

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and 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 2005-2006



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006
PART II DUE FEBRUARY 1, 2007**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies.*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs.*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children.*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk.*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform.*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund).*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology.*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants.*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program).*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers.*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs.*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities.*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program.*

In addition to the programs cited above, the Title X, Part C - *Education for Homeless Children and Youths* program data will be incorporated in the CSPR for 2005-2006.

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by December 1, 2006 . Part II is due to the Department by February 1, 2007.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **December 1, 2006**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2005-2006 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2005-2006 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2005-2006 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2005-2006 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **December 1, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **February 1, 2007**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2005-2006 school year, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "2005-06 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the 2005-2006 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 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 estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2005-2006



PART I DUE DECEMBER 1, 2006

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

1.1.1 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

State Response

Grade Level Content Standards

South Dakota established science content standards for all grades K - 12 which

were approved by the SDBOE in December 1999. The science content standards were reviewed and revised according to the Board's revision cycle beginning in the summer of 2004. The Revised Science Standards were approved by the SDBOE in March 2005. Districts aligned curriculum to the revised science standards during the 2005-06 school year and implemented these standards during the 2006-07 school year.

Alternate Content Standards

In July 2005, workgroups of science general classroom teachers and special educators met to develop the science alternate content standards and achievement descriptors at each grade level K-12. These alternate content standards and achievement descriptors were presented to and approved by the Board of Education in January of 2006. They were implemented during the 2006-07 school year.

1.1.2 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

State Response

DAKOTA STEP

Dakota STEP (State Test of Educational Progress) is the state assessment system for accountability in South Dakota and was administered in the spring of 2006 for reading and math. DSTEP has as its basic platform the SAT 10 Abbreviated test which has been augmented to fully assess South Dakota Content Standards in Reading, Mathematics, and Science. The Science assessment,

augmented to align to the revised science standards, will be administered in the spring of 2007 for grades 5, 8, and 11. Dakota STEP is given at Grades 3-8 and 11. Alignment studies were completed by SD teachers, facilitated by Buros Institute of UNL.

Alternate Assessment

The Dakota STEP-A assesses reading, mathematics, and science at grades 3-8 and 11. The test is comprised of grade specific rating scales and a body of evidence component documenting achievement of alternate content standards for each specific grade. The Dakota STEP-A is administered during

February and March each year, including the spring of 2006.

1.1.3 Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

State Response

Grade Level Achievement Standards

South Dakota has four performance levels: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic. The SDBOE approved the revised reading content standards and performance descriptors at its January 2004 meeting and approved the revised mathematics content standards and performance descriptors in May 2004. Cut scores for Dakota STEP reading were set in May 2005 and those for the revised math test were set during a standards setting workshop in May, 2006 facilitated by Buros Institute. Reading cut scores for 2005 were approved by SDBOE in June 2005 and the academic achievement standards for mathematics in June 2006. Science content and achievement standards were approved by the State Board of Education in the spring of 2005. Science cut scores will be set in late spring 2007 after the first administration of the science test in grades 5, 8, and 11 in spring 2007.

Alternate Achievement Standards

Alternate performance levels and their corresponding grade-level performance levels are as follows:

Advancing= Advanced

Applying= Proficient

Developing= Basic

Introducing=Below Basic

Grade specific alternate achievement descriptors were developed in conjunction with writing the alternate content standards for reading and mathematics in February and March of 2005 and science in July of 2005. Buros Institute, University of Lincoln, Nebraska, conducted a standards setting process for the Dakota STEP-A in April of 2006 for both reading and math. Science cut scores will be set in late spring 2007 after the first administration of the science assessment in spring 2007.

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**Participation of All Students in 2005-2006 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2005-2006 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.1 Student Participation in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration**1.2.1.1 2005-2006 School Year Mathematics Assessment**

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	63984	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	7239	98.70
Asian or Pacific Islander	658	99.10
Black, non-Hispanic	1035	99.30
Hispanic	1302	98.90
White, non-Hispanic	53750	99.70
Students with Disabilities	9009	99.20
Limited English Proficient	3026	99.10
Economically Disadvantaged	22001	99.40
Migrant	311	99.40
Male	32920	99.60
Female	31065	99.50

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.1.2 2005-2006 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	63943	99.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	7234	98.60
Asian or Pacific Islander	657	98.90
Black, non-Hispanic	1023	98.20
Hispanic	1295	98.30
White, non-Hispanic	53733	99.60
Students with Disabilities	8606	94.70
Limited English Proficient	3055	100.00
Economically Disadvantaged	21973	99.20
Migrant	309	98.70
Male	32898	99.50
Female	31045	99.40

