

# 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 2007-08**

**SOUTH DAKOTA**



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008**  
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**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 (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- 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 V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

### PART I

Part I of the CSPR 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 the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **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.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

### PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, 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 pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

## **GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES**

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. 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 "SY 2007-08 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 SY 2007-08 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 1965, 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-HLPEDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614

Expiration Date: 10/31/2010

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:

Part I, 2007-08

Part II, 2007-08

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

Address:  
700 Governors Drive  
Pierre, Sd 57501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Diane R. Lowery

Telephone: 605-773-6509

Fax: 605-773-3782

e-mail: [diane.lowery@state.sd.us](mailto:diane.lowery@state.sd.us)

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

Mr. Tom Oster

Friday, March 13, 2009, 2:05:46 PM

Signature

Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT  
PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2007-08**



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 19, 2008  
5PM EST**

## 1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the NCLB academic content standards, academic achievement standards and assessments to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA.

### 1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's content standards were approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. Indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Dakota's current content standards and academic achievement descriptors revision cycle can be found at <http://doe.sd.gov/contentstandards/docs/ContentStandardsRevisionCycle.pdf>

The revised reading/language arts content standards and academic achievement descriptors were approved by the South Dakota Board of Education March 2007.

The process for reviewing and updating the mathematics standards and academic achievement descriptors has recently begun. The state is working with several stakeholders and outside vendors to create a framework and guidance documents for the standards revision committee to follow when they revise the content standards and academic achievement descriptors. The mathematics standards and academic achievement descriptors are scheduled to be State Board approved January 2011.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Items have been aligned to the newly revised reading/language arts content standards. These items were field tested during the 2008 Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP) and will be operational on the 2009 Dakota STEP. The same process occurred for the alternate assessment.

In addition, on the 2009 Dakota STEP, 30% of the reading and mathematics items will be refreshed.

As the mathematics contents standards and academic achievement descriptors are currently under revision, items aligned to those content standards will be field tested spring 2012 to become operational in spring 2013.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### 1.1.4 Assessments in Science

If your State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have been approved through ED's peer review process, provide in the space below a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments and/or academic achievement standards in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Responses should focus on actions taken or planned since the State's assessment system was approved through ED's peer review process. Responses also should indicate specifically in what school year your State expects the changes to be implemented.

As applicable, include any assessment (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA as well as alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards for certain students with disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

If the State has not made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to assessments and/or academic achievement standards taken or planned."

If the State's assessments in science required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA have not been approved through ED's peer review process, respond "State's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Dakota's assessments and academic achievement standards in science not yet approved. The system was initially reviewed in May 2008 and the few remaining issues will be resolved through a submission for peer review in 2009.

South Dakota administered a criterion-referenced science assessment and alternate science assessment in grades 5, 8 and 11 during spring 2007 and 2008 that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3).

30% of the science items will be refreshed annually.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

## 1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State NCLB assessments.

### 1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of students enrolled during the State's testing window for NCLB mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and the number of students who participated in the mathematics assessment in accordance with NCLB. The percentage of students who were tested for mathematics will be calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	64,021	63,694	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,387	7,294	98.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	749	99.1
Black, non-Hispanic	1,366	1,354	99.1
Hispanic	1,567	1,547	98.7
White, non-Hispanic	52,838	52,689	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,444	8,397	99.4
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,480	1,480	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,363	22,239	99.4
Migratory students	165	158	95.8
Male	32,901	32,747	99.5
Female	31,049	30,922	99.6

**Comments: The data in 1.2.1 is a result of an file upload through EDEN. The data in 1.2.2 is from our State All Assessed Report. The reason for the difference in the numbers is due to slight variations between the two sources. We are working with our contractor to resolved these differences. 3/6/09 -We believe our file upload contained some duplicate records. Our revised figures are: All Students -62,402/62,148 American Indian or Alaska Native -7243/7158 Asian or Pacific Islander - 730/723 Black, non Hispanic -1316/1304 Hispanic -1519/1503 White, non Hispanic -51554/51420 Children w/Disabilities - 7256/7222 Limited English Prof -2552/2522 Econ Disadvantaged -22303/22184 Migratory students -162/157 Male -32098/31952 Female -30302/30194**

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X081 that includes data group 588, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F, and subtotal 1. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities (IDEA) who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) participating will also be calculated automatically.

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

<b>Type of Assessment</b>	<b># Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating</b>	<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment</b>
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,793	38.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,837	53.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	592	8.2
Total	7,222	
<b>Comments: The data in 1.2.1 is a result of an file upload through EDEN. The data in 1.2.2 is from our State All Assessed Report. The reason for the difference in the numbers is due to slight variations between the two sources. We are working with our contractor to resolved these differences.</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.3 Participation of All Students in the Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	64,021	63,691	99.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,387	7,300	98.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	756	743	98.3
Black, non-Hispanic	1,366	1,356	99.3
Hispanic	1,567	1,540	98.3
White, non-Hispanic	52,838	52,689	99.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	8,444	8,400	99.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	1,474	1,474	100.0
Economically disadvantaged students	22,363	22,224	99.4
Migratory students	165	159	96.4
Male	32,901	32,748	99.5
Female	31,049	30,916	99.6

**Comments: The data in 1.2.3 is a result of an file upload through EDEN. The data in 1.2.4 is from our State All Assessed Report. The reason for the difference in the numbers is due to slight variations between the two sources. We are working with our contractor to resolved these differences.**

Source – The same file specification as 1.2.1 is used, but with data group 589 instead of 588.

### 1.2.4 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Reading/Language Arts Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,794	38.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	3,835	53.1
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	592	8.2
Total	7,221	

**Comments: The data in 1.2.3 is a result of an file upload through EDEN. The data in 1.2.4 is from our State All Assessed Report. The reason for the difference in the numbers is due to slight variations between the two sources. We are working with our contractor to resolved these differences.**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

### 1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	26,507	26,316	99.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,720	2,665	98.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	333	325	97.6
Black, non-Hispanic	508	485	95.5
Hispanic	592	578	97.6
White, non-Hispanic	22,334	22,243	99.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	2,683	2,661	99.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	807	766	94.9
Economically disadvantaged students	8,490	8,417	99.1
Migratory students	51	51	100.0
Male	13,617	13,514	99.2
Female	12,889	12,801	99.3
<b>Comments: 3/6/09 -No noticeable difference found when reviewing the data. Very small differences noted. We believe the data entered above to be correct. Please advise.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New

collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### 1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment.

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

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	871	32.7
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,542	57.9
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	248	9.3
Total	2,661	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

### **1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

This section collects data on student academic achievement on the State NCLB assessments.

#### **1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics**

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who completed the State NCLB assessment(s) in mathematics implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA (regardless of whether the students were present for a full academic year) and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and the number of these students who scored at or above proficient, in grades 3 through 8 and high school. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

#### **1.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science**

This section is similar to 1.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State's NCLB science assessment administered at least one in each of the following grade spans 3 through 5, 6 through 9, and 10 through 12.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do not include former LEP students.

