CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Part II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2002-2003

DUE JUNE 30, 2004

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

| OMB Number: |
| Expiration Date: |

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
Indiana Department of Education

Address: Room 229 State House
　　　　　Indianapolis, IN 46204-2798

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Gary Wallyn

Telephone: 317-233-3716

Fax: 317-233-2196

e-mail: gwallyn@doe.state.in.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction

| | 06/30/2004 |
| Signature | Date |

A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. __299___

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2001-2002 school year. __227___

B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following:

1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State   799

2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State   619

3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State   180

C. Title I, Part A Student Participation

1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups

Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	17,381
Limited English Proficient	5,082
Homeless	1,460
Migrant	873

Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian or Alaskan Native	216
Asian / Pacific Islander	574
Black or African American	33,023
Hispanic or Latino	10,917
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	---------
White	69,464

2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level						
	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total	Percent of Total
Age 0-2						
Age 3-5	485	1723	20	7	2,235	1.80
K	8,804	8,822	369	9	18,004	14.76
1	13,786	9,992	502	26	24,306	19.93
2	10,759	9,318	446	38	20,561	16.90
3	6,689	8,624	386	42	15,741	12.91
4	4,145	8,468	255	92	12,960	10.63
5	3,989	8,222	222	93	12,526	10.27
6	2,609	3,902	163	167	6,841	5.61
7	1,410	1,744	84	223	3,461	2.84
8	1,212	1,626	64	277	3,179	2.61
9	88	262	29	363	742	.61
10	45	143	15	279	482	.39
11	34	125	1	209	369	.30
12	29	85	1	91	206	.17
Ungraded	-0-	222	-0-	112	334	.27
TOTALS	54,084	63,278	2,557	2,028	121,947	100

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

Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services	
Instructional Services	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	17,081
Reading/Language Arts	43,702
Science	N/A
Social Studies	N/A
Vocational/Career	N/A
Other (specify)	
Support Services	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	2,320
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	6,003
Other (Home Visits)	2,711

C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	50.33
Teachers	687.06
Teacher Aides	906.15
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	76.23
Other (specify)	28.74

A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the 2002-2003 school year, please provide the following information:

1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

    a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State   _____18___

2. Even Start Families Served

    a. Total number of families served   ____539___

    b. Total number of adults participating   ____566___

    c. Total number of adults who are English language learners   _____59___

    d. Total number of children participating   ____796___

3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families <u>at the time of enrollment</u>

    a. Number of newly enrolled families   ____391___

    b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants   ____437___

    c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the
       Federal Poverty level   ____85%__

    d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a
       high school diploma or GED   ____87%__

    e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have
       not gone beyond the 9th grade   ____41%___

4. Percent of families that have remained in the program

    a. Less than 3 months   ____18%___

    b. From 4 to 6 months   ____24%___

    c. From 7 to 12 months   ____28%___

    d. More than 12 months   ____30%___

B. State Even Start Performance Indicators

Indiana Even Start Programs - Program Year 2002-2003

Total number of Programs Reporting = 14 (4 programs were start-ups this year and not included in this report.)

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
1	**Recruitment**	A minimum of 15 families (12 hours or more) are enrolled per site per quarter.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	6 of 12 sites met the standard (50%), 209-279 families and 336-428 children were enrolled for 12 hours or more at all times during the year.	7 of 14 sites met the standard (50%), 261-291 families and 422-453 children were enrolled for 12 hours or more at all times during the year.	Standard not met.	Program sites in largest population areas did meet the recruitment standard. Projects in smaller communities have a more difficult time recruiting.
2	**Retention in Program – Adults**	40% of enrolled families for a minimum of 12 months (with a minimum attendance = 75% for parent and child).	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	Unreliable data	5 of 14 sites met the standard (36%)	Standard not met. .	On average, 35% of families remain in the program for a min. of 12 months.
		40% of enrolled families for a minimum of 6 months (with a minimum attendance = 75% for parent and child).			6 of 14 sites met the standard (43%)		On average, 29% of families remain in the program for 6-12 months.
		10% of enrolled families for a minimum of 3 months (with a minimum attendance = 75% for parent and child).			10 of 14 sites met the standard (71%)		On average, 20% of families remain in the program for 3-6 months.
3	**Recruitment in Program for Teens**	A minimum of 15 families (12 hours or more) are enrolled per site per quarter.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	Only 1 site serving teen parents – standard not met.	2 sites serve teen parents – standard not met	Standard not met.	Enrollments were not large enough at the two sites.