Comments:

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.2.2

1.2.2.1 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Math Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	8445	93.70
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	564	6.30

Comments:

1.2.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2005-2006 School Year Test Administration -- Reading/Language Arts Assessment

	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	8042	93.50
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	0	0.00
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	564	6.50

Comments:

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2005-2006 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2005-2006 school year. States should provide data on the total number of students tested as well as the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2005-2006 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

1.3.1 Grade 3 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8942	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1118	48.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	99	78.00
Black, non-Hispanic	161	59.00
Hispanic	224	56.00
White, non-Hispanic	7321	83.00
Students with Disabilities	1726	56.00
Limited English Proficient	572	48.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3501	64.00
Migrant	60	65.00
Male	4588	78.00
Female	4335	77.00

Comments: New mathematics assessment in 2006.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.2 Grade 3 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8906	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1116	63.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	99	85.00
Black, non-Hispanic	160	78.00
Hispanic	222	70.00
White, non-Hispanic	7308	89.00
Students with Disabilities	1721	63.00
Limited English Proficient	574	60.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3494	74.00
Migrant	60	70.00
Male	4580	82.00
Female	4325	87.00

Comments: Small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.3 Grade 4 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8925	78.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1129	48.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	80.00
Black, non-Hispanic	153	60.00
Hispanic	199	63.00
White, non-Hispanic	7349	84.00
Students with Disabilities	1526	46.00
Limited English Proficient	560	43.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3450	65.00
Migrant	54	65.00
Male	4588	78.00
Female	4336	79.00

Comments: New assessment

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.4 Grade 4 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8914	87.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1125	67.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	90.00
Black, non-Hispanic	152	76.00
Hispanic	197	80.00
White, non-Hispanic	7346	91.00
Students with Disabilities	1524	61.00
Limited English Proficient	564	63.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3443	78.00
Migrant	54	78.00
Male	4581	85.00
Female	4332	90.00

Comments: Small subgroup sizes

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.5 Grade 5 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8948	75.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1072	45.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	171	55.00
Hispanic	204	54.00
White, non-Hispanic	7420	81.00
Students with Disabilities	1372	43.00
Limited English Proficient	522	40.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3310	60.00
Migrant	38	59.00
Male	4637	77.00
Female	4311	75.00

Comments: New assessment.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.6 Grade 5 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8941	85.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1072	64.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	81	88.00
Black, non-Hispanic	169	74.00
Hispanic	202	75.00
White, non-Hispanic	7417	89.00
Students with Disabilities	976	56.00
Limited English Proficient	524	62.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3305	75.00
Migrant	37	83.00
Male	4635	84.00
Female	4306	87.00

Comments: Small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.7 Grade 6 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9297	71.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1101	39.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	120	80.00
Black, non-Hispanic	157	59.00
Hispanic	200	48.00
White, non-Hispanic	7719	77.00
Students with Disabilities	1235	29.00
Limited English Proficient	474	30.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3307	55.00
Migrant	49	44.00
Male	4830	71.00
Female	4467	71.00

Comments: New assessment, small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.8 Grade 6 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9293	83.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1101	57.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	120	87.00
Black, non-Hispanic	153	72.00
Hispanic	199	71.00
White, non-Hispanic	7719	87.00
Students with Disabilities	1235	46.00
Limited English Proficient	475	44.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3302	71.00
Migrant	48	73.00
Male	4828	81.00
Female	4464	85.00

Comments: Small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.9 Grade 7 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9595	69.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1137	37.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	89	73.00
Black, non-Hispanic	146	45.00
Hispanic	181	41.00
White, non-Hispanic	8042	75.00
Students with Disabilities	1245	23.00
Limited English Proficient	387	32.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3345	53.00
Migrant	52	55.00
Male	4994	68.00
Female	4601	70.00

Comments: Small group size.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.10 Grade 7 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9594	82.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1138	54.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	88	89.00
Black, non-Hispanic	145	67.00
Hispanic	181	65.00
White, non-Hispanic	8042	87.00
Students with Disabilities	1245	40.00
Limited English Proficient	391	47.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3345	70.00
Migrant	52	67.00
Male	4993	79.00
Female	4601	86.00

Comments: Small group size.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.11 Grade 8 - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9741	70.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1122	33.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	84	79.00
Black, non-Hispanic	158	54.00
Hispanic	181	48.00
White, non-Hispanic	8196	76.00
Students with Disabilities	1168	22.00
Limited English Proficient	376	33.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3239	53.00
Migrant	42	51.00
Male	4955	71.00
Female	4786	70.00