### 1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,843	7,059	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,184	587	49.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	103	87	84.5
Black, non-Hispanic	201	114	56.7
Hispanic	262	171	65.3
White, non-Hispanic	7,088	6,095	86.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,392	864	62.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	533	256	48.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,535	2,389	67.6
Migratory students	22	14	63.6
Male	4,626	3,711	80.2
Female	4,217	3,348	79.4

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 3

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,824	7,806	88.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,184	823	69.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	101	90	89.1
Black, non-Hispanic	192	144	75.0
Hispanic	257	200	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	7,085	6,544	92.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,392	990	71.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	514	327	63.6
Economically disadvantaged students	3,531	2,855	80.9
Migratory students	17	12	70.6
Male	4,613	4,017	87.1
Female	4,211	3,789	90.0

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3**

<b>Grade 3</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science Assessment given in grades 5, 8 and 11 only.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

**1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,777	6,886	78.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,159	572	49.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	98	79	80.6
Black, non-Hispanic	218	125	57.3
Hispanic	234	149	63.7
White, non-Hispanic	7,063	5,959	84.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,459	636	43.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	513	237	46.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,423	2,252	65.8
Migratory students	23	14	60.9
Male	4,466	3,473	77.8
Female	4,311	3,413	79.2

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our previous figure of 1198 for 4th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1459. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,763	7,812	89.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,159	823	71.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	97	87	89.7
Black, non-Hispanic	211	172	81.5
Hispanic	232	191	82.3
White, non-Hispanic	7,059	6,534	92.6
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,459	835	57.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	501	243	48.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,419	2,789	81.6
Migratory students	23	21	91.3
Male	4,456	3,863	86.7
Female	4,307	3,949	91.7

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our previous figure of 1198 for 4th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1459. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4**

<b>Grade 4</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science Assessment given in grades 5, 8 and 11 only.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,893	6,826	76.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,089	533	48.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	85	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	187	111	59.4
Hispanic	234	139	59.4
White, non-Hispanic	7,268	5,955	81.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,252	524	41.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	385	161	41.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,348	2,119	63.3
Migratory students	28	24	85.7
Male	4,581	3,514	76.7
Female	4,312	3,312	76.8

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our previous figure of 1063 for 5th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1252. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 5

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,888	7,658	86.2
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,088	725	66.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	93	89.4
Black, non-Hispanic	184	141	76.6
Hispanic	235	169	71.9
White, non-Hispanic	7,266	6,524	89.8
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,252	658	52.6
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	380	214	56.3
Economically disadvantaged students	3,346	2,610	78.0
Migratory students	28	23	82.1
Male	4,578	3,852	84.1
Female	4,310	3,806	88.3

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. It appears that we may have a discrepancy in our LEP numbers for this level. We are working with our contractor to resolve this issue. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our previous figure of 1063 for 5th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1252. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 5**

<b>Grade 5</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,886	7,117	80.1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,087	550	50.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	104	85	81.7
Black, non-Hispanic	184	121	65.8
Hispanic	233	146	62.7
White, non-Hispanic	7,267	6,209	85.4
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,059	611	57.7
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	381	154	40.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,346	2,247	67.2
Migratory students	20	14	70.0
Male	4,575	3,707	81.0
Female	4,311	3,410	79.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,047	6,911	76.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,112	522	46.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	76	70.4
Black, non-Hispanic	176	100	56.8
Hispanic	216	135	62.5
White, non-Hispanic	7,434	6,077	81.7
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,009	414	41.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	355	125	35.2
Economically disadvantaged students	3,473	2,194	63.2
Migratory students	23	12	52.2
Male	4,630	3,495	75.5
Female	4,417	3,416	77.3

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . The Asian populations saw a slight increase. These populations in SD are very small so a few new students can increase our percentage by 20% very easily.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 6

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,039	7,630	84.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,112	664	59.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	108	83	76.9
Black, non-Hispanic	170	124	72.9
Hispanic	215	169	78.6
White, non-Hispanic	7,433	6,560	88.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,008	524	52.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	346	163	47.1
Economically disadvantaged students	3,472	2,563	73.8
Migratory students	23	16	69.6
Male	4,626	3,757	81.2
Female	4,413	3,843	87.1

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . The Asian populations saw a slight increase. These populations in SD are very small so a few new students can increase our percentage by 20% very easily.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6**

<b>Grade 6</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science Assessment given in grades 5, 8 and 11 only.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

**1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,142	6,743	73.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,032	431	41.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	87	64	73.6
Black, non-Hispanic	210	116	55.2
Hispanic	209	113	54.1
White, non-Hispanic	7,595	6,012	79.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	956	315	32.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	334	112	33.5
Economically disadvantaged students	3,330	1,975	59.3
Migratory students	17	N<10	
Male	4,703	3,476	73.9
Female	4,438	3,266	73.6

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . Both the Asian and Black subgroups are very small in SD. A few more or a few less students from year to year can change our percentage by 20% very easily.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,120	7,626	83.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,033	643	62.2
Asian or Pacific Islander	85	72	84.7
Black, non-Hispanic	198	143	72.2
Hispanic	204	151	74.0
White, non-Hispanic	7,591	6,610	87.1
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	956	473	49.5
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	314	150	47.8
Economically disadvantaged students	3,322	2,454	73.9
Migratory students	17	10	58.8
Male	4,690	3,794	80.9
Female	4,429	3,831	86.5

**Comments: The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . The Asian subgroup is very small in SD. A few more or a few less students from year to year can change our percentage by 20% very easily. . It appears that we may have a discrepancy in our LEP numbers for this level. We are working with our contractor to resolve this issue.**

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7**

<b>Grade 7</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	0	0	0.0
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0.0
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Hispanic	0	0	0.0
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	0.0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	0	0	0.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	0	0	0.0
Economically disadvantaged students	0	0	0.0
Migratory students	0	0	0.0
Male	0	0	0.0
Female	0	0	0.0
<b>Comments: Science Assessment given in grades 5, 8 and 11 only.</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,301	7,030	75.6
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,015	404	39.8
Asian or Pacific Islander	129	100	77.5
Black, non-Hispanic	192	107	55.7
Hispanic	209	117	56.0
White, non-Hispanic	7,750	6,298	81.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,047	322	30.8
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	300	102	34.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,304	2,037	61.7
Migratory students	32	21	65.6
Male	4,820	3,594	74.6
Female	4,481	3,436	76.7

**Comments:** The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . Both the Asian and Black subgroups are very small in SD. A few more or a few less students from year to year can change our percentage by 20% very easily. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our figure of 911 for 8th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1047. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -Grade 8

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,279	7,408	79.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,017	526	51.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	125	98	78.4
Black, non-Hispanic	181	120	66.3
Hispanic	200	136	68.0
White, non-Hispanic	7,750	6,522	84.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1,047	407	38.9
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	280	99	35.4
Economically disadvantaged students	3,298	2,252	68.3
Migratory students	30	22	73.3
Male	4,805	3,704	77.1
Female	4,474	3,704	82.8

**Comments:** The number of migrant students have been steadily decreasing in our state in the past few years which is the reason for the lower number of migrants students tested. . The Asian subgroup is very small in SD. A few more or a few less students from year to year can change our percentage by 20% very easily. 3/11/09 -We have been in discussion with our contractor who provided us with our figure of 911 for 8th Grade Reading/Math for Children with Disabilities. They have determined that the number was understated and should in fact be 1047. We have updated the numbers above with the new figures which are in line with our Child Count numbers.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 8**

<b>Grade 8</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	9,282	6,757	72.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,013	390	38.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	127	89	70.1
Black, non-Hispanic	181	111	61.3
Hispanic	206	102	49.5
White, non-Hispanic	7,749	6,061	78.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	910	311	34.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	283	68	24.0
Economically disadvantaged students	3,301	1,934	58.6
Migratory students	23	11	47.8
Male	4,809	3,575	74.3
Female	4,473	3,182	71.1
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

### 1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics -High School

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,146	5,445	66.8
American Indian or Alaska Native	567	190	33.5
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	63	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	120	48	40.0
Hispanic	139	65	46.8
White, non-Hispanic	7,223	5,077	70.3
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	693	112	16.2
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102	18	17.6
Economically disadvantaged students	1,770	866	48.9
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	4,127	2,725	66.0
Female	4,018	2,719	67.7

**Comments: The migrant subgroup in SD is ver small. A couple more or a couple less students from year to year can change our percentage by 20% very easily.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts -High School

<b>High School</b>	<b># Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned</b>	<b># Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>	<b>Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient</b>
All students	8,149	5,585	68.5
American Indian or Alaska Native	571	245	42.9
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	63	67.0
Black, non-Hispanic	119	66	55.5
Hispanic	137	67	48.9
White, non-Hispanic	7,225	5,142	71.2
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	694	132	19.0
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	100	18	18.0
Economically disadvantaged students	1,770	956	54.0
Migratory students	13	N<10	
Male	4,129	2,677	64.8
Female	4,019	2,907	72.3

**Comments: Both the Black and Migrant subgroups are small in SD. A few more or less students from year to year can cause a change of 20% very easily.**

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

### 1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science -High School

	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
<b>High School</b>			
All students	8,147	5,775	70.9
American Indian or Alaska Native	564	237	42.0
Asian or Pacific Islander	94	59	62.8
Black, non-Hispanic	120	65	54.2
Hispanic	139	70	50.4
White, non-Hispanic	7,227	5,342	73.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	692	167	24.1
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	102	15	14.7
Economically disadvantaged students	1,769	1,001	56.6
Migratory students	N<10	N<10	
Male	4,130	2,955	71.5
Female	4,016	2,819	70.2
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.**

#### 1.4 SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

##### 1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of schools and districts and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
Schools	690	581	84.2
Districts	161	144	89.4
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2007-08 school year. Include only public Title I schools. Do not include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2007-08
All Title I schools	341	281	82.4
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	166	110	66.3
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	175	171	97.7
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – The table above is produced through ED Facts. The SEA submits the data in N/X129 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

##### 1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2007-08. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2007-08
158	140	88.6
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

Note: DG 582 is not collected from the SEA, rather it comes from the Title I funding data.