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
4	**Retention in Program for Teens**	10% of teen parent families are enrolled for 12 or more months.	Sign-in sheets, Attendance forms, Participation Report	Unreliable data	1 of 2 sites met the standard (50%)	Standard not met.	On average, 36% of families remain in the program for a min. of 12 months.
		45% of teen parent families are enrolled for 6-12 months.			1of 2 sites met the standard (50%)		On average, 36% of families remain in the program for 6-12 months.
		35% of teen parent families are enrolled for 3-6 months.			1 of 2 sites met the standard (50%)		On average, 18% of families remain in the program for 3-6 months.
5	**Collabor-ation**	A minimum of four coordination advisory meetings are held with collaborators.	Collaboration Report, Meeting Minutes	10 of 11 sites met the standard (91%). Average number of meetings held = 6.27.	12 of 14 sites met the standard (86%). Average number of meetings held = 6.64	Standard met.	All programs convene advisory committees and attempt to meet on a quarterly basis.
		Ten or more, or an increase of two, non-LEA collaborating agencies made in-kind contributions.	Cumulative In-Kind Report		13 of 14 sites met the standard (92%). Average number of agencies making in-kind contributions = 16.83	Standard met	
6	**Year-Round Services**	A minimum of 20 contact sessions were held with Even Start families during the summer.	Program records, Year-Round Services Report	8 of 10 sites met the standard (80%). A statewide average of 24.23 sessions were held.	12 of 14 sites met the standard (86%). A statewide average of 25.43 sessions were held.	Standard met.	
		At least 75% of summer sessions focus on adult education, early childhood education and/or parenting objectives.	Program records, Lesson plans, Year-Round Services Report	10 of 10 sites met the standard (100%)	14 of 14 sites met the standard (100%).	Standard met.	

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
7	**PreSchool-Age Children's Achievement**	75% or more of Even Start preschool children will demonstrate a one-level increase in ▪ language and literacy, ▪ numeracy and concept development, and ▪ socialization and inter-personal skills.	COR, Work Sampling System, LAP-R/ELAP, Galileo System	5 of 11 sites reporting met the standard (45%). Making expected progress (Indiana average) ▪ Language and Literacy (72%) ▪ Numeracy and Concept Development (70%) ▪ Socialization and Interpersonal Development (76%)	13 of 14 sites met the standard (93%). 605 children in preschool program, 261 enrolled for 6 months or more (43%) Making expected progress (Indiana average) ▪ Language and Literacy (92%) ▪ Numeracy and Concept Development (91%) ▪ Socialization and Interpersonal Development (95%)	Standard met.	
8	**School-Age Children's Achievement**	At least 90% of Even Start K-3 children will maintain a school attendance rate of 95% or better; demonstrate grade-level or above reading ability; make continuous progress through grade 3 without being retained in grade; and pass the 3rd grade ISTEP+ in English/language arts and math.	School Age Children's Achievement Form	2 of the 9 sites with K-3 children met the standard (22%). Making expected progress (Indiana average) ▪ Attendance rate of 95% (82%) ▪ Continuous progress (22%) ▪ Pass the ISTEP+ (88%)	0 of the 8 sites with K-3 children met the standard (0%). 103 school-age children in K-3 Making expected progress (Indiana average) ▪ Attendance rate of 95% (78%) ▪ Grade level or above reading ability (65%) ▪ Continuous progress (96%) ▪ Pass the ISTEP+ (50%)	Standard not met.	Difficulty for children in the program to demonstrate reading ability on grade level or above and to pass the ISTEP+. Some of the children served are special needs.

