several collaborations in place to support teacher and principal evaluation systems and to develop and deliver technical assistance. IDOE has partnered with the IU Center for Education and Lifelong Learning to develop the Indiana Teacher Appraisal and Support System (INTASS), a tool for LEAs to assess the strengths and weaknesses of evaluation implementation and their processes for involving stakeholders to improve their evaluation systems (3B Attachment 8, 9). Beginning in 2012, evaluator training has been provided through the Education Service Centers and by professional education organizations at statewide and regional conferences. IDOE staff participates in many of those regional and state meetings as presenters; in 2012 standardized online training modules were not yet available. The INTASS is currently developing online evaluation training modules that are research based to help evaluators meet training goals set forth by the State Board of Education: to conduct more effective observations and analyze best classroom practices and student learning objectives; to collect and analyze evidence; to make summative evaluation decisions; and to improve their own practice in collecting and using evidence in the evaluation process (3A Attachment 10).

IDOE will continue its partnership with the GLCC, the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders and the IU Center for Education and Lifelong Learning to effectively analyze evaluation monitoring data, to refine its monitoring process, and to improve IDOE's processes and supports for LEAs. GLCC is currently facilitating IDOE strategic planning in all program areas, which has assisted IDOE to identify opportunities to leverage internal collaborations, expertise and capacity to accomplish its goals. IDOE is also collaborating with the Indiana Association of School Principals (IASP) and the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents (IAPSS) to develop guidance and technical assistance around providing meaningful feedback from observations and to create effective improvement plans for teachers and administrators. This technical assistance will be delivered through web video technology and posted to IDOE and association websites during summer and early fall 2014 and will be revisited in summer 2015 based on analysis of monitoring data and the 2015 end-of-school PD survey. Educator Effectiveness staff are also participating in a conference for new principals and the IASP Fall Conferences as co-presenters for the evaluation sessions.

Through collaboration with Outreach and the IASP "Schools to Watch" program, leaders in struggling middle schools will receive support and technical assistance by being matched with mentor leaders from high performing middle schools. The impact of this mentoring program will be assessed over time through analysis of monitoring data, aggregate evaluation results and school accountability grades.

An additional linkage to provide foundational support and strengthen both teacher and principal practice is the incorporation of teacher and principal evaluation principles and standards into pre-service preparation at the higher education level. Many teacher preparation programs are embedding the RISE Teacher Effectiveness Rubric into their pre-service programs to increase new teacher awareness of the expectations for classroom practice. A parallel trend

is evident in principal preparation, which carries an additional incentive: the new CORE principal licensure examination that became effective in February 2014 is closely aligned to the RISE Principal Effectiveness Rubric. Educator preparation programs have an additional incentive for pre-service program improvement since the Indiana General Assembly first passed legislation in 2013 to link LEA educator evaluation results to the educators' pre-service training institutions and requiring this information to be posted publicly on IDOE's website. While amendments in 2014 added additional standards and data on which pre-service programs will be viewed and assessed by consumers through a data matrix, the link to teacher evaluation results is considered an important public indicator for teacher preparation program performance beginning in the 2015-16 school year (3B Attachment 10).

### Summary

Indiana has worked collaboratively with an array of stakeholders to develop and build support for a comprehensive teacher and principal evaluation system that recognizes and rewards excellence. The state understands that the development of a robust system is an iterative process. As IDOE continues to work closely with school districts and gets further into the weeds, the state will leverage its unique position as the SEA to provide resources and disseminate best practices across the state.

Both the teacher and principal evaluation models include a collaborative goal-setting component for teachers and principals to set growth goals specific to student achievement and teacher or principal effectiveness. This design reflects Indiana's belief in the power of evaluations to support the improvement of human capital and ensure a pipeline of great teachers in every classroom and strong leaders in every building.

Preparation programs not meeting standards face action by the state authorizing entities.

In addition to using student growth to evaluate teachers and principals, IDOE believes Indiana's teacher preparation institutions should be held accountable for producing effective teachers and leaders. The legislative tying of evaluation results to preparation programs will provide transparency to the link between pre-service training and new teacher performance.

**SAMPLE FORMAT FOR PLAN**

Below is one example of a format an SEA may use to provide a plan to meet a particular principle in the *ESEA Flexibility*.