## 1.4.4 Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.4.1 List of Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the school met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the school met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the school met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing))
- Whether (yes or no) the school is or is not a Title I school (This column must be completed by States that choose to list all schools in improvement. Column is optional for States that list only Title I schools.)
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003(a).
- Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through 1003 (g).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter school data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.4.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>1</sup> The school improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	5
Extension of the school year or school day	0
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	0
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	0
Replacement of the principal	0
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	0
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	4
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	2
Reopening the school as a public charter school	0
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	0
Take over the school by the State	0
Other major restructuring of the school governance	3
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The three schools using the other major restructuring option divided their schools into two separate schools with new educational structure filed with the Department of Education and principals assigned to each new school.

## 1.4.5 Districts That Received Title I Funds Identified for Improvement

### 1.4.5.1 List of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the following table, provide a list of districts that received Title I funds and were identified for improvement or corrective action under Section 1116 for the SY 2008-09 based on the data from SY 2007-08. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in reading/language arts as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the district met the participation rate target for the reading/language arts assessment
- Whether the district met the proficiency target in mathematics as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school met the participation rate target for the mathematics assessment
- Whether the district met the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
  
- Whether the district met the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2008-09 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action )
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds. Indicate "Yes" if the district received Title I funds and "No" if the district did not receive Title I funds. (This column **must be completed by States that choose to list all districts or all districts in improvement. This column is optional for States that list only** districts in improvement that receive Title I funds.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter district data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.5.1 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

<sup>2</sup> The district improvement statuses are defined in LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance. This document may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.

#### 1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

In the space below, briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement or corrective action. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by the State (e.g., the number of districts served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Statewide System of Support The state provides technical assistance to districts with schools in improvement through the School Support Team (SST) and seven regional Educational Service Agencies (ESAs). SDDOE is also supported in its work by its comprehensive center and McREL. The groups that comprise the SD statewide system of support and some of their functions are: South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE)

1. SITAT (School Improvement Technical Assistance Team) represents the SD Department of Education and provides leadership and service in coordinating district/school improvement efforts. This group is currently working with the NCCC, McRel, and the Center on Innovation and Improvement to determine ways to build capacity at the school district level for school improvement.
2. Prioritize assistance to districts and schools.
3. Develop a statewide system of support that, at a minimum, includes the following approaches:
  - a. Establishing school support teams for assignment to, and working in, districts and schools in school improvement.
  - b. Devising additional approaches to providing the assistance, such as providing assistance through institutions of higher education and educational service agencies or other local consortia, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance. School Support Team (SST)

School Improvement:

1. SST person assigned to each district with a school(s) in school improvement:
  - a. SST will contact the assigned school to check on development and implementation of the school improvement plan.
  - b. Assist with school data retreat.
  - c. Participate in and/or facilitate a school-level audit.
  - d. Collaborate with ESA personnel.
1. Recommend approval of the school improvement plan to DOE.
2. Monitor and support implementation of the improvement plan.

Schoolwide:

1. SST person assigned to schools planning a schoolwide program:
  - a. Assist with the annual schoolwide conference.
  - b. Provide technical assistance with writing of schoolwide plan.
  - c. Recommend schoolwide plan approval to DOE.
  - d. Monitor the implementation of the schoolwide plan.

Education Service Agencies (ESA)

1. Provide technical assistance to schools as requested by the district.
2. Provide professional development in curriculum areas.
3. Coordinate school activities with SST.
4. Participate in school audits.
5. Assist with development of formative assessments using the Achievement Series.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under NCLB were implemented in SY 2007-08 (based on SY 2006-07 assessments under Section 1111 of ESEA).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2007-08
Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	2
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	2
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2006-07 and beginning of SY 2007-08 as a corrective action)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on 2007-08 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	10	0
Schools	33	8
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2007-08 data was complete	10/09/08
---	----------

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.4.8 School Improvement Status

In the section below, "Schools in Improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA for SY 2007-08.

#### 1.4.8.1 Student Proficiency for Schools Receiving Assistance Through Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Funds

The table below pertains only to schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.

- In the SY 2007-08 column, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2007-08 who were:
  - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in SY 2007-08.
  - Total number of schools for which the data in this table are reported. This should be the total number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08.
- In the SY 2006-07 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2007-08. No total is requested for schools in SY 2006-07.

Category	SY 2007-08	SY 2006-07
Total number of students who were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003 (a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	6,793	6,474
Total number of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	3,860	3,744
Percentage of students who were proficient in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	56.8	57.8
Total number of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	4,769	4,942
Percentage of students who were proficient in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	70.2	76.3
Number of schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2007-08	44	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.2 School Improvement Status and School Improvement Assistance

In the table below, indicate the number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that:

- Made adequate yearly progress;
- Exited improvement status;
- Did not make adequate yearly progress.

Category	# of Schools
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	10
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2007-08	1
Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2007-08 that did not make adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2007-08	34
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.4.8.3 Effective School Improvement Strategies

In the table below, indicate the effective school improvement strategies used that were supported through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds.

Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5	Column 6	Column 7
<b>Effective Strategy or Combination of Strategies Used (See response options in "Column 1 Response Options Box" below.) If your State's response includes a "5" (other strategies), identify the specific strategy(s) in Column 2.</b>	<b>Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>	<b>Number of schools in which the strategy(s) was used</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, and exited improvement status</b>	<b>Number of schools that used the strategy(s), made AYP, but did not exit improvement status</b>	<b>Most common other Positive Outcome from the Strategy (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below)</b>	<b>Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters.</b>
1		3	0	2	A	
2		16	1	1	A	
6 = Combo 1	Strategies 1 and 2	20	0	4	A	
7 = Combo 2	Strategies 1 & 5; Strategy 5 - attendance incentives, formative assessment tools, books, SES	4	0	1	A	
8 = Combo 3	Strategies 1, 2, & 5 - Strategy 5 - SES	1	0	1	D	A focused professional development and more intensive direct instruction to at risk students
3		0	0	0	D	not used
4		0	0	0	D	not used
5	Not used alone by a school	0	0	0	D	not used
<b>Comments:</b>						

#### Column 1 Response Options Box

1 = Provide customized technical assistance and/or professional development that is designed to build the capacity of LEA and school staff to improve schools and is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

2 = Utilize research-based strategies or practices to change instructional practice to address the academic achievement problems that caused the school to be identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

3 = Create partnerships among the SEA, LEAs and other entities for the purpose of delivering technical assistance, professional development, and management advice.

4 = Provide professional development to enhance the capacity of school support team members and other technical assistance providers who are part of the Statewide system of support and that is informed by student achievement and other outcome-related measures.

5 = Implement other strategies determined by the SEA or LEA, as appropriate, for which data indicate the strategy is likely to result in improved teaching and learning in schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.

6 = Combination 1: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies

comprise this combination.

7 = Combination 2: Schools using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

8 = Combination 3: Schools Using a combination of strategies from above. Please use Column 2 to indicate which of the above strategies comprise this combination.