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
9	**Parent Involvement in Home and School**	80% of parents participate in at least 80% of parent-teacher conferences and monthly home visits.	Attendance sheets, Parent Involvement in Home and School Form, PACT records	9 of 12 sites met the standard (75%). Statewide, an average of 83% of the parents met this standard.	13 of 14 sites met the standard (93%). Statewide, an average of **92%** of the parents met the standard.	Standard met.	
		75% of parents extend literacy and learning activities into the home at least 4 times weekly.		7 of 11 sites met the standard (64%). Statewide, 74% of the parents met section (1) of the standard, 85% met section (2), and 92% of the parents met section (3).	10 of 14 sites met the standard (71%). Statewide, an average of **85%** of the parents met the standard.	Standard met.	
		80% of parents participate in a minimum of 6 family activities with a literacy or leaning focus;			10 of 14 sites met the standard (71%). Statewide, an average of **83%** of the parents met the standard.	Standard met.	
10	**Parenting and PACT Services**	At least 10 parent-child interactive literacy activities are incorporated monthly.	Parent-Child Interactive Literacy Activity Record	7 of 12 sites met the standard (58%). Statewide, this goal was met an average of 7.6 months.	13 of 14 sites met the standard (93%). Statewide, this goal was met an average of **10.21** months.	Standard met.	Some misinterpretations of the reporting form exist. These are being corrected with revised forms
11	**Parent Support Training Activities**	At least two parent support or training activities are held monthly.	Parent Support Training Activities Log	6 of 12 sites met the standard (50%). Statewide, this goal was met an average of 7.13 months.	14 of 14 sites met the standard (100%). Statewide, this goal was met an average of **10.86** months.	Standard met.	

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
12	**Adult Achievement**	After 40 hours of instruction, a percentage of adult learners at specified levels will complete that level and advance to the next level as follows:	TABE, CASA, Adult Learner Results Form	3 of 12 sites met the standard for <u>all</u> levels of learning (25%). Statewide averages exceed the specified levels.	7 of 14 sites met the standard for <u>all</u> levels of learning (50%). Statewide, an unduplicated count of 376 adult learners achieved 40+ hours of instruction, 278 advanced one or more levels (74%)	Standard met.	
		20% of Beginning Literacy ABE			18 enrolled, 15 advanced (83%)		
		28% of Beginning Basic ABE			41 enrolled, 25 advanced (61%)		
		30% of Low Intermediate ABE			81 enrolled, 55 advanced (68%)		
		30% of High Intermediate ABE			138 enrolled, 87 advanced (63%)		
		34% of Low Adult Secondary Education			89 enrolled, 54 advanced (61%)		
		35% of High Adult Secondary Education			57 enrolled, 21 advanced (37%)		
		23% of Beginning Literacy ESL			3 enrolled, 3 advanced (100%)		
		27% of Beginning Basic ESL			22 enrolled, 15 advanced (68%)		
		28% of Low Intermediate ESL			19 enrolled, 11 advanced (58%)		
		28% of High Intermediate ESL			15 enrolled, 11 advanced (73%)		
		30% of Low Advanced ESL			10 enrolled, 5 advanced (50%)		
		30% of High Advanced ESL			1 enrolled, 1 advanced (100%)		
13	**Adult Learner Attainment**	20% of adult learners with the goal of advanced education/training will enroll in post-secondary education or a job training/retraining program.	Adult Learner Results Form	10 of 12 sites met the standard (83%). Statewide, 70% of adult learners met the standard.	10 of 11 sites met the standard (91%). Statewide, 129% of adult learners met the standard. *	Standard met.	* 48 adult learners had a goal of advanced education/training, but 62 actually enrolled; hence, 129% success rate.
		20% of adults not employed at enrollment with the goal of employment will obtain unsubsidized employment.	Adult Learner Results Form	Incomplete data.	11 of 12 sites met the standard (91%). Statewide, 283 adults not employed, 106 with goal of employment, 81 placed (76%)	Standard met.	
		34% of adults with a high school completion goal will earn a high school diploma or GED.	Adult Learner Results Form	11 of 11 sites met the standard (100%). 60% of the students, statewide, achieved this standard.	11 of 14 sites met the standard (79%). Statewide, 83% with goal of high school completion, 51 completed (61%)	Standard met.	

	Performance Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Results 2001-2002	Results 2002-2003	Assessment of Progress '03	Explanation of Progress
14	**Adult Employ-ability**	Based on parents' goals, at least 80% of parents either (1) improve their computer skills or (2) improve employability-related attitudes, behaviors, and skills.	Computer Skills Competency Checklist, Employment Related Attitude Behavior Appraisal, Transferable Employability Skills Checklist	8 of 10 sites with parents who held these goals met the standard (80%). Statewide, an average of 90% of the parents achieved this standard.	11 of 12 sites met the standard (92%). Statewide, 85 % of the parents with goal of improving computer skills achieved their goal and 81% of parents with goal of improving employability behaviors achieved their goal.	Standard met.	
15	**Teen Parent Achievement**	Of teen parents participating in a secondary program, • 65% pass the ISTEP+ GQE in both English/language arts and math and/or receive a waiver in those areas; • 75% who retest on the ISTEP+ GQE increase their scores; • 80% will accumulate Core 40 high school credits at a rate to ensure on-time graduation; and • 80% with a grade 12 status in the fall of the year will earn a high school diploma during the school year.	ISTEP Results, High school records	0 of 1 project site met all components of the standard (0%) 55% of the teen parents passed the ISTEP+ GQE, 100% increased their scores on retest, 100% accumulated credits at the appropriate rate, and 100% of grade 12 students received a diploma.	0 of 2 project sites met all components of the standard (0%) 67% of the teen parents passed the ISTEP+ GQE, 100% increased their scores on retest, 29% accumulated credits at the appropriate rate, and 100% of grade 12 students received a diploma.	Standard not met.	The requirement that student accumulate Core 40 credits is not realistic for the teen parents. The goals of passing the ISTEP+ GQE and earning a high school diploma are quite appropriate and can be achieved without Core 40 status.