Comments: New assessment, small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.12 Grade 8 - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	9735	79.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	1121	53.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	84	84.00
Black, non-Hispanic	155	68.00
Hispanic	180	64.00
White, non-Hispanic	8195	83.00
Students with Disabilities	1167	35.00
Limited English Proficient	386	44.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3234	67.00
Migrant	42	54.00
Male	4951	76.00
Female	4784	83.00

Comments: Small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.13 High School - Mathematics

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8554	64.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	560	28.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	91	71.00
Black, non-Hispanic	89	40.00
Hispanic	113	45.00
White, non-Hispanic	7701	67.00
Students with Disabilities	736	12.00
Limited English Proficient	135	20.00
Economically Disadvantaged	1848	48.00
Migrant	16	50.00
Male	4327	65.00
Female	4227	64.00

Comments: New assessment, small group sizes.

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.3.14 High School - Reading/Language Arts

	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 2005-2006
All Students	8561	73.00
American Indian or Alaska Native	561	44.00
Asian or Pacific Islander	91	64.00
Black, non-Hispanic	89	46.00
Hispanic	114	50.00
White, non-Hispanic	7705	76.00
Students with Disabilities	737	22.00
Limited English Proficient	141	24.00
Economically Disadvantaged	1849	58.00
Migrant	16	44.00
Male	4328	69.00
Female	4232	76.00

Comments: small group sizes

- Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

1.4.1 For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	697	561	80.50

Comments:

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	165	159	96.40

Comments: We have three K-12 school districts that tuition ALL students out of state and therefore have been excluded from the above statistics.

1.4.2 For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2005-2006 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	343	267	77.80

Comments:

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2005-2006 School Year Data	159	150	94.30

Comments:

1.4.3 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1.4.3.1 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.3.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of **schools** identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

A School Improvement Conference was provided in August for all schools in school improvement. Requirements of this identification were discussed and technical assistance that would be provided by the SEA was outlined. Breakout sessions were provided on varying topics including supplemental educational services, teacher mentoring, and leadership. The sessions offered provided information for both Title I and non-Title I schools. The state provides technical assistance through the School Support Team and seven regional ESAs (Educational Service Agencies). Assistance includes facilitation, guidance, and support in data analysis and in writing school level improvement plans, a peer review of those plans, and curriculum support for reading and mathematics. DOE staff also provide direct assistance as requested by schools and districts. School

Improvement funding for Title I schools is allocated on a formula basis to all Title I schools in improvement status. The source of this funding is the required set aside of Title I Part A funds.

1.4.4 Title I Districts Identified For Improvement.

1.4.4.1 Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action (in 2006-2007 based on the data from 2005-2006)

1.4.4.2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

Districts as well as schools attend the School Improvement Conference held in August each year. The DOE provides support through the School Support Team and seven ESA (Educational Service Agency) units. Assistance is provided with data analysis, developing and evaluating district improvement plans, and professional development. School Support Team members facilitate and participate in school level audits to assist districts with this responsibility. They also facilitate and participate in district level audits at the request of the department. Results of the district level audits will be used to determine the corrective actions to take with districts in Level 3 or Corrective Action of district improvement. Technical assistance will continue to be provided as the corrective action is implemented.

1.4.5.1 Public School Choice	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	3
2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	3
How many of these schools were charter schools?	0
3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	<n
4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	13286
Optional Information:	
5. If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
6. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	
7. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2005-2006 school year.	
Comments:	

1.4.5.2 Supplemental Educational Services	
	Number
1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	12
2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	155
3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	5757
Optional Information:	
If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:	
4. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2005-2006 school year.	249
Comments:	

1.5 TEACHER AND PARAPROFESSIONAL QUALITY

1.5.1 In the following table, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate for all schools and in "high-poverty" and "low-poverty" elementary schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	14607	14017	96.00
Elementary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	1154	1117	96.80
Low-Poverty Schools	1140	1114	97.70
All Elementary Schools	4702	4592	97.70
Secondary Level			
High-Poverty Schools	2489	2280	91.60
Low-Poverty Schools	2454	2395	97.60
All Secondary Schools	9905	9425	95.20
Comments:			

Definitions and Instructions

What are the core academic subjects?

English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

How is a teacher defined?

An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or un-graded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

How is a class defined?

A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class). Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50 percent of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

Should 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes be reported in the elementary or secondary category?

States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless if their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?

States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class.

On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?

Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if English, calculus, history, and science are taught in a self-contained classroom by the same teacher, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher is Highly Qualified in English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

1.5.2 For those classes in core academic subjects being taught by teachers who are **not highly qualified** as reported in Question 1.5.1, estimate the percentages of those classes in the following categories (Note: Percentages should add to 100 percent of classes taught by not highly qualified teachers for each level).

Reason For Being Classified as Not Highly Qualified	Percentage
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	15.80
b) Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
c) Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	2.90
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
SECONDARY SCHOOL CLASSES	
a) Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	65.70
b) Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	3.90
c) Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	11.70
d) Other (please explain)	0.00
Comments:	

1.5.3 Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty elementary and secondary schools used in the table in Question 1.5.1.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary Schools	52.40	23.30
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students qualified for free and reduced lunch program.	
Secondary Schools	36.40	18.10
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students qualified for free and reduced lunch program.	

Comments:

Definitions and Instructions

How are the poverty quartiles determined?

Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percent poverty measure. Divide the list into 4 equal groups. Schools in the first (highest group) are high-poverty schools. Schools in the last group (lowest group) are the low-poverty schools. Generally, states use the percentage of students who qualify for the free or reduced price lunch program for this calculation.

Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?

States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K-5 (including K-8 or K-12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

1.5.4 Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2005-2006 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

School Year	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2005-2006 School Year	96.50

Comments:

1.6 ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY**1.6.1.1 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

Has the State developed ELP standards (k-12) as required under Section 3113(b)(2) and are these ELP standards fully approved, adopted, or sanctioned by the State governing body?

Developed	<u>Yes</u>
Approved, adopted, sanctioned	<u>Yes</u>
Operationalized (e.g., Are standards being used by district and school teachers?)	<u>Yes</u>

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in establishing, implementing, and operationalizing English Language Proficiency (ELP) standards for raising the level of ELP, that are derived from the four domains of speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and that are aligned with achievement of the challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The South Dakota Board of Education approved the current ELP standards in July 2004. These ELP standards include Reading/language arts and Mathematics and are designed for grade spans K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. South Dakota ELP Standards were revised beginning July 2006 and have been presented to the South Dakota Board of Education in November 2006. These revised standards were developed for Kindergarten, grade spans 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The revised ELP Standards are expected to be approved by the South Dakota Board of Education in Spring/Summer 2007.

1.6.1.2 Alignment of Standards

Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress for linking/aligning the State English Proficiency Standards to the State academic content and student academic achievement standards in English language arts/reading and mathematics.

STATE RESPONSE

The South Dakota Board of Education approved the current ELP standards in July 2004. These ELP standards include linkages to Reading/language arts and Mathematics. South Dakota ELP Standards were revised beginning July 2006 and have been presented to the South Dakota Board of Education in November 2006. These revised standards include links to Reading/language arts, mathematics and science. The workgroup of South Dakota teachers convened to revised these standards included ELL Teachers as well as content experts. These ELP Standards are expected to be approved by the South Dakota Board of Education in Spring/Summer 2007.

1.6.2 English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments
1. The expectation for the full administration of the new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency (ELP) standards as required under Section 3113 (b)(2) is spring 2007. Please indicate if the State has conducted any of the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An independent alignment study <u>Yes</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other evidence of alignment <u>No</u>
2. Provide an updated description of the State's progress in developing and implementing the new or enhanced ELP assessments. Specifically describe how the State ensures:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades k-12; 2. The ELP assessment(s) which address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension; 3. ELP assessments are based on ELP standards; 4. Technical quality (validity, reliability, etc.)
STATE RESPONSE
<p>An alignment study was conducted by Gary Cook in Spring 2005. This study was an alignment of the SD ELP Standards and the Stanford English Language Proficiency assessment. Based on the results of this study, Harcourt augmented the Stanford English Language Proficiency assessment in Reading and Listening. South Dakota's assessment has been renamed the Dakota English Language Proficiency assessment. The Dakota ELP addresses the five domains and was administered for the first time in February 2006, for all students that have been identified as LEP in grades K-12. The Stanford English Language Proficiency Technical Manual provides information on technical quality of the assessment. The 2006 Dakota ELP Technical Manual has been received. South Dakota's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) will be reviewing the Dakota ELP Technical Report and addressing any issues of the Dakota ELP in December 2006. SD DOE and Harcourt will further explore any TAC recommendations.</p>

1.6.3.2 Data Reflecting the Most Common Languages Spoken in the State		
2005-2006 Data of the Most Common Languages Spoken by LEPs		
Language	Number of ALL LEP Students in the State	Percentage of ALL LEP Students in the State
1. Lakota	2123	41.50
2. Spanish	767	15.00
3. Hutterite	524	10.30
4. German	292	5.70
5. Dakota	262	5.10
6. English	136	2.70
7. Arabic	91	1.80
8. Ukrainian	88	1.70
9. French	84	1.60
10. Somali	82	1.60
Comments:		

- In the above chart, list the ten most commonly spoken languages in your State. Indicate the number and percentage of LEP students that speak each of the languages listed in table 1.6.3.2.