Column 6 Response Options Box

A = Improvement by at least five percentage points in two or more AYP reporting cells

B = Increased teacher retention

C = Improved parental involvement

D = Other

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

#### **1.4.8.4 Sharing of Effective Strategies**

In the space below, describe how your State shared the effective strategies identified in item 1.4.8.3 with its LEAs and schools. Please exclude newsletters and handouts in your description.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SD DOE shares effective strategies through its NCLB Title Update published three times each year and at its School Improvement Conference held each fall.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

#### **1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**

Note: New section for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

##### **1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2007 (SY 2007-08) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of ESEA and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of ESEA: 4.0 %

**Comments:**

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 83I.

#### 1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

In the tables below, provide the requested information for FY 2007 (SY 2007-08).

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter allocation data.

Download template: [Question 1.4.8.5.2 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#)

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool.

Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of ESEA allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2007-08.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SD DOE's reserve of 1003(g) funds are used for technical assistance for Title I schools by supporting the contracts for the state's School Support Team. Funds for evaluation of the program will be completed at the end of the 2008-09 school year as 1003(g) funds were provided to schools during this time period.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

**1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).**

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2007-08 that were supported by funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of ESEA.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Funds from the state's reserve of Title II A are used to support professional development for Title I schools in improvement. Carry-over funds from Title V are being used during the 2008-09 school year for the state's School Support Team.

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

##### 1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

##### 1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied for public school choice, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:

- (1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
- (2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
- (3) Students who previously transferred under Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	12,366
Applied to transfer	26
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	24

Indicate in the table below the categories of students that are included in the count of eligible students.

	Yes/No
Enrolled in a school identified for improvement	Yes
Transferred in the current school year, only	No
Transferred in a prior year and in the current year	Yes
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

	<b>Amount</b>
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	\$ 23,093
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

In the table below provide the number of LEAs in your State that are unable to provide public school choice options to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level are in school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring.
2. LEA only has a single school at the grade level of the school at which students are eligible for public school choice
3. LEA's schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable.

	<b># LEAs</b>
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	15
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### FAQs about public school choice:

*a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?*

An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a choice program) that receives Title I funds and has been identified, under the statute, as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; and
- Has elected to enroll, at some point since July 1, 2002 (the effective date of the Title I choice provisions), and after the home school has been identified as in need of improvement, in a school<sup>3</sup> that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

*b. How do States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (e.g., LEAs in which all schools in a grade level are in school improvement, LEAs that have only a single school at that grade level, or LEAs whose schools are so remote from one another that choice is impracticable)? For those LEAs, States should count as eligible all students who attend identified Title I schools. States should report that no eligible schools or students were provided the option to transfer and should provide an explanation why choice is not possible within the LEA in the Comment Section.*

<sup>3</sup> Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html>.

### 1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

#### 1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	5,527
Applied for supplemental educational services	467
Received supplemental educational services	351
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	\$ 406,079
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

This section collects data on "highly qualified" teachers as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA.

### 1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of ESEA) and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data. The percentages used for high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in 1.5.3.

School Type	# of Core Academic Classes (Total)	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	# of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All schools	16,343	16,080	98.4	263	1.6
Elementary level					
High-poverty schools	1,050	1,011	96.3	39	3.7
Low-poverty schools	1,328	1,306	98.3	22	1.7
All elementary schools	8,883	8,759	98.6	124	1.4
Secondary level					
High-poverty schools	1,290	1,234	95.7	56	4.3
Low-poverty schools	1,595	1,574	98.7	21	1.3
All secondary schools	7,460	7,321	98.1	139	1.9

**Comments: When formulating the data for CSPR I, it was noted that in the FAQ's (d), there is a question regarding the reporting of 6th, 7th, and 8th grade classes. Specifically, should they be reported in the Elementary or the Secondary Category? In South Dakota the middle school level should be included with the Elementary Category. The Totals for Elementary did not include the Middle School for the 2006-2007 school year. After a review, it was determined that the middle school should be included in the 2007-2008 data. This change impacts both sets of numbers. Clarification provided by Carla Leingang on 3/11/2009**

Do the data in Table 1.5.1 above include classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects?

Data table includes classes taught by special education teachers who provide direct instruction core academic subjects.

Yes

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In addition to the special education teachers who provide direct instruction for core content areas, we also included those that collaborate with the regular classroom teacher.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The response depends on how the school is structured. Typically, KG-4 is self-contained and 5-8 is departmentalized. Some elementary

schools employ self-contained teachers and those assignments are counted once. The elementary schools with departmentalized settings are counted multiple times by each assignment.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

**FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:**

- a. *What are the core academic subjects? English, reading/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.*
- b. *How is a teacher defined? An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded 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]*
- c. *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% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].*
- d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the 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. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.*
- e. *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.*
- f. *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 the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.*
- g. *What is a "high-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*
- h. *What is a "low-poverty school"? Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.*

**1.5.2 Reasons Core Academic Classes Are Taught by Teachers Who Are Not Highly Qualified**

In the table below, estimate the percentages for each of the reasons why teachers who are not highly qualified teach core academic classes. For example, if 900 elementary classes were taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, what percentage of those 900 classes falls into each of the categories listed below? If the three reasons provided at each grade level are not sufficient to explain why core academic classes at a particular grade level are taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, use the row labeled "other" and explain the additional reasons. The total of the reasons is calculated automatically for each grade level and must equal 100% at the elementary level and 100% at the secondary level.

**Note:** Use the numbers of core academic classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified from 1.5.1 for both elementary school classes (1.5.2.1) and for secondary school classes (1.5.2.2) as your starting point.

	Percentage
<b>Elementary School Classes</b>	
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	61.0
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	3.0
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	7.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	29.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those individuals who are not highly qualified because they do not meet Full-State Certificaton AND Competency.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
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)	64.0
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	11.0
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	6.0
Other (please explain in comment box below)	19.0
Total	100.0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those individuals who are not highly qualified because they do not meet Full-State Certificaton AND Competency.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the poverty quartiles breaks used in determining high-and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine the poverty quartiles. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	56.5	25.6
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
Secondary schools	39.5	17.8
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced Lunch	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- a. *How are the poverty quartiles determined? Separately rank order elementary and secondary schools from highest to lowest on your percentage poverty measure. Divide the list into four 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.*
- b. *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 through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.*

## 1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

This section collects annual performance and accountability data on the implementation of Title III programs.

### 1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

#### Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs = Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html>.**
2. **Other Language = Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.**

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual	
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Lakota and Dakota
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
No	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

### 1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of ALL LEP students in the State. LEP students are defined as all students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State ELP assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined in Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,745
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.2.2 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of the number of LEP students who received services in Title III language instructional education programs.

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4,167
<b>Comments: Districts and Consortiums: Andes Central, Rapid City, Sioux Falls, Huron, Flandreau, Shannon County, Todd County, Leola Consortium, Mid-central Consortium.</b>	

Source – The SEA submits the data in file N/X116 that contains data group ID 648, category set A.

### 1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Lakota	2,123
Spanish	1,196
Hutterite	469
Dakota	176
German	168

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121(b)(1).

#### 1.6.3.1.1 ALL LEP Participation in State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,618
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	549
Total	4,167
<b>Comments: The students not tested are from BIA Schools, Private Schools and Title VII Programs that could not receive funding from both Title III and Title VII for programming.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	772
Percent proficient or above on State annual ELP assessment	18.5
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Participation in English Language Proficiency

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students participating in the annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	<b>#</b>
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	2,803
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	815
Total	3,618
<b>Comments: ....</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

In the table below, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12.

#### Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Making Progress = Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
2. **ELP Attainment = Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.**
3. **Results = Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.**

	<b>Results</b>	
	<b>#</b>	<b>%</b>
Making progress	759	27.0
ELP attainment	546	19.0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

#### 1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised

question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB 831.

#### 1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for NCLB accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
N/A
<b>Comments:</b>

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

#### 1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the unduplicated count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program funded by Title III into classrooms that are not tailored for LEP students.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Year One = Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.**
2. **# Year Two = Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.**
3. **Total = Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.**

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
397	565	962
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### **Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
721	201	27.9	520
<b>Comments: Grades 3-8 and 11 tested only</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
721	157	21.8	564
<b>Comments: Grades 3-8 and 11</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned into classrooms not designed for LEP students and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

#### Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.**
2. **# At or Above Proficient = State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.**
3. **% Results = Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.**
4. **# Below proficient = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment. This will be automatically calculated.**

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
721	201	27.9	520
<b>Comments:</b>			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. Note: New or substantially revised question for the SY 2007-08 CSPR.