<b>Key Milestone or Activity</b>	<b>Detailed Timeline</b>	<b>Party or Parties Responsible</b>	<b>Evidence (Attachment)</b>	<b>Resources (e.g., staff time, additional funding)</b>	<b>Significant Obstacles</b>

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**3.B- Provide technical assistance to LEAs regarding the design and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems based on reviews of LEA evaluation systems and results of monitoring activities, including steps for developing SEA capacity to provide such support.**

**Key Components**

1. Building SEA capacity to provide ongoing technical assistance to provide support to LEAs regarding the design and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems.
2. Providing technical assistance to LEAs regarding design and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems based on comprehensive compliance check and onsite monitoring.

**Key Component #1**

Building SEA capacity to provide ongoing technical assistance to provide support to LEAs regarding the design and implementation of teacher and principal evaluation systems.

Key milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
IDOE partners with the nine Educational Service Centers (ESC) for training of evaluators and technical assistance	Began in 2011 and still continues	IDOE EEL staff Educational Service Centers	ESC Training flyers, sign in sheets, agendas	Educational Service Centers Directors and Trainers	No current obstacles
Survey to teachers, principals, evaluators and superintendents on implementation of evaluation plans to improve guidance on the Learning Connection and IDOE Evaluation website	October 2013	IDOE EEL staff	Survey and survey results	IDOE technology team	No current obstacles

<p>To build SEA capacity to provide technical assistance continue partnerships with Great Lakes East Comprehensive Center (GLECC), the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders (GTL) and Council for Chief State Superintendents Organization (CCSSO) to build SEA Capacity for technical assistance</p>	<p>Ongoing partnership started in January 2014</p>	<p>IDOE EEL staff and GLECC and GTL staff</p>	<p>Agenda from meeting and conference calls, strategic planning documents</p>	<p>GLECC and GTL staff</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p>Outreach Coordinators conducted implementation checks and provide technical assistance to 200 Priority and Focus schools through teacher and principal evaluations</p>	<p>2013-2014 school year</p>	<p>IDOE EEL and Outreach Coordinators  Priority and Focus Schools</p>	<p>Outreach monitoring documents, school improvement plan feedback, classroom observations</p>	<p>Final evaluation results  A-F performance data</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p>Partnering with Indiana Teacher Appraisal Support System (INTASS) and using data from comprehensive compliance check and onsite monitoring, provide ongoing technical assistance to LEAs (ex. principal professional development on providing effective feedback)</p>	<p>Beginning September 15, 2014 and ongoing throughout 14-15 and 15-16 school year</p>	<p>IDOE EEL staff will provide technical assistance with IDOE Title III staff, Outreach Coordinators, and School Improvement Staff LEAs</p>	<p>IDOE Internal compliance tracking sheet  Indiana Teacher Appraisal Support System (INTASS) rubric</p>	<p>Indiana Principal and Superintendent Associations  INTASS</p>	<p>No current obstacles</p>
<p><b>Key Component #2</b></p> <p>Building SEA capacity to provide ongoing technical assistance to provide support to LEAs regarding the design and implementation of</p>					

teacher and principal evaluation systems.					
Key milestones and activities	Timeframe	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Augment Guidance Materials for the development and implementation of SLOs for EL and SPED for transition to new standards and assessments (NCSC and WIDA)	Updated SLO guidance and samples will be available for the 2014-15 school year	IDOE EEL staff will provide technical assistance with IDOE EL and SPED Specialist	Current SLO handbook and guidance	IDOE EEL, EL and SPED Specialist  IDOE technology and media team	Connecting SLOs with new WIDA standards and assessments within timeline
Targeted technical assistance to Priority and Focus Schools for gaps between evaluation results and school A-F accountability data	Process beginning 2014-2015 school year and ongoing	IDOE EEL and Outreach staff  Priority and Focus Schools	Onsite monitoring document  Outreach school improvement plan template	A-F accountability data  Final evaluation rating results  Training from EEL staff	No current obstacles
Survey to principals on evaluation implementation	May/June 2014  Analysis Summer 2014	IDOE EEL staff	Memo to principals for survey link, survey and survey results and analysis	IDOE technology and communications team	Receiving completed evaluations from a high percentage of applicable participants



**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**3.B- Review teacher and principal evaluation systems submitted by LEAs and monitor their implementation, including ensuring that systems meet all ESEA flexibility requirements, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year.**

**Key Components**

1. Comprehensive Compliance Check
2. Final Evaluation Rating Results/Data
3. Onsite Monitoring

**Key Component #1**

Review teacher and principal evaluation systems submitted by LEAs and monitor their implementation, including ensuring that systems meet all ESEA flexibility requirements, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year.