1.6.4 Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Programs and activities for immigrant children and youth

Definitions:

- **# immigrants enrolled in the State** = number of students, who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6), enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State
- **# immigrants served by Title III** = number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities
- **# of immigrants subgrants** = number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities

**Table 1.6.4 Education Programs for Immigrant Students
2005-2006**

# Immigrants enrolled in the State	# Immigrants served by Title III	# Immigrant subgrants
1184	905	1

Comments:

STATE RESPONSE: (Provide information on what has changed, e.g., sudden influx of large number of immigrant children and youth, increase/change of minority language groups, sudden population change in school districts that are less experienced with education services for immigrant students in the State during the 2 previous years.)

South Dakota has not experienced significant changes in immigrant students during the 2 previous years. One district has received an Immigrant Subgrant. These students are primarily the population of LEP students served by this district.

1.6.5 Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments under Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments;
2. A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English;
3. Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English.

STATE RESPONSE

DELP 2006

Scaled Score Cut Points and Performance Standards

Pre Emergent Emergent Basic Intermediate Proficient

Kindergarten 327 484 533 581 608

1st Grade 327 494 541 592 624

2nd Grade 327 502 550 605 640

3rd Grade 383 518 566 611 649

4th Grade 383 527 571 617 660

5th Grade 383 535 576 626 676

6th Grade 381 545 590 638 683

7th Grade 381 558 600 646 697

8th Grade 381 569 610 653 709

9th Grade 394 573 617 658 713

10th Grade 394 581 625 665 720

11th Grade 394 589 632 672 727

12th Grade 394 597 640 679 734

Cut scores on the English language proficiency test are set and reported based on the performance descriptors, to reflect student progress. The curriculum of the English language learning program is aligned with these performance descriptors. By aligning the curriculum goals and objectives of the program to the performance descriptors, teachers are able to track the progress of students through the program and determine their readiness to achieve the content standards intended to be met by all South Dakota students.

The performance descriptors are organized into proficiency levels. These proficiency levels describe how an ELL student performs in English and reflect increasing acquisition of English language skills.

Buros conducted the standards setting and South Dakota teachers determined the cut score based on the state's definition for each level of proficiency. Proficiency is defined as attaining Level 5 on the Stanford ELP.

The composite score is the sum total of all of the five sub-tests. The composite score is the one that is actually used. Five scores, including comprehension scores must be reported. The composite is based on the item scores for all items on the test, not the scores on the subscales. All reading and listening items contribute to the comprehension score. Therefore, that a comprehension score is produced does not affect the composite score and reading and listening items are not double-counted.

The test developer, Harcourt Educational Measurement, used natural weighting resulting in similar scores across all domains. For example, reading at lower levels is 48 points while listening and speaking is 54 points. A final analysis of the sub-tests shows they are close to being the same weight.

English language proficiency for South Dakota English language learners is defined as attaining a proficient achievement level for two consecutive years on the overall composite score of the Dakota ELP assessment. The Dakota ELP assessment composite score incorporates the 5 domains (listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension).

1.6.6 Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessment(s) in Section 3122(a)(3). Please include the following in your response:

1. A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments;
2. A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources).

STATE RESPONSE

The English language proficiency levels are as follows:

Proficient: An ELL student performing at the proficient level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet expectations for the student's grade level.

Intermediate: An ELL student performing at the intermediate level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet some expectations for the student's grade level, but is not yet fluent enough to sufficiently to meet grade-level expectations.

Basic: An ELL student performing at the basic level is starting to read, write, speak and listen in English, but is not fluent enough to function in English without assistance.

Emergent: An ELL student performing at the emergent level has very little ability to read, write, speak, and listen to English. The student has a few isolated words.

Pre-emergent: An ELL student performing at the pre-emergent level does not understand enough language to read, write, speak, or listen in English.

Making progress is defined as advancing at least one-half of a performance level (meet or exceed the midpoint scaled score between the cut scores for the performance levels for the grade assessed), or by maintaining a level 5 as measured by the Stanford ELP.