III. Education of Migratory Children
(Title I, Part C)

TABLE I. POPULATION DATA	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	1187	1312	573	549	554	521	507	472	519	512	467	499	474	356	319	39	1688	10,548
B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"	---	---	281	269	271	255	248	231	254	251	229	245	232	174	156	21	---	3117
C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)																		
1. Migrant Children who are LEP	---	111	213	340	318	313	304	324	349	274	228	226	184	159	96	---	1296	4735
D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATON																		
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	---	---	---	4	---	---	3	4	5	1	3	3	---	3	---	39	---	65
E. MOBILITY																		
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	581	642	281	269	271	255	248	231	254	251	229	245	232	174	156	21	827	5167
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	369	394	172	164	166	156	152	142	156	154	140	150	142	107	96	13	506	3179
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	165	182	80	77	78	73	71	66	73	72	65	70	66	50	45	5	236	1474
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months)	---	---	483	479	481	452	461	406	439	428	413	441	401	303	286	39	---	5512

TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION -- (Note: Data on the high school graduation <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> for migrant students has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		
1. Dropped out of school										---	---	---	---	---	---	---		---*
2. Obtained GED																		---*
ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT -- (Note: The results of migrant students on State assessments in mathematics and reading/ language arts have been collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																		

* Not Collected in 2002-03

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
G. PARTICIPATION—<u>REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</u>																		
1. Served in MEP (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in any SWPs even if MEP funds are combined)	740	1412	462	476	461	439	399	423	429	421	368	415	407	368	253	36	1411	8420
2. Priority for Service	---	---	227	211	201	203	221	201	210	213	204	214	206	160	117	31	---	2619
3. Continuation of Service	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---*
4. Any Instructional Service	---	---	462	476	461	439	399	423	429	421	368	415	407	368	253	36	617	5974
5. Reading Instruction	---	---	462	476	461	439	399	423	429	421	368	415	407	368	253	36	617	5974
6. Mathematics Instruction	---	---	462	476	461	439	399	423	429	421	368	415	407	368	253	36	617	5974
7. High School Credit Accrual												43	32	39	31	---	---	145
8. Any Support Service	287	791	182	328	302	299	270	282	295	243	235	237	182	158	140	36	891	5158
9. Counseling Service	---	---	8	19	17	25	12	22	32	39	39	37	26	19	12	4	---	311
10. Any Referred Service	103	529	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	10	12	11	12	15	---	---	692

*Not Collected in 2002-03

TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
H. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION																		
1. Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	716	842	477	412	447	422	419	371	421	407	384	397	352	314	264	11	1447	8103
2. Priority for Service	---	---	217	221	233	211	206	197	216	219	189	193	181	143	118	11	---	2555
3. Continuation of Service	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---*
4. Any Instructional Service	---	---	477	412	447	422	419	371	421	407	384	397	352	314	264	11	342	5440
5. Reading Instruction	---	---	477	412	447	422	419	371	421	407	384	397	352	314	264	11	342	5440
6. Mathematics Instruction	---	---	477	412	447	422	419	371	421	407	384	397	352	314	264	11	342	5440
7. High School Credit Accrual												8	15	12	10	---	---	45
8. Any Support Service	396	758	134	292	283	265	264	253	274	245	238	235	201	159	137	11	93	5138
9. Counseling Service	---	---	1	10	7	5	8	6	7	3	3	4	2	6	9	11	---	82
10. Any Referred Service	116	611	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	17	12	19	18	---	---	793

