

**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 2009-10

SOUTH DAKOTA



PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2010
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2011

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) 2009-10 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 ED Facts 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 2009-10 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 17, 2010**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 18, 2011**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2009-10, 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 2009-10 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 2009-10 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-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

| | | |
|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | | OMB Number: 1810-0614 |
| | | Expiration Date: 10/31/2010 |
| <p>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</p> | | |
| Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2009-10 <input type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2009-10 | | |
| Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: South Dakota Department of Education | | |
| Address: 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501 | | |
| Person to contact about this report: | | |
| Name: Dr. Kristine Harms | | |
| Telephone: 605-773-6509 | | |
| Fax: 605-773-3782 | | |
| e-mail: kristine.harms@state.sd.us | | |
| Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Dr. Kristine Harms | | |
| | | Monday, March 7, 2011, 4:49:33 PM |
| Signature _____ | | |

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I**

For reporting on
School Year 2009-10



**PART I DUE DECEMBER 17, 2010
5PM EST**

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

This section requests descriptions of the State's implementation of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA)* 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.1.1
The Standards Adoption Cycle and Timeline (see attached) was brought before SD curriculum and per review committee before being approved by the State Board of Education on November 29, 2010. At this point in time, SD plan for full implementation of the common core English Language Arts and Math standards will not happen until the 2014-2015 school year. Full implementation of the new science standards will happen during the 2015-2016 school year.

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

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

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, reading/language arts and/or 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 the most 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.

| |
|---|
| South Dakota does not plan to make any major changes this year on our assessments. 30% of the reading and mathematics items are refreshed each year on the Dakota STEP for security purposes. |
|---|

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

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities**1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes**

For funds your State had available under ESEA section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

| Purpose | Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent) |
|--|---|
| To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b) | 80.0 |
| To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results | 20.0 |
| Comments: | |

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under ESEA 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2009-10 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

| Purpose | Used for Purpose (yes/no) |
|---|------------------------------|
| Administering assessments required by section 1111(b) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111(b) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7) | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (IDEA) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| Other | <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Comments: | |

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

This section collects data on the participation of students in the State 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 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 *ESEA*. 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. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

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 | 63,925 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7,765 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 867 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1,608 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 1,756 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,929 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,859 | | >97 |
| Limited English proficient (<i>LEP</i>) students | 1,942 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 24,638 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 114 | | >97 |
| Male | 32,853 | | >97 |
| Female | 31,072 | | >97 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 2,709 | 34.6 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 4,441 | 56.7 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 679 | 8.7 |
| Total | 7,829 | |
| Comments: South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade level or modified achievement standards. | | |

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 reading/language arts assessment.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 63,925 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7,765 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 867 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1,608 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 1,756 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 51,929 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 7,859 | | >97 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 1,942 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 24,638 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 114 | | >97 |
| Male | 32,853 | | >97 |
| Female | 31,072 | | >97 |

Comments: South Dakota has limited numbers of Asian, LEP, and migrant students enrolled in its public schools. The (35) student difference comes from the inclusion of recently arrived students who are LEP and attended schools in U.S. less than 12 months who took the Access test in lieu of the DSTEP reading/language arts test in the participating file. However, in the Academic Achievement file the guidance instructed us to leave these students out. Therefore, this results in a difference between the participating students and the academic level achieved.

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 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 (*IDEA*). Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 2,709 | 34.6 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 4,440 | 56.7 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 680 | 8.7 |
| Total | 7,829 | |

Comments: South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade level or modified achievement standards. The difference of (1) student comes from the inclusion of recently arrived students who are LEP and attended schools in U.S. less than 12 months who took the Access test in lieu of the DSTEP reading test in the participating file. However, in the Academic Achievement file the guidance instructed us to leave these students out. Therefore, this results in a difference between the participating students and the academic level achieved.

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 science assessment.

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Participating | Percentage of Students Participating |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| All students | 27,118 | | >97 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3,037 | | >97 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 353 | | >97 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 595 | | >97 |
| Hispanic | 686 | | >97 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 22,447 | | >97 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 2,895 | | >97 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 614 | | >97 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 9,540 | | >97 |
| Migratory students | 45 | | >97 |
| Male | 13,945 | | >97 |
| Female | 13,173 | | >97 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

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 science assessment.