A student is given credit for advancing one-half of a performance level if the student's scaled score meets or exceeds the midpoint scaled score between the performance levels for the grade assessed. If a student scored above the midpoint for that performance level the prior year but does not advance to the next performance level during the year assessed, the student is determined not to have made progress.

DELP 2006

Scaled Score Cut Points and Performance Standards

Pre Em 1/2 Cut Em 1/2 Cut Basic 1/2 Cut Inter 1/2 Cut Prof

Kind 327 398 484 507 533 557 581 594 608

1st 327 411 494 516 541 566 592 607 624

2nd 327 421 502 525 550 577 605 622 640

3rd 383 450 518 542 566 589 611 629 649

4th 383 450 527 548 571 594 617 639 660

5th 383 450 535 556 576 601 626 651 676

6th 381 464 545 567 590 614 638 660 683

7th 381 464 558 578 600 623 646 672 697

8th 381 476 569 589 610 632 653 680 709

9th 394 479 573 595 617 638 658 686 713

10th 394 479 581 602 625 644 665 692 720

11th 394 490 589 611 632 652 672 700 727

12th 394 490 597 619 640 660 679 707 734

1.6.7 Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the last Consolidated State Performance Report submission (for school year 2004-2005), please provide the State's definition of "cohort." Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The definition of cohort 1 is those students identified and assessed statewide as LEP in grades K-12 in the school year 2002-2003. Additional cohorts for ensuing years will include new or re-enrolling K-12 students statewide who were not included in Cohort 1.

Cohort 2 included new or re-enrolling K-12 students statewide who were not included in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 and subsequent cohorts may be dominated by kindergarten students at the pre-emergent and emergent levels along with new enrollees in the state's schools. The baseline for Cohort 2 was determined in the spring of 2004 based on the data from the SELP. The baseline for Cohort 3 was determined in the spring of 2005 based on the data from the SELP. The baseline for Cohort 4 was determined in the spring of 2006 based on the data from the DELP.

1.6.8 Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State? Yes

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected AMAO Target		Actual		Projected AMAO Target		Actual	
2005-2006 School Year	% 50.00	# 500	% 23.10	# 231	% 30.00	# 270	% 45.80	# 494

If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency and provide the data from that evaluation.

Data above reflects Cohort Group 1 only.

Data below is for all cohort groups.

English Language Proficiency Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency

[1.6.8.2.x.x.x.] Actual Actual

Projected Projected

2005-2006 School Year AMAO Target AMAO Target

Cohort 1 50.00% 500 23.10% 231 25.00% 270 45.78% 494

Cohort 2 50.00% 397 36.07% 286 20.00% 168 46.13% 387

Cohort 3 50.00% 568 41.55% 472 20.00% 225 35.05% 395

Cohort 4 NA NA NA NA 20.00% 188 15.96% 150

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Critical synthesis of data reported by Title III subgrantees

[SEC. 3121(a) p. 1701, 3123(b)(1, 3) p.1704]

Provide the results of Title III LEP students in meeting the State English language proficiency (ELP) annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) for making progress and attainment of English language proficiency as required in Table 1.6.9.

TABLE 1.6.9 INSTRUCTIONS:

Report **ONLY** the results from State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.

Blackened cells in this form indicate information which, each SEA should collect and maintain, but which is not being collected at this time.

Definitions:

1. **MAKING PROGRESS** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY** = as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **TOTAL** = the total number of students from **making progress**, **not making progress**, and **attainment**, for each year in the table. The figure reported in this cell should be an unduplicated count of LEP students who participate in Title III English language instruction educational programs in grades K-12.
5. **AMAO TARGET** = the AMAO target for the year as established by State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended and approved, for each objective for "Making progress" and "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS** = The number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met/did not meet the State definitions of "Making Progress" and the number and percentage of Title III LEP students who met the definition for "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

1.6.9 Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants			
	2005-2006		
	AMAO TARGET	ACHIEVEMENT RESULTS	
	%	#	%
MAKING PROGRESS	50.00	264	35.60
DID NOT MAKE PROGRESS		477	
ATTAINED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY	25.00	315	64.40
TOTAL		741	

Explanation of data for Table

Check the answer to the following question.

Are monitored* LEP students reflected in the Table "Attainment" "Achievement Results"? No

* Monitored LEP students are those who

- have achieved "proficient" on the State ELP assessment
- have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students
- are no longer receiving Title III services, and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition

1.6.10 Title III program effectiveness in assisting LEP students to meet State English language proficiency and student academic achievement standards

[SEC. 3122(b)(2) p. 1703, 3123(b)(1, 4) p.1704-5, 3121(b)(2) p. 1701,]

Provide the count for each year.