*Not Collected in 2002-03

TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA		
I. STUDENT ENROLLMENT	**NUMBER OF SCHOOLS**	**NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED**
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 283	b. 16,239
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 9	b. 497

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
J. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT	NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS	NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 21	b. 5052
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 1	b. 123
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 12	b. 5697

TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA		
K. KEY MEP PERSONNEL	REGULAR-TERM FTE 1 FTE = 180 Days	SUMMER-TERM /INTERSESSION FTE 1 FTE =30 Days
1. State Director	a. 1.0	b. 1.0
2. Teachers	a. 36.5	b. 78.0
3. Counselors	a. 3.5	b. 4.5
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 93.5	b. 104.5
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 72.0	b. 81.5
6. Recruiters	a. 7.5	b. 20.5
7. Records Transfer Staff	a. 16.5	b. 13.5

IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2003-2004 school year. These data will not be available in Spring 2004, but will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report which will cover the results of school year 2003-2004 activities.

V. Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

VII. Enhancing Education through Technology (Title II, Part D)

The first school year in which LEA projects were implemented is the 2003-2004 school year. Therefore performance data for this program will not be available until next year when the next Consolidated State Performance Report will be due.

VIII. English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement (Title III, Part A)

States are not required to report any additional data for the 2002-2003 school year in this Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report. States reported data for the 2002-2003 school year for the Title III program in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application. Specifically, in the September 2003 Consolidated State Application, States reported the information listed below.

IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act
(Title IV, Part A)

A. 1 State Performance Indicators for Title IV, A - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets	
Decrease the number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the state.		Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2003-2004	0	2003-2004	0
				2004-2005	0
				2005-2006	0
				2006-2007	0
Decrease the number of expulsions for possession of deadly weapons	DOE-EX Report	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2002-2003	1,246	2003-2004	1221
				2004-2005	1196
				2005-2006	1172
				2006-2007	1149
Decrease the number of suspensions and expulsions for the use/possession of alcohol and tobacco	DOE-EX and DOE-SU Reports	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2002-2003	18,115	2003-2004	17,753
				2004-2005	17,398
				2005-2006	17,051
				2006-2007	16,710
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	24.3%	2003-2004	23.5%
				2004-2005	22.8%
				2005-2006	22.1%
				2006-2007	21.3%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	14.0%	2003-2004	13.4%
				2004-2005	12.5%
				2005-2006	11.6%
				2006-2007	10.7%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 8 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	10.6%	2003-2004	9.8%
				2004-2005	9.4%
				2005-2006	9.1%
				2006-2007	8.7%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	36.9%	2003-2004	34.1%
				2004-2005	34.1%
				2005-2006	34.1%
				2006-2007	34.1%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	22.2%	2003-2004	22.1%
				2004-2005	20.4%
				2005-2006	18.7%
				2006-2007	17.0%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 10 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	18.2%	2003-2004	17.2%
				2004-2005	16.8%
				2005-2006	16.3%
				2006-2007	15.9%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of alcohol in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	46.1%	2003-2004	42.2%
				2004-2005	40.2%
				2005-2006	39.3%
				2006-2007	36.3%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of tobacco in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	28.8%	2003-2004	27.4%
				2004-2005	24.5%
				2005-2006	21.7%
				2006-2007	18.8%
Decrease the percentage of students in grade 12 reporting the use of marijuana in the last month.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	19.8%	2003-2004	18.3%
				2004-2005	17.2%
				2005-2006	16.1%
				2006-2007	15.0%

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection and year of most recent collection	2002-2003 Baseline	Targets	
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	79.1%	2003-2004	79.0%
				2004-2005	78.4%
				2005-2006	77.8%
				2006-2007	77.1%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	69%	2003-2004	70.2%
				2004-2005	68.4%
				2005-2006	66.7%
				2006-2007	64.9%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 8 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	28.8%	2003-2004	29.6%
				2004-2005	29.1%
				2005-2006	28.6%
				2006-2007	28.0%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	84.2%	2003-2004	84.5%
				2004-2005	85.9%
				2005-2006	87.3%
				2006-2007	88.7%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	57.4%	2003-2004	59.3%
				2004-2005	59.9%
				2005-2006	60.5%
				2006-2007	61.0%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 10 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	24.1%	2003-2004	26.0%
				2004-2005	25.7%
				2005-2006	25.4%
				2006-2007	25.1%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke one or more packs of cigarettes a day.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	85.9%	2003-2004	85.9%
				2004-2005	86.8%
				2005-2006	87.6%
				2006-2007	88.5%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they smoke marijuana occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	51.9%	2003-2004	53.3%
				2004-2005	53.6%
				2005-2006	54.0%
				2006-2007	54.3%
Increase the percentage of students in grade 12 responding "moderate risk" or "great risk" to the question "How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they take one or more drinks of alcohol (beer, wine liquor occasionally.	ATOD Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents Survey	Frequency: Annually Most Recent Year: 2004	19.3%	2003-2004	21.2%
				2004-2005	21.8%
				2005-2006	22.3%
				2006-2007	22.9%