Proposed under OMB 831.

### 1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

#### 1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do not leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do not double count subgrantees by category.

**Note: Do not** include number of subgrants made under Section 3114(d)(1) from funds reserved for education programs and activities for immigrant children and youth. (Report Section 3114(d)(1) subgrants in 1.6.5.1 ONLY.)

	#
Total number of subgrantees for the year	9
Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	1
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	1
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	1
Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	1
Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	8
Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2006-07 and 2007-08)	8
Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2007-08 for not meeting Title III AMAOs	8
Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08)	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met all three Title III AMAOs.

**Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting each** State-set target for each objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	<u>No</u>
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs or activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs or activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

This section collects data on education programs and activities for immigrant students.

### 1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

In the table below, report the unduplicated number of immigrant students enrolled in the State and who participated in qualifying educational programs under Section 3114(d)(1).

#### Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled = Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.**
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program = 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. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).**
3. **3114(d)(1) Subgrants = Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do not include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.**

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
197	57	1

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs as required under Section 3123(b)(5).

### 1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

**Note: Section 3301(8) – The term 'Language instruction educational program' means an instruction course – (A) in which a limited English proficient child is placed for the purpose of developing and attaining English proficiency, while meeting challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards, as required by Section 1111(b)(1); and (B) that may make instructional use of both English and a child's native language to enable the child to develop and attain English proficiency and may include the participation of English proficient children if such course is designed to enable all participating children to become proficient in English and a second language.**

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	47
Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	10

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

\* This number should be the total additional teachers needed for the next 5 years, not the number needed for each year. Do not include the number of teachers currently working in Title III English language instruction educational programs.

### 1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the table below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meets the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

#### **Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **Professional Development Topics = Subgrantee activities for professional development topics required under Title III.**
2. **# Subgrantees = Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1.1 and 1.6.4.1.)**
3. **Total Number of Participants = Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development (PD) activities reported.**
4. **Total = Number of all participants in PD activities.**

<b>Type of Professional Development Activity</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	9	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	9	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	9	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	9	
Other (Explain in comment box)	0	
<b>Participant Information</b>	<b># Subgrantees</b>	<b># Participants</b>
PD provided to content classroom teachers	9	97
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	9	97
PD provided to principals	9	9
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	9	2
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	9	28
PD provided to community based organization personnel	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>233</b>

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

### 1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be in the format MM/DD/YY.

#### **Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:**

1. **Date State Received Allocation = Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).**
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees = Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.**
3. **# of Days/\$\$ Distribution = Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.**

Example: State received SY 2007-08 funds July 1, 2007, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2007, for SY 2007-08 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

<b>Date State Received Allocation</b>	<b>Date Funds Available to Subgrantees</b>	<b># of Days/\$\$ Distribution</b>
07/01/07	07/15/07	15
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Provide the money immediately to the subgrantees.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

In the table below, provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous, as determined by the State, by the start of the school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, refer to Section B "Identifying Persistently Dangerous Schools" in the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.pdf>.

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

### 1.8.1 Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Graduation Rate
All Students	88.4
American Indian or Alaska Native	61.4
Asian or Pacific Islander	91.7
Black, non-Hispanic	78.0
Hispanic	69.5
White, non-Hispanic	91.5
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	79.4
Limited English proficient	64.1
Economically disadvantaged	79.7
Migratory students	80.0
Male	87.7
Female	89.0
<b>Comments: Graduation rate calculations based on State's Grad Rate Formula.</b>	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: C SPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online C SPR collection tool.

#### FAQs on graduation rates:

- a. *What is the graduation rate? 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.
- b. *What if the data collection system is not in place for the collection of graduate rates? 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.*

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

### 1.8.2 Dropout Rates

In the table below, provide the dropout rates calculated using the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's (NCES) Common Core of Data (CCD) for the previous school year (SY 2006-07). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Student Group	Dropout Rate
All Students	1.3
American Indian or Alaska Native	4.1
Asian or Pacific Islander	0.9
Black, non-Hispanic	1.2
Hispanic	2.5
White, non-Hispanic	0.9
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	1.3
Limited English proficient	3.2
Economically disadvantaged	1.8
Migratory students	1.6
Male	1.3
Female	1.2
<b>Comments: Drop data calucations made from state's formula.</b>	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### FAQ on dropout rates:

*What is a dropout? A dropout is 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.*

### 1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

This section collects data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento grant program.

In the table below, provide the following information about the number of LEAs in the State who reported data on homeless children and youths and the McKinney-Vento program. The totals will be will be automatically calculated.

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	169	169
LEAs with subgrants	2	2
Total	171	171
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

#### 1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs With Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10	56
K	13	73
1	12	108
2	N<10	114
3	32	124
4	34	109
5	35	103
6	31	98
7	N<10	100
8	N<10	96
9	11	120
10	N<10	71
11	N<10	22
12	N<10	25
Ungraded	0	0
Total	211	1,219
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

#### 1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs Without Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs With Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	33	252
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	146	703
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	10	11
Hotels/Motels	22	253
Total	211	1,219
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

## 1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

### 1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	56
K	73
1	108
2	114
3	124
4	109
5	103
6	98
7	100
8	96
9	120
10	71
11	22
12	25
Ungraded	0
Total	1,219
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.2 Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served

In the table below, please provide the following information about the homeless students served during the regular school year.

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied youth	22
Migratory children/youth	0
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	154
Limited English proficient students	46
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.9.2.3 Educational Support Services Provided by Subgrantees

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantee programs that provided the following educational support services with McKinney-Vento funds.

	# McKinney-Vento Subgrantees That Offer
Tutoring or other instructional support	2
Expedited evaluations	2
Staff professional development and awareness	2
Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services	2
Transportation	2
Early childhood programs	2
Assistance with participation in school programs	2
Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs	2
Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment	2
Parent education related to rights and resources for children	2
Coordination between schools and agencies	2
Counseling	2
Addressing needs related to domestic violence	1
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 – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0
Other (optional – in comment box below)	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual input by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.4 Barriers To The Education Of Homeless Children And Youth

In the table below, provide the number of subgrantees that reported the following barriers to the enrollment and success of homeless children and youths.

	# Subgrantees Reporting
Eligibility for homeless services	1
School Selection	2
Transportation	1
School records	2
Immunizations	1
Other medical records	1
Other Barriers – in comment box below	0

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of homeless children and youths served by McKinney-Vento subgrants.

#### 1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths served who were tested on the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment and the number of those tested who scored at or above proficient. Provide data for grades 9 through 12 only for those grades tested for NCLB.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	107	24
4	98	23
5	88	21
6	86	19
7	90	19
8	88	18
High School	14	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

#### 1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.2.5.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient
3	107	16
4	99	16
5	89	16
6	86	14
7	90	14
8	68	13
High School	14	0
<b>Comments:</b>		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

## 1.10 MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have sufficient procedures in place to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must inform the Department of its concerns and explain how and when it will resolve them in Section 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes.

**Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.**

### FAQs on Child Count:

*How is "out-of-school" defined? Out-of-school means youth up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping.*

*How is "ungraded" defined? Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded, or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a GED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a GED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)*

### 1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	33
K	26
1	26
2	29
3	32
4	17
5	21
6	18
7	20
8	24
9	20
10	20
11	14
12	N<10
Ungraded	N<10
Out-of-school	0
Total	318
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We started the Identification and Recruitment program In SY 2006-07 this program would teach key staff in every school district about the South Dakota Migrant Program. The purpose of the program is to teach key personnel in each school district how to identify students who might be migratory and how to complete the necessary Certificate of Eligibility. The program also provides school district staff with an in-depth training on the Non-Regulatory Guidance Section II. Child Eligibility and III. Identification and Recruitment. The results in SY 2007-2008 have been a reduction in the time it takes to identify eligible migrant children and students and provide them with the program's benefits. The training is timely, well received, and acquaints key school staff with the benefits of a migrant identification and recruitment system. When school staff are well trained the benefits are experienced by the district's migratory students. It has not, however, increased the number of migratory students identified as eligible. I can only conclude that the continued political pressures the program has encountered during the last several years as well as the current change of Federal regulations are taking a toll on the number of families moving across the border from Mexico to perform temporary and seasonal work in the U. S. Families that are already in South Dakota are beginning to seek more permanent work and have not been moving as frequently as they might have in previous years. Employers are also more careful to check the legal status of the employees they hire for temporary or seasonal work.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

<b>Age/Grade</b>	<b>Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes</b>
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	N<10
K	N<10
1	N<10
2	N<10
3	N<10
4	N<10
5	N<10
6	N<10
7	N<10
8	N<10
9	N<10
10	N<10
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	33
<b>Comments:</b>	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

### 1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have had a decrease in the number of sites that operate a regular school year migrant education program. We now have only 3 sites that operate a regular school year migrant education program. Of those three sites 2 sites agreed to operate a summer program. All three sites experienced a dramatic decrease in the migratory student population at the end of the regular school year, leaving only 2 sites operating a summer program. The result is fewer students that can participate in the summer migrant education program, statewide. However, we did have positive results in the number of students participating in summer intersession. I think it might be due to the fact that we used the Consortium program Migrant Reading Net as the basis for our summer program. All the teachers that used the program really liked it and participating students exhibited positive gains in reading achievement as a result of the program.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

The following question requests information on the State's MEP child count calculation and validation procedures.

#### 1.10.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system(s) did your State use to compile and generate the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)? Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)? If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please identify each system.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

What system(s) did your state use to compile and generate its 2007-2008 category 1 child count and the category 2 child count? (e.g. NGS MIS 2000 COE Star manual system)?

Category 1: MIS 2000

Category 2: SY 2007-2008 MEP Program Evaluation Report & SY 2008 Summer MEP Progress Report

Were child counts for the last reporting period generated using the same system(s)?

Yes

If the State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count please identify each system.

Category 1 Child Count:

South Dakota uses a "Certificate of Eligibility (COE)." The following data are collected for the Category 1 Child Count:

- a) Names of legal parents or guardians address and phone number;
- b) Name of self-eligible youth address and phone number;
- c) Name of child/youth including: gender birth date grade in school ethnicity place of birth etc;
- d) Verification which indicates how children's data was obtained;
- e) Eligibility data which includes: last school and residence of children current school district qualifying arrival date status of children's residency qualifying activity of the children's parent or legal guardian and place of employment (if applicable) to help determine PMOL date of enrollment in school the assigned Student Information Management System (SIMS) number any other work performed by members of the household is noted and interviewer comments/verification statements;
- f) Type of work performed at previous place of residence and number of months family resided at previous residence;
- g) Assurance of PMOL assurance that work is temporary/seasonal assurance that FERPA rights have been explained to worker and assurance that parent engages in a migratory lifestyle;
- h) Parent recruiter and LEA representative signatures and dates.

The Category 1 Child Count data is stored in a data management system called MIS2000. The MIS2000's report building function allows the State to customize reports based on the data stored in the system. The Category Child 1 count is generated by using this report building function.

Category 2 Child Count:

The Category 2 Child Count is collected by using the SY 2007-2008 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2008) and the 2008 Summer MEP Project Report. The program evaluation report contains the number of eligible migrant students served in an extended year program and the types of services provided. The summer MEP project report contains the names of all the eligible migrant students who were provided with extended year services and their progress in attaining proficiency in reading and math (pre/post test scores).

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

In the space below, respond to the following questions: How was the child count data collected? What data were collected? What activities were conducted to collect the data? When were the data collected for use in the student information system? If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

Each LEA designate a person as the contact for the Identification and Recruitment of migrant students. That person has been trained by Office of Educational Services and Support recruiters in the identification and recruitment of students that might be migratory. The LEA contact person is also trained in the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Once the COE is completed using information provided by the child's parent the person interviewing the parent signs the COE and asks for a parent signature. Once that process is complete the LEA representative verifies the information on the COE signs the COE and sends it to the Office of Educational Services and Support. Information on the COE is verified by 2 different SEA staff and if found to be accurate is encoded by one SEA staff into the MIS 2000 data management system for storage and eventual reporting. The SEA is the only data entry point for all data managed by the MIS 2000.

What data were collected?

South Dakota uses a "Certificate of Eligibility (COE)." The following data are collected for the Category 1 Child Count:

- a) Names of legal parents or guardians address and phone number;
- b) Name of self-eligible youth address and phone number;
- c) Name of child/youth including: gender birth date grade in school ethnicity place of birth etc;
- d) Verification which indicates how children's data was obtained;
- e) Eligibility data which includes: last school and residence of children current school district qualifying arrival date status of children's residency qualifying activity of the children's parent or legal guardian and place of employment (if applicable) to help determine PMOL date of enrollment in school the assigned Student Information Management System (SIMS) number any other work performed by members of the household is noted and interviewer comments/verification statements;
- f) Type of work performed at previous place of residence and number of months family resided at previous residence;
- g) Assurance of PMOL assurance that work is temporary/seasonal assurance that FERPA rights have been explained to worker and assurance that parent engages in a migratory lifestyle;
- h) Parent recruiter and LEA representative signatures and dates.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

School district staff that are designated as the contact person for the identification and recruitment of migrant students are trained by SEA recruiters in the collection and reporting of child and family data. LEA designees conduct family interviews review school records and use family data from all available sources to complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is completed after a "face-to-face" interview has been conducted with the parent or guardian or eligible youth. COEs are signed by the LEA migrant recruiter designee, parent, and verified by the LEA Representative. Because of the free school meals program that eligible migrant families can acquire, most school district superintendents and principals are now completing COEs when migratory parents come to school to enroll their children. Annually each LEA is also provided with I & R Training Packets that can be used for district education program inservice training. The packet contains a copy of the COE a ID & R training manual and a copy of the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title I Part C.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count please describe each set of procedures.

Category 1 Child Count:

The data collection process is explained in the previous question. The Category I Child Count data collection process is a year-round data collection process maintained by the South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE). The only site that has final determination of eligibility and resolves all data anomalies is SDDOE. All quality control procedures are implemented by SDDOE and all data entry is completed by SDDOE.

The Category I Child Count data is stored in a data management system called MIS2000. The MIS2000's report building function allows the State to customize reports based on the data stored in the system. The Category Child 1 count is generated by using this report

building function.

Category 2 Child Count: The Category 2 Child Count is collected by using the SY 2007-2008 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2008) and the 2008 Summer MEP Project Report. The program evaluation report contains the number of eligible migrant students served in an extended year program and the types of services provided. The Summer MEP Project Report contains the names and unique identification number of all the eligible migrant students who were provided with extended year services and reports their progress in attaining proficiency in reading and math using pre and post test scores.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count information is updated daily or as new COEs are submitted by LEAs or ID & R recruiters and verified by SEA staff. The SEA is the sole data entry point for all COEs verified and encoded into the MIS 2000 data management system. Two staff persons at the SEA will verify all COEs and reconcile any discrepancies in data or information. Once all discrepancies are resolved the individual COE data will be recorded into the MIS 2000 data base. After the end of the "count year" (August 31 of each year) the person who encodes all data into the MIS 2000 generates a report of all identified migrant children by school district of residence. That report is sent to each LEA superintendent or the MEP project director of each school district in the state for updating and verification. If a student's parent(s) maintains residence in the district and the student's eligibility has not expired district personnel return the list of eligible students with a request to re-enroll the eligible migrant student(s). If a student has moved out of the district during the count year, the date of the move and the eventual residence (if known) are submitted to the SEA. An authorized representative of the district must sign this report and return it to the SEA. Once that information is verified by SEA staff encoding the updated COE information the MIS 2000 is updated with the eligible migrant students residing in South Dakota's school districts during the count year. The MIS 2000 runs a report of duplicate names; those duplications are eliminated by checking both SEA and LEA data bases. The data is compiled using the MIS 2000 the Category 1 count is generated and reported to the federal Office of Migrant Education as requested.