It is not necessary to respond to the items in this form, which reference other collections. The information provided by each SEA to those other collections will be collected by OELA and utilized to produce the Biennial Report.

Title III Subgrantee Information

	2005-2006
Total number of Title III subgrantees for each year	9
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for making progress	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for attaining English proficiency	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met the AMAO target for AYP	5
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs*	0
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 2 AMAOs	2
Total number of Title III subgrantees that met 1 AMAO	6
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet any AMAO	3
Total number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs	1
Total number of Title III subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in 2007-08)	0
Did the State meet all three Title III AMAOs? *	<u>No</u>

Comments:

* Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each State set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency and making AYP.

1.6.11 On the following tables for 2005-2006, please provide data regarding the academic achievement of monitored LEP students who transitioned into classrooms not designated for LEP students and who are no longer receiving services under Title III. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned in 2005-2006 school year.

1.6.11.1 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State reading language arts assessments		
Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	46	95.80
4	107	91.50
5	113	86.30
6	83	57.20
7	100	63.30
8	64	57.70
H.S.	18	32.10

Comments:

1.6.11.2 Number and percent of former Title III served, monitored LEP students scoring at the proficient and advanced levels on the State mathematics assessments

Grade/Grade Span	Students Proficient & Advanced	
	#	%
3	38	79.20
4	83	70.90
5	74	56.50
6	57	39.30
7	79	50.00
8	49	44.10
H.S.	12	23.50

Comments:

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

1.7.1 In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2006-2007 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2006-2007 School Year	1

Comments:

1.8 GRADUATION AND DROPOUT RATES

1.8.1 Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2004-2005 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

1.8.1 Graduation Rates	
High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	89.10
American Indian or Alaska Native	66.30
Asian or Pacific Islander	81.10
Black, non-Hispanic	74.40
Hispanic	58.20
White, non-Hispanic	91.70
Students with Disabilities	81.70
Limited English Proficient	63.60
Economically Disadvantaged	82.80
Migrant	73.70
Male	87.70
Female	90.40

Comments: Above rates were calculated as prescribed within the SD Accountability workbook and based on data available.

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2004-2005 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

1.8.2 Dropout Rate	
Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	2004-2005 School Year
All Students	2.50
American Indian or Alaska Native	6.50
Asian or Pacific Islander	2.40
Black, non-Hispanic	5.30
Hispanic	5.90
White, non-Hispanic	1.90
Students with Disabilities	0.40
Limited English Proficient	7.80
Economically Disadvantaged	3.40
Migrant	4.20
Male	3.00
Female	2.40

Comments: Based on data reported by districts/schools. More training and instruction provided in recent year to add it accurate data reporting. Also due to small subgroup sizes a change increase/decrease of just a few districts will result in a change that exceeds the allowance within the programming.
Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

1.9.1.1 How does your State define the period that constitutes a school year? (e.g., "The school year shall begin on the first day of July and end on the thirtieth day of June" or "A total of 175 instructional days").

STATE RESPONSE

13-26-1. School fiscal year--Local board to set length of school term, day and week-- Minimum hours in school term. The school fiscal year shall begin July first and end June thirtieth. Each local school board shall set the number of days in a school term, the length of a school day, and the number of school days in a school week. The local school board or governing body shall establish the number of hours in the school term for kindergarten programs. The Board of Education shall promulgate rules pursuant to chapter 1-26 setting the minimum number of hours in the school term for grades one through three. The number of hours in the school term for grades four through twelve may not be less than nine hundred sixty-two and one-half hours, exclusive of intermissions. An intermission is the time when pupils are at recess or lunch. Source: SDC 1939, Â§ 15.3002

1.9.1.2 What are the totals in your State as follows:

	Total Number in State	Total Number LEAs Reporting
LEAs without Subgrants	165	165
LEAs with Subgrants	2	2

Comments:

1.9.1.3 Number of Homeless Children And Youth In The State

Provide the number of homeless children and youth in your State enrolled in public school (compulsory grades--excluding pre-school) during the 2005-2006 school year according to grade level groups below:

Grade Level	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs without subgrants	Number of homeless children/youth enrolled in public school in LEAs with subgrants
K	13	89
1	<n	84
2	<n	84
3	<n	99
4	<n	101
5	<n	81
6	<n	56
7	<n	67
8	<n	79
9	<n	29
10	<n	20
11	<n	17
12	<n	10

Comments:

1.9.1.4 Primary Nighttime Residence Of Homeless Children And Youth

Of the total number of homeless children and youth (excluding preschoolers), provide the numbers who had the following as their primary nighttime residence at the time of initial identification by LEAs.