A.2 Provide an explanation of the data provided in the table (A.1).

The suspension and expulsion data are collected annually through an electronic self reporting system.

Survey Methodology
Data for the projections were gathered via the annual *Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use by Indiana Children and Adolescents* survey conducted by the Indiana Prevention Resource Center at Indiana University. Participants in the survey included Indiana students in grades 6th through 12th. Data used for the projections were collected in March and April each year from years 2000 through 2004 and utilized data from grades 8th, 10th and 12th.

The survey was administered in both public and private schools each spring. In most cases all students present on the day of administration were surveyed. While administering the survey, all students were informed that they had the right to withdraw from the survey at any time and the survey was anonymous and confidential. While non-probability cluster (intact classrooms) sampling methods were used, the samples were found to be representative in terms of demographic and geographic characteristics, and community size.

While administering the survey, all students were informed that they had the right to withdraw from the survey at any time and the survey was anonymous and confidential. The sample size varied yearly (see table below), nevertheless the percentage of usable (valid) surveys always exceeded 90%.

The self-administered questionnaire consisted of questions concerning demographic characteristics, alcohol, tobacco, and other drug (ATOD) use, school safety, and after-school activities. The instrument was developed by the Indiana Prevention Resource Center based on the questionnaires used for the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1991) and for the National Institute on Drug Abuse's "Monitoring the Future" National High School Survey (Johnston, et al., 1991, 1992, & 1993). All study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board at Indiana University.

Year	Grade			Annual Total
	8th	10th	12th	
2000	12,273	11,082	8,166	31,521
2001	17,360	13,099	9,793	40,252
2002	15,538	11,780	7,990	35,308
2003	26,935	21,760	15,500	64,195
2004	17600	16117	11247	44,964

B. In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions or expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students. States should use their definition of elementary, middle, and high school and provide those definitions in the report.

1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for <u>physical fighting</u>.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	N/A	N/A
Middle	N/A	N/A
High School	N/A	N/A

2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for <u>weapons</u> possession

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	375	293
Middle	462	293
High School	409	293

3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	8	293
Middle	116	293
High School	695	293

4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.

	Number for 2002-2003 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary	76	293
Middle	1324	293
High School	2421	293

Definitions:
    Weapons Related: All data are reported based on local school district discipline codes and are reported under the category of "deadly weapons (other than firearms)" and under the categories of handguns, rifles or shotguns and other firearms as defined by U.S. Code.

C. Describe the outcomes of the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts.

The state of Indiana has worked to ensure that parents are both informed and included in the drug and violence prevention efforts coordinated through the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities program. Both the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) and the Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA), which oversees the Governor's portion of the SDFSC funding, have included parents through various state-level efforts.

The Indiana Department of Education has organized a state Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Advisory Council. Included in the membership of the council is a parent representative. Through this involvement the parent member has had the opportunity to gain greater knowledge and provide input into the drug and violence prevention efforts of IDOE. Also, in an effort to connect parents to prevention in Indiana the IDOE has developed a web page specifically for parents related to Safe and Drug-Free Schools. The web site provides information useful to parents in their role as prevention partners. It also can be used as a vehicle to inform parents of current drug and violence prevention efforts conducted by IDOE.

Through the efforts of the Division of Mental Health and Addiction parents have had the opportunity to participate in the development of a prevention framework for the state. For more than three years, hundreds of Indiana residents working in dozens of task groups have developed the "Framework" to guide the state's prevention efforts in the early 21st Century. The effort was driven by a desire to empower individuals, families, neighborhoods, and grassroots organizations to increase their control over alcohol, tobacco, and other drug problems in their own environments. DMHA also convenes the Governor's Addiction Planning Council which includes a Prevention Committee. The membership of the Addiction Planning Council includes a parent representative who provides a connection to a perspective that is both valuable and necessary.