If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For purposes of generating the Category 1 Child Count the State of South Dakota uses the South Dakota Department of Education Office of Educational Services and Support as the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. A Senior Secretary assigned to the migrant education program and the State Director of Migrant Education Programs both review every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000 data management system. Information on a COE that requires clarification and/or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. When necessary a phone call is made to the school district administrator employer migrant parent or recruiter who completed and verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000 data management system. This data entry process occurs on an on-going basis throughout the year. An MEP or local school district might update their information by conducting home visits when appropriate or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the school year. Preschool student information is verified by the school district through home visits when appropriate by making a phone call or by visiting with the parent during school hours. Self-eligible youth are usually verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is normally done with a phone call to the last known residence. If the State of South Dakota cannot verify a residence the child or youth is not included in the Category 1 Child Count.

The MIS 2000 allows the SEA to withdraw a child from the child count on the last day the child was enrolled in an LEA. Upon re-enrollment in the same LEA at the start of the Fall Semester the child's migratory status would be updated as an eligible child for purposes of the Migrant Child Count. Should the child's 36 months of eligibility have expired during this time the MIS 2000 would automatically generate a report of termination. The data used to document enrollment and termination dates is taken from the COE and is verified and updated annually by the authorized LEA administrator. Duplication of identified migrant students is avoided by comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student in a report of duplicates generated by the MIS 2000. All duplicated names are researched, eligibility verified and duplications resolved.

Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS 2000 data management system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts are provided with an MIS 2000 printout of all students in the district who were identified as eligible migratory students during the count year. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Forms are returned to the SEA and discrepancies are discussed by phone with the LEA administrator. All discrepancies are resolved prior to final child count report.

Category 2 data are collected when project reports and the annual MEP Evaluation Reports are completed by district MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names and unique identification number of all migrant students who received MEP funded

summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP must complete the annual MEP Evaluation Report. The evaluation report contains the Participation Table for Summer Services used to report the number of children served during summer intersession. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked to verify that the count of students reported in the project report matches the count reported on the MEP Evaluation Report. Currently we are providing summer services to those eligible migrant students who were enrolled in an MEP during the current school year (August 15 through June 15) and who still reside in the district or to migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession and verified to be eligible by the SEA. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students can be provided with summer intersession services.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, respond to the following question: How was each child count calculated? Please describe the compilation process and edit functions that are built into your student information system(s) specifically to produce an accurate child count. In particular, describe how your system includes and counts only:

- children who were between age 3 through 21;
- children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a last qualifying move, had a qualifying activity);
- children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period (September 1 through August 31);
- children who—in the case of Category 2—received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession term; and
- children once per age/grade level for each child count category.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

-How was each child count calculated?

Category 1 Child Count: All COEs are generated by individual school district personnel, or by a recruiter from the South Dakota Department of Education and mailed or delivered to the department. The South Dakota Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. A Senior Secretary assigned to the migrant education program and the State Director of Migrant Education Programs review every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000. Information that requires clarification or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. When necessary a phone call is made to the school administrator employer migrant parent or recruiter that verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and verified clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000. This data entry process occurs on an on-going basis. An MEP or school district updates information by conducting home visits or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the year. Self-eligible youth are verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is done with a phone call to the last known residence. If residence cannot be verified the youth is not included in the Category 1 Count.

The MIS 2000 allows the SEA to withdraw a child on the last day the child was enrolled in an LEA. Upon re-enrollment in the same LEA at the start of the Fall Semester the child's migratory status would be updated as an eligible child for purposes of the Child Count. Should the child's 36 months of eligibility have expired during this time the MIS 2000 would automatically generate a report of termination. The data used to document enrollment and termination dates is taken from the COE and is verified and updated annually by the authorized LEA administrator. Duplication of identified migrant students is avoided by comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student. All duplicated names are researched and eligibility reverified.

Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS 2000 tracking system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts are provided with an MIS 2000 printout of all students in the district identified as eligible migratory students. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Discrepancies are discussed and resolved with the LEA administrator. Category 2 data are collected when project reports submitted as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP completes the MEP Evaluation Report and summer intersession participation is recorded in the evaluation report. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked..

Summer intersession is provided to those migrant students enrolled and residing in an MEP during the recent school year (August 15 through June 1) or to eligible migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students. -children who were between age 3 through 21; -children who met the program eligibility criteria

All migrant data is entered into the MIS 2000 data collection system by an SEA data entry operator. The system provides a report building feature that allows the data entry person to design the reports needed to verify Category 1 Count. The SD Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the system. No MEP has the ability to encode data or generate reports. SEA data entry personnel build a report to determine the exact criteria for counting only eligible migrant students during the count period of 9-1 through 8-31 of each count year. The

report generates information on children 3-21 years of age who made a qualifying move between the count dates (QAD) and who remain eligible. Only eligible children making a qualifying move during the count year are counted with this process. The SEA data entry specialist verifies the qualifying activity of the parent based on the coded list of qualifying agricultural activities. -children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period

The report building feature of the MIS 2000 generates a "current enrollment report" of the eligible students based on the qualifying arrival date between 9-1 and 8-31 of the count year. A student who made a qualifying move with their parent(s) between school districts or states would be an eligible student and counted once if that move was between 9-1 and 8-31 of the count year. A student who moved out of the district or state of residence would not be an eligible migrant child/youth after the end date of the count year in which the child/youth moved. Eligibility would be reestablished if the child moved back to the state or district and a new COE completed.

-children who-in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession

The Category 2 count is obtained by cross-checking data reported during the MEPs completion of an annual program evaluation report with data from summer intersession project reports with the name and SIMS numbers of each migrant child participating in the summer program. The SEA collects a unique SIMS identification number on the COE of each identified migrant student in the state and compares - children once per age/grade level for each child count category

Category 1: Data entry personnel build a report to search for duplicate students by determining the exact criteria for counting only eligible migrant students during the count period of 9-1 through 8-31 of each year. The report generates information on children 3-21 years of age who made a qualifying move between the count dates (qualifying arrival date) and who remain eligible. Duplicate names and birth date are generated by an MIS 2000 report asking for duplicate names and dates. If determined necessary the data entry personnel will call the school district of record to discuss duplicate students. The SEA also uses the unique SIMS number of each identified migrant student to locate any duplicate students or to verify the existence of duplicate students. We added the SIMS number, a unique student number currently assigned to all school age children in South Dakota, to the COE during the summer of 2003.

Category 2: Only those children and youth determined to be eligible under the Category 1 Child Count can be counted as a Category 2 child. As part of the project report for summer services, MEPs report the names and SIMS numbers of participating children. This data is used to verify eligibility for services when it is compared to data reported as part of the MEP Evaluation Report each fall and compared to the list of eligible Category 1 children.

If your State's category 2 count was generated using a different system from the category 1 count, please describe each system separately.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

-Category 1 count:

For purposes of generating the Category 1 Child Count the State of South Dakota uses the South Dakota Department of Education Office of Educational Services and Support as the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. A Senior Secretary assigned to the migrant education program and the State Director of Migrant Education Programs initiate a quality control process by both reviewing every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000 tracking system. Information that requires clarification and/or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. A phone call is made to the school district administrator employer migrant parent or recruiter who completed and verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and verified clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000 tracking system. This data entry process occurs on an on-going basis throughout the year. An MEP or local school district updates their information by conducting home visits when appropriate or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the school year. Preschool student information is verified by the school district through home visits when appropriate by making a phone call or by visiting with the parent during school hours. Self-eligible youth are verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is normally done with a phone call to the last known residence. If the State of South Dakota cannot verify a residence the child or youth is not included in the Category 1 Child Count.

-Category 2 Count:

Category 2 data are collected when project reports completed as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP must complete the MEP Evaluation Report. It contains a Participation Table for Summer Services. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked to verify that the count of students reported in the project report matches the count reported on the MEP Evaluation Report.

Currently we are providing summer services to those eligible migrant students who were enrolled in an MEP during the recent school year (August 15 through June 15) and who still reside in the district or to migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession and verified to be eligible by the SEA. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students

can be provided with summer intersession services.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

### 1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MIS 2000 includes only those children and youth between the ages of 3 and 21 years that have not graduated from high school. The tracking system automatically verifies that a student has made a qualifying move within the last 36 month time period. (new federal regulations state that a migrant child/family needs to move in 12 months or less in order to maintain their migrant lifestyle. The migrant child/family still qualify up to 36 months but if they move after being in their prior qualifying job more than 12 months then at their new location for employment they will not qualify per the regulations.)