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
LEAs submit evaluation plan for teachers and principals through Legal Standard 12 for Accreditation and post on IDOE website	September 2012 and submitted annually	IDOE Educator Effectiveness and Licensing (EEL) and Accreditation staff  LEAs	LEA evaluation plans with LEA superintendent assurance	IDOE Online Legal Standards website  IDOE EEL and Accreditation staff	No current obstacles

IDOE reviews LEA compensation plans that are tied to evaluations	Annually starting with 2012-2013 school year	IDOE EEL staff  LEAs, bargaining units, Indiana Education Employee Relations Board, State Board of Education	Annual final reports to State Board of Education  Compensation Plans posted on IDOE website  Communication to LEAs on compliance	IDOE EEL staff and third party vendor	No current obstacles
Excellence in Performance Awards	Excellence in Performance Grants 2011-12 \$6 million, 2012-13 \$10 million, 2013-14 \$ 2 million and 2014-15 \$30 million and \$2 million	IDOE EEL staff  State Board of Education and State Budget Committee  LEAs	Contracts with LEAs  Memos and award notices to LEAs	IDOE EEL, legal and finance staff	No current obstacles
Comprehensive Compliance check of all LEA evaluation plans submitted to IDOE through Legal Standard 12 for Accreditation	Compliance check to start no later than September 15, 2014 and LEAs receive feedback from IDOE within 60 days  Continue annually	IDOE EEL staff will coordinate work with IDOE Title III staff, Outreach Coordinators, and School Improvement Staff (total of 23 staff members)  LEAs	Comprehensive Compliance Checklist  Legal Standard 12 Assurance  IDOE internal tracking sheet of compliance	10 IDOE staff members review all evaluation plans and provide compliance feedback within 60 days of September 15, 2014 submission	No current obstacles

**Key Component #2**

LEAs submit annual final evaluation ratings for all teachers and principals with a 1-4 rating (Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement and Improvement Necessary) to the IDOE. The data is published on the IDOE’s website.

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
LEAs submit final evaluation ratings results for teachers and principals	Annually starting with April 2014	IDOE EEL staff LEAs	IDOE website of final evaluation ratings of 249 LEAs and 1993 schools for teachers and principals, including Higher Ed teacher prep programs by years of experience	IDOE data collection and technology team	No current obstacles
Strategic plan for displaying all historic evaluation ratings data to all stakeholders on IDOE website	Annually starting December 2014	IDOE EEL, data collection and technology staff	Final evaluation rating for all principals and teachers by school and LEA on IDOE’s COMPASS data website	IDOE data collection and technology team	No current obstacles

**Key Component #3**

Conduct onsite monitoring to LEAs implementing teacher and principal evaluations for evidence of implementation, including all systems meet ESEA flexibility requirement for the 2014-2015 school year.

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Onsite monitoring of LEAs for evidence of implementation of evaluations	<p>On-site monitoring to begin in the 2014-15 school year and continue each subsequent school year</p> <p>Each LEA will be reviewed per onsite monitoring once every four years</p>	<p>IDOE EEL staff will coordinate monitoring with IDOE Title III staff, Outreach Coordinators, and School Improvement Staff</p> <p>LEAs</p>	<p>Onsite monitoring document</p> <p>Onsite monitoring reports to LEAs</p> <p>IDOE internal tracking of implementation of required components</p>	IDOE EEL, Title II, Outreach and School Improvement staff	Continue feedback loop to ensure ongoing effectiveness of implementation of evaluations

<p>Communicate with LEAs that are not fully implementing teacher and principal evaluation the financial consequences for Highly Effective and Effective Teachers</p>	<p>July 2014-ongoing</p>	<p>IDOE EEL, Legal and Communications staff  LEAs</p>	<p>Memos to 40 LEAs, phone call notes, agendas and sign in sheets from meetings</p>	<p>Excellence in Performance Grants 2011-12 \$6 million, 2012-13 \$10 million, 2013-14 \$ 2 million and 2014-15 \$30 million and \$2 million  IDOE EEL, Legal and Communications staff</p>	<p>Getting LEAs to bargain prior to expiration date of contracts</p>
--	--------------------------	---	---	--	--

**Indiana ESEA Flexibility High Quality Plan**

**3.B- A high-quality plan for how it will ensure that its principal evaluation system will be used to inform personnel decisions based on 2015-2016 ratings.**

**Key Components**

1. Informing them of principal evaluation results mirror teacher evaluation results in use of personnel decisions.
2. Reviewing the performance and qualifications of non-SIG priority school principals at the SEA level and determining whether the current principal has demonstrated a past track record of improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort.