Primary nighttime residence	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs without subgrants	* Number of homeless children/ youth-- excluding preschoolers LEAs with subgrants
Shelters	35	180
Doubled-up	39	332
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, etc.)	<n	<n
Hotels/Motels	0	152
Unknown	<n	144

Comments:

* The primary nighttime residence is the basis for identifying homeless children and youth. The totals should match the totals in item #3 above.

1.9.2 DATA FROM LEAs WITH MCKINNEY-VENTO SUBGRANTS

1.9.2.1 Number Of Homeless Children And Youths Served By McKinney-Vento Subgrants

Provide the number of homeless children and youth that were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants in your State during the 2005-2006 academic school year disaggregated by grade level groups

Grade levels of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006	Number of homeless children and youth <i>served</i> by subgrants enrolled in school by grade level
K	89
1	84
2	84
3	99
4	101
5	81
6	56
7	67
8	79
9	29
10	20
11	17
12	10

Comments:

1.9.2.2 Number of homeless preschool-age children

Provide the number of homeless preschool-age children in your State in districts with subgrants attending public preschool programs during the 2005-2006 school year (i.e., from birth through pre-K).

Number of homeless preschool-age children enrolled in public preschool in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

58

Comments:

1.9.2.3 Unaccompanied Youths

Provide the number of unaccompanied youths served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless unaccompanied youths enrolled in public schools in LEAs with subgrants in 2005-2006

18

Comments:

1.9.2.4 Migrant Children/Youth Served

Provide the number of homeless migrant children/youth served by subgrants during the 2005-2006 school year.

Number of homeless migrant children/youth enrolled in public schools (Total for LEAs with subgrants)

11

Comments:

1.9.2.5 Number of Children Receiving Educational and School Support Services

Provide the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants and enrolled in school during the 2005-2006 school year that received the following educational and school support services from the LEA

Educational and school related activities and services	Number of homeless students in subgrantee programs that received educational and support services
Special Education (IDEA)	135
English Language Learners (ELL)	54
Gifted and Talented	<n
Vocational Education	<n

Comments:

1.9.2.6 Educational Support Services

Provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

Services and Activities Provided by the McKinney-Vento subgrant program	Number of your State's subgrantees that offer these services
Tutoring or other instructional support	2
Expedited evaluations	1
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	1
Assistance with participation in school programs	2
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	1
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	2
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	2
Clothing to meet a school requirement	2
School supplies	2
Referral to other programs and services	2
Emergency assistance related to school attendance	2
Other (optional)	0

Comments:

1.9.2.7 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

Provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youth during the 2005-2006 school year.

Barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School selection	0
Transportation	1
School records	1
Immunizations or other medical records	1
Other enrollment issues	0

Comments:

1.9.2.8 Additional Barriers (Optional)

Note any other barriers not listed above that were frequently reported:

List other barriers	List number of subgrantees reporting each barrier
	0
	0
	0

Comments:

1.9.2.9 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

In order to ensure that homeless children and youth have access to education and other services needed to meet the State's challenging academic standards:

a) Check the grade levels in which your State administered a statewide assessment in reading or mathematics; b) note the number of homeless children and youth served by subgrants in 2005-2006 that were included in statewide assessments in reading or mathematics; and c) note the number of homeless children and youth that met or exceeded the State's proficiency level or standard on the reading or mathematics assessment.

Reading Assessment:

School Grade Levels *	a) Reading assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking reading assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	94	48
Grade 4	Yes	89	46
Grade 5	Yes	71	33
Grade 6	Yes	55	17
Grade 7	Yes	60	19
Grade 8	Yes	69	32
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:**Mathematics Assessment:**

School Grade Levels *	a) Mathematics assessment by grade level (check boxes where appropriate; indicate "DNA" if assessment is required and data is not available for reporting; indicate "N/A" for grade not assessed by State)	b) Number of homeless children/youth taking mathematics assessment test.	c) Number of homeless children/youth that met or exceeded state proficiency.
Grade 3	Yes	94	39
Grade 4	Yes	89	44
Grade 5	Yes	71	29
Grade 6	Yes	55	15
Grade 7	Yes	60	16
Grade 8	Yes	69	28
Grade 9	N/A		
Grade 10	N/A		
Grade 11	Yes	<n	<n
Grade 12	N/A		

Comments:

* Note: State assessments in grades 3-8 and one year of high school are NCLB requirements. However, States may assess students in other grades as well.