Verification of parent/guardian qualifying activity takes place at the recruitment location (usually the school district) and again during data entry at the SEA. An MIS 2000 report is generated that searches the data base for duplicate names and birth dates. The COE beginning in 2003 includes the unique SIMS number of every identified migrant child enrolled in South Dakota's schools. Use of this unique number insures that an identified migrant child is counted only once for Category 1 and 2 Child Counts. The State of South Dakota is the only data entry point for the MIS 2000. At the time data is entered by the Department of Education data entry person all information contained in the COE is scrutinized for accuracy by both the state director and data entry personnel. If the director or data entry person suspects that data is inaccurate or incomplete, a phone call is made to the LEA district administrator, employer, parent, or recruiter to re-verify the COEs data. All discrepancies are rectified before the student(s) listed on the COE can be encoded as eligible migratory students in the MIS 2000 data base.

Category 2 Child Count data is generated during the collection of data for the Migrant Program Evaluation Report each fall. Children receiving summer services in a funded MEP would be counted as Category 2 children. In order to verify that children served in the summer MEP are eligible children the SEA uses the child's unique SIMS number to make sure that served children are identified migrant children with a valid COE. This information is included in the summer program project report and is compared to data reported in the MEP evaluation report completed each fall.

If a child, previously identified as migratory but not encoded as eligible, turns 3 years of age prior to 8-31 of each count year, the MIS 2000 system automatically updates the child's status when a child count report is generated for a district. The district MEP staff then verifies that the child is still eligible for services and a resident of the district by checking district enrollment and attendance records. For a child turning 3 years of age prior to 8-31 of each year who was not already reported as a migratory child an updated COE is generated and submitted to the SEA for verification and data entry.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe specifically the procedures used and the results of any re-interview processes used by the SEA during the reporting period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations. In this description, please include the number of eligibility determinations sampled, the number for which a test was completed, and the number found eligible.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The following re-interview process was initiated with the 2004-05 child count and continued with the 2005-06 child count. The re-interview process for 2006-2007 will begin after the count is verified and during the summer of 2008, which it has. In order to verify the unduplicated child count, the procedure chosen by the South Dakota Migrant Education Program selects 10% of all families whose QAD falls between September 1 and August 31 of the count year for a reinterview procedure. These are "new" families who recently moved into South Dakota and were not residing in South Dakota during the previous count year. For count year 2006-2007 the re-interview process was completed in the Fall of 2008. A QAD report generated by MIS 2000 indicated that 80 new families had been verified as eligible migrant families during the count year of September 1 2006 through August 31 2007. That would generate a re-interview process for 8 randomly selected families. The South Dakota Migrant Education Project used the South Dakota Bureau of Information and Technology (BIT) as the source for a set of 8 randomly selected numbers between 1 and 80. The BIT used a computer generated RAND function to select the 8 numbers. Listed alphabetically by last name, the 8 numbers selected the families that would receive a re-interview from the state office. All families were contacted personally, when available, by staff from the state office. Alternate methods of contact were used when the families had moved to other locations out-of-state. Those contacts consisted of school district administrators or employers in the receiving school district. Results of the re-interview process indicated that all 8 families had been appropriately identified as migratory. But due to a conviction one of the migrant fathers were incarcerated. Thus the defect rate was determined to be one family was not eligible, The father had not had a job for a long time, he was now incarcerated, Thus not demonstrating a migratory life style.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: Throughout the year, what steps are taken by staff to check that child count data are inputted and updated accurately (and—for systems that merge data—consolidated accurately)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The South Dakota Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. One data entry specialist encodes all COE data sent to the SEA by MEPs or LEAs. The MIS 2000 uses a unique DOE student identification (SIMS) number to search for duplicate names and to track migrant students. The MIS 2000 also uses the 36 month eligibility rule to generate the Category 1 Child Count. The MIS 2000 system also provides the South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) with a list of all eligible migratory students who had a verified documented COE during the period of 9-1 through 8-31 of the count year. The DOE and the MIS 2000 both use the unique SIMS number to identify enrolled students. Any duplicate student numbers are identified by the DOE system and by the MIS 2000. The report of migrant students currently enrolled is sent to each reporting school district and verified. Any children who are not verified as eligible migratory students are not counted. The unique SIMS student identification number is used as a quality control method to verify the accuracy of the count of migratory children and youth. An MIS 2000 report of duplicate students is generated and all duplicate students are rectified prior to generation of the annual migratory child count.

Category 2 Child Count is verified by on-site visits to the summer MEP and by comparing data from the summer project report to the annual MEP Evaluation Report. The SEA verifies the count of eligible Category 2 migrant students by comparing the names and SIMS numbers of served students to the names and SIMS numbers of eligible Category 1 migrant students.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, respond to the following question: What final steps are taken by State staff to verify the child counts produced by your student information system(s) are accurate counts of children in Category 1 and Category 2 prior to their submission to ED? The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children determined to be eligible migratory students during the previous school year have been re-verified as eligible migratory children residing in the school district of residence. This verification is certified by an LEA Representative (school superintendent school principal or MEP director) following September 1 of each school year. The MIS 2000 also contains built-in edit checks to help determine which students qualify for the Category 1 Child Count. Duplicate names and missing data are located by the edit checks and data entry staff is alerted to the problem. The Category 2 Child Count submitted by MEPs are unduplicated counts provided by the MEPs implementing summer services. Only children and youth already served by a regular-term MEP program or determined to be eligible during summer intersession are served by a summer program. Student eligibility is verified when an MEP participating in the summer program reports the names and SIMS numbers of the participating students. Children not documented as an eligible migrant student are not served with MEP funds. The names and unique identification numbers of each student reported in the Category II count is cross-checked with 3 reports. The Summer Project Report, the annual MEP Evaluation Report and the MIS 2000 data base. Annual migrant program evaluation reports and project reports completed by the MEP document only those students who have received summer intersession services. Guidance provided to MEP sites includes information on the provision of summer programs and completion of child count data. Included in the guidance and instructions for completion of the MEP Evaluation Report is the process each MEP uses for category 1 and 2 child count reporting. Guidance provided indicates that children not yet graduated within a 36 month QAD or children who are at least 3 years of age can be counted as participating students. The count period established for the summer program was June 1 through August 31 2007.

When the MIS 2000 system identifies multiple entries for a student with a similar name or similarly spelled name data entry fields are checked using the following procedure:

- a. student's name is checked for exact spelling using original COE;
- b. student's SIMS number is checked;
- c. student's birth date is checked;
- d. student's grade level is checked;
- e. names of the student's parents or guardians are checked;
- f. names of siblings if available are checked;
- g. If unresolved the school district of residence is contacted to verify additional student information.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At this time the quality control procedures implemented in 2006 have been producing positive results and the changes to the identification and recruitment process have produced positive results. One big change that has come to light is the new federal migrant regulations. As of August 28, 2008 The new federal regulation change the way we identify qualifying migrant families. The biggest change in the regulations would be that in order to demonstrate a migratory life style. (New federal regulations state that a migrant child/family needs to move in 12 months or less in order to maintain their migratory lifestyle. The migrant child/family still qualifies up to 36 months but if they move after being in their prior qualifying job more than 12 months then at their new location for employment they will not qualify per the regulations.)

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2006-2007 we decided to use the identification and recruitment process as a technical assistance and in-service training program. We teach key personnel in every school district how to appropriately recruit and identify migrant families how to conduct interviews and how to document information on the required COE. Using our internal quality control process all COE information is then verified by state office personnel prior to final determination of eligibility and the school food service personnel are notified that the family is eligible for free meals within 2 weeks of transmittal of the original COE to the state office. The result has been quicker identification of migrant families better school/parent involvement and a working quality control process that meets the needs of all involved.

It has not, however, increased the count of Category I migrant children enrolling in South Dakota's school districts. We suspect that forces beyond our control are influencing the number of migrant families entering the temporary and seasonal workforce in South Dakota. Recent ICE raids in plants/farms in South Dakota have had a negative impact on the number of migratory families working in South Dakota.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.