**Key Component #1**

Review teacher and principal evaluation systems submitted by LEAs and monitor their implementation, including ensuring that systems meet all ESEA flexibility requirements, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year.

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Informing principal evaluation results mirror teachers to inform personnel decisions per IC 20-28-8 based on the 2015-2016 ratings	July 1, 2014	IDOE EEL and Legal staff	Memo to field through DOE Dialogue	IDOE technology and communications team	Ensuring all stakeholders receive information and continue to mirror teacher and principal evaluations to personnel decisions
IDOE data analysis of principal evaluation ratings submitted by LEAs to inform personnel decisions	Summer 2014-ongoing	IDOE EEL and data collection staff  LEAs	Data tracking sheet of principal evaluation ratings for each year submitted	IDOE EEL and data collection staff	No current obstacles at this time

**Component #2**

Reviewing the performance and qualifications of non-SIG Priority School principals at the SEA level and determining whether the current principal has demonstrated a past track record of improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort.

Key milestones and activities	Detailed timeline	Party responsible	Evidence	Resources	Significant obstacles
Communication with LEA superintendents to ensure an understanding of the requirements for Priority School Principals	11/2013-2/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	December memo, Meeting with stakeholders, Agenda from regional meetings	Outreach Division of School Improvement, Indiana State Teacher's Association, Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents, Indiana Association of School Principals, Indiana Federation of Teachers, Indiana School Board Association	Quick timeframe and need to reach schools throughout the state
Provided superintendents with an evaluation tool aligned with the Turnaround Principles to facilitate the requirement of ability to do the turnaround work	1/2014-3/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Evaluating tool	Outreach Division of School Improvement Dave English, USED	Quick timeframe and need to communicate with many different stakeholders

Provided school and district leadership teams with technical assistance and professional development to understand Turnaround Principle One: Ensuring Strong Leadership	12/2013-ongoing	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Regional meeting agenda and training materials	Outreach staff	Implementing a new process
Created documents to facilitate the determination of a principal's past track record of student success and evidence requirements	12/2013-1/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Ensuring strong leadership documents	Outreach staff	Aligning documents to FAQ requirements
Provided superintendents with ensuring strong leadership documents and verification forms requiring signatures and submittal to the IDOE by February 28, 2014	12/2013-2/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Evidence documents and verification forms	Outreach staff	Communicating expectations and following up with LEAs
Utilized a rubric internally to evaluate the evidence submitted from LEAs to the IDOE	3/2014-4/2014	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Rubric documents	Outreach staff	Training internal IDOE staff to evaluate evidence consistently
Provided internal IDOE staff training to effectively and consistently evaluate LEA leadership documents	3/2014	Outreach Division of School improvement	Examples used in training of staff	Outreach and Legal staff	Finding a common time for training



Responded to LEAs by April 15, 2014, regarding determinations made by the IDOE after reviewing evidence and allowed LEAs two weeks to resubmit missing evidence	4/14	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Yes and No letters	Outreach and Legal staff	Quick timeframe and staff capacity to evaluate evidence
Provided LEAs with a final determination and ensured strong leadership for all Priority Schools prior to the 14-15 school year	5/14	Outreach Division of School Improvement	Yes and No letters	Outreach and Legal staff	Quick timeframe and staff capacity to evaluate evidence

### Conclusion

Indiana is aggressively advancing education reforms. The state’s current plan for ESEA flexibility **builds on earlier** initiatives called “Putting Students First” **and continues efforts to** close the achievement gap and have a lasting impact on education in this state.

Indiana’s proposal raises the bar on the original 2013-2014 proficiency requirement called for in No Child Left Behind by utilizing new advances in measuring student growth and overall school performance. Indiana’s A-F framework closely aligns with federal efforts to support high standards without compromising on accountability. Moreover, Indiana’s focus on the bottom 25% hones in on the need to close the achievement gap and prevent more students from slipping through the cracks in the current accountability system.

Working collaboratively with schools and LEAs, IDOE will continue to move swiftly and deliberately in pursuit of our vision for academic achievement and global competitiveness, encouraging fresh new ideas and out-of-the-box thinking. Contrary to what other states may be contemplating, Indiana’s efforts to attain these flexibilities does not reflect a desire to slow down or back off of the importance of accountability. In fact, Indiana intends to use these flexibilities to provide fuel for Indiana’s reform efforts and align federal priorities with recent structural changes at the state and local level. Indiana’s commitment to high standards and accountability has never been greater. The urgency to improve has never been higher and the focus on putting students first has never been stronger.