In addition, other State agencies collaborated with DOE and DMHA to provide training for a workforce that directly serves families at risk for substance abuse and domestic violence.

Finally, Community Consultants were trained to work with volunteers and disseminated local information on crime and violence. Soon the Community Consultants will complete a train-the-trainer model, Pathways, and will teach volunteers in Local Coordinating Councils how to gather their own local data to improve their Comprehensive County Plans for treatment services, prevention and law enforcement. Together, they will make safer environments for schools and communities.

X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers
(Title IV, Part B)

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

XI. Innovative Programs
(Title V, Part A)

Indiana has created and is implementing a ***single accountability system*** that incorporates the requirements of both No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and of Indiana accountability laws. The Department funds several types of activities that support local efforts to improve the quality of education for all students. The intended result is that student achievement improves.

Schools are encouraged to ***consolidate all school reform efforts under a single continuous school improvement plan***, ***focusing*** the processes and activities of this plan ***on high levels of student achievement***. Examples of the various school reform efforts include, but are not limited to:
- No Child Left Behind.
- Indiana accountability requirements for continuous school improvement and professional development.
- North Central Association (the regional accrediting agency of which Indiana schools are members).
- Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award for Education criteria.
- other school improvement planning and professional development models that meet both local and state requirements.

Department staff members ***provide technical assistance*** to any school or local school corporation that requests such assistance ***with school improvement or professional development planning and implementation***. The focus of such assistance is ***to support educators as they develop local capacities*** for continuous school improvement. Topics for such technical assistance include, but are not limited to:
- data gathering/analysis/interpretation; data-driven decision-making; identifying the achievement gap (i.e., regional workshops; LEA-sponsored in-service activities; school level work sessions).
- promoting scientifically-based research related to continuous school improvement and closing/eliminating the achievement gaps; prioritizing local program needs (i.e., regional workshops; LEA-sponsored in-service activities; school level work sessions).
- connecting local curriculum/instruction/ assessment/professional development to Indiana academic standards (i.e., regional workshops; LEA-sponsored in-service activities; school level work sessions).
- promoting educational practices that focus on the identified needs of each child as a means to higher levels achievement for all students.
- promoting and guiding the development and implementation of professional development that extends from school improvement goals and that is grounded in the best practices of professional development; moving to the next level of continuous school improvement—revising short and long term plans based on what the data say (i.e., telephone and in-person consultations; regional workshops; LEA-sponsored in-service activities; school level work sessions).

Department staff members ***promote and support collaboration and development of partnerships*** between and among various constituencies: school and community partnerships; college and university partnerships; partnerships with NCA and other professional organizations (i.e., telephone and in-person consultations; regional workshops; LEA-sponsored in-service activities; school level work sessions).

The Indiana Department of Education also uses state level Title V funds to assist in supporting "IndianaNEXT." The mission of "IndianaNEXT" is to provide Indiana principals and superintendents, from public and private schools, high quality leadership development experiences and an understanding of the power of technology to effect systemic change in their schools and districts.

A total of seven Kick-off Conferences will be held from July 1, 2002 to September 30, 2004, which will serve an estimated 1,397 administrators. During the Kick-off, the participants create Goal Action Plans for how they will use technology for school improvement in their schools or corporations. Focus areas for improvement include: teaching and learning, professional development, data analysis, and communication with stakeholders.

B. The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20**% or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including**: **(1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2002-2003 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area	Number of LEAs that used **20**% or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: **Student Achievement in Reading and Math**	232	232	755,282
Area 2: **Teacher Quality**	75	75	241,180
Area 3: **Safe and Drug Free Schools**	4	4	4,562
Area 4: **Increase Access for all Students**	52	52	34,371

B.1 Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2002-2003, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above. ____26_____

B.2 Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2002-2003. ____26_____

XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)
(Title VI, Part B)

A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2002-2003 school year.
____11_____

B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2002-2003 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	4
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	4
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	7
Parental involvement activities	2
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	0
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	0

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Programs as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

Goal One: By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

Exhibit One:

School Corporation % Passing	English/Language Arts			Mathematics		
	2001	2002	**2003**	2001	2002	**2003**
Crawford Co Com School Corp	57.2	65.2	65.9	57.1	65.6	66.1
Barr-Reeve Com Schools Inc	77.0	72.4	81.4	82.4	75.9	90.3
North Daviess Com Schools	72.9	74.6	75	71.2	74.0	75.9
Vincennes Community Sch Corp	67.0	71.0	70.3	66.4	62.8	66.6
Shoals Community School Corp	70.1	66.7	70.8	68.0	63.9	74.0
Peru Community Schools	61.5	65.5	67.4	66.6	67.3	74.3
Paoli Community School Corp	66.0	67.2	73.9	72.2	68.5	70.1
Southwest Parke Com Sch Corp	51.0	58.8	62.7	56.1	62.8	63.0
Jac-Cen-Del Community Sch Corp	68.3	66.0	72.9	62.7	55.8	67.0
Knox Community School Corp	54.2	54.1	64.3	56.1	59.8	69.5
Linton-Stockton School Corp	70.2	76.3	69.9	69.1	74.4	75.3

ISTEP+ Data from school years 1998-1999 through 2003-2004, by school corporation by language arts and math can also be located at: www.asap.state.in.us/data.html

Goal Two: School dropout rates will decrease by ½ percent during the life of the program.

Exhibit Two: Number of dropouts by school corporation from school years 1999-2000 through 2002-2003.

Indiana Rural and Low Income Schools
Number of Dropouts by School Year

School Corporation	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03
Crawford Co Com School Corp	18	23	9	10
Barr-Reeve Com Schools Inc	11	10	11	15
North Daviess Com Schools	17	19	11	7
Vincennes Community Sch Corp	19	28	38	26
Shoals Community School Corp	9	3	9	7
Peru Community Schools	34	44	36	48
Paoli Community School Corp	12	11	23	8
Southwest Parke Com Sch Corp	.	0	0	.
Jac-Cen-Del Community Sch Corp	5	7	8	10
Knox Community School Corp	16	13	12	18
Linton-Stockton School Corp	0	0	0	0

Goal Three: Each school district participating in the Rural and Low-Income School Program will execute a professional development plan that provides scientifically based professional development for all its instructional staff.

Exhibit Three:

1. State Board Rule 511 IAC 6.2 requiring all schools in Indiana to have a school improvement plan in which a plan for professional development is required.

2. Rule for applying for state funds for professional development

Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan
(511 IAC 6.2)

General Requirements

- A plan shall lay out objectives for a three (3) year period and must be annually reviewed and revised to accomplish the achievement objectives of the school.
- A plan must establish objectives for the school to achieve. These achievement objectives must be consistent with academic standards and include improvement in at least the following areas:

    (1) Attendance rate.
    (2) The percentage of students meeting academic standards under the Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) program.
    (3) For a secondary school, graduation rate.

- A plan must specify how and to what extent the school expects to make continuous improvement in all areas of the education system where results are measured by setting benchmarks for progress on an individual school basis.
- A plan must note specific areas where improvement is needed immediately.

Required Plan Components
A plan must contain the following components for the school:

(1) A list of the statutes and rules that the school wishes to have suspended from operation for the school.

(2) A description of the curriculum and information concerning the location of a copy of the curriculum that is available for inspection by members of the public.

(3) A description and name of the assessments that will be used in the school in addition to Indiana Statewide Testing for Educational Progress Plus (ISTEP+) assessments.

(4) A plan to be submitted to the governing body and made available to all interested members of the public in an easily understood format.

(5) A provision to maximize parental participation in the school.

(6) For a secondary school, a provision to do the following:

    (A) Offer courses that allow all students to become eligible to receive an Academic Honors Diploma.
    (B) Encourage all students to earn an Academic Honors Diploma or complete the Core 40 curriculum.

(7) A provision to maintain a safe and disciplined learning environment for students and teachers.

(8) A provision for the coordination of technology initiatives.

(9) The professional development program should include the following:

    (A) A narrative that includes:

        (i) A summary analysis of data regarding student learning.

        (ii) Strategies, programs, and services to address student learning needs.

        (iii) Activities to implement the strategies, programs, and services.

        (iv) Evaluation that will be conducted of the impact of the activities.

    (B) An assurance that the program complies with the board's core principles for professional development.

(10) The professional development program must be signed by the exclusive representative as an indication of support only for the professional development program component of the plan.

XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)

A. State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2002-2003 school year? <u>NO</u>

B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2002-2003 school year. <u>104</u>

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	41	$339,203.74
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	23	$234,170.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	18	$181,143.37
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	75	$2,059,091.55
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	13	$112,407.00

Program	Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program	Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	78	$2,073,812.90
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	36	$336,130.13
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	35	$370,040.56
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	22	$146,999.57