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|--|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 872 | 30.3 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 1,721 | 59.8 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 284 | 9.9 |
| Total | 2,877 | |
| Comments: South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade level or modified achievement standards. | | |

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students who received a valid score on the State 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, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). 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.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,098 | 7,002 | 77.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,254 | 635 | 50.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 120 | 96 | 80.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 279 | 164 | 58.8 |
| Hispanic | 276 | 164 | 59.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,169 | 5,943 | 82.9 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,516 | 865 | 57.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 534 | 204 | 38.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,919 | 2,577 | 65.8 |
| Migratory students | 16 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,694 | 3,595 | 76.6 |
| Female | 4,404 | 3,407 | 77.4 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,081 | 7,079 | 78.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,255 | 695 | 55.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 113 | 95 | 84.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 272 | 163 | 59.9 |
| Hispanic | 273 | 172 | 63.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,168 | 5,954 | 83.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,516 | 840 | 55.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 518 | 215 | 41.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,906 | 2,615 | 66.9 |
| Migratory students | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,688 | 3,560 | 75.9 |
| Female | 4,393 | 3,519 | 80.1 |

Comments: The Data has been reviewed and verified. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 3

| Grade 3 | #Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | #Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| Comments: Science is not tested in grade 3. | | | |

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,295 | 7,313 | 78.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,217 | 662 | 54.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 127 | 93 | 73.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 259 | 148 | 57.1 |
| Hispanic | 288 | 180 | 62.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,404 | 6,230 | 84.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,383 | 728 | 52.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 366 | 124 | 33.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,943 | 2,657 | 67.4 |
| Migratory students | 22 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,823 | 3,785 | 78.5 |
| Female | 4,472 | 3,528 | 78.9 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,270 | 7,127 | 76.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,217 | 627 | 51.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 115 | 82 | 71.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 252 | 151 | 59.9 |
| Hispanic | 286 | 180 | 62.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,400 | 6,087 | 82.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,383 | 699 | 50.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 342 | 83 | 24.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,920 | 2,545 | 64.9 |
| Migratory students | 12 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,811 | 3,606 | 75.0 |
| Female | 4,459 | 3,521 | 79.0 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 4

| Grade 4 | #Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | #Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| Comments: Science is not tested in grade 4. | | | |

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,181 | 7,013 | 76.4 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,259 | 571 | 45.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 127 | 98 | 77.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 234 | 125 | 53.4 |
| Hispanic | 280 | 174 | 62.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,281 | 6,045 | 83.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,168 | 508 | 43.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 298 | 69 | 23.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,801 | 2,405 | 63.3 |
| Migratory students | 18 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,780 | 3,621 | 75.8 |
| Female | 4,401 | 3,392 | 77.1 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,174 | 6,955 | 75.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,259 | 622 | 49.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 122 | 86 | 70.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 233 | 142 | 60.9 |
| Hispanic | 280 | 184 | 65.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,280 | 5,921 | 81.3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,168 | 510 | 43.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 292 | 75 | 25.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,796 | 2,428 | 64.0 |
| Migratory students | 15 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,777 | 3,474 | 72.7 |
| Female | 4,397 | 3,481 | 79.2 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,179 | 7,090 | 77.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,258 | 594 | 47.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 127 | 89 | 70.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 234 | 127 | 54.3 |
| Hispanic | 280 | 176 | 62.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,280 | 6,104 | 83.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,168 | 591 | 50.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 298 | 72 | 24.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,801 | 2,473 | 65.1 |
| Migratory students | 18 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,779 | 3,794 | 79.4 |
| Female | 4,400 | 3,296 | 74.9 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 9,110 | 7,154 | 78.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,154 | 574 | 49.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 143 | 105 | 73.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 243 | 151 | 62.1 |
| Hispanic | 258 | 184 | 71.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,312 | 6,140 | 84.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,057 | 401 | 37.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 237 | 53 | 22.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,634 | 2,428 | 66.8 |
| Migratory students | 19 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,621 | 3,556 | 77.0 |
| Female | 4,489 | 3,598 | 80.2 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 9,089 | 6,812 | 74.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,155 | 541 | 46.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 134 | 93 | 69.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 234 | 148 | 63.2 |
| Hispanic | 256 | 167 | 65.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,310 | 5,863 | 80.2 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,058 | 378 | 35.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 219 | 33 | 15.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,617 | 2,258 | 62.4 |
| Migratory students | 14 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,609 | 3,261 | 70.8 |
| Female | 4,480 | 3,551 | 79.3 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 6

| Grade 6 | #Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | #Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| Comments: Science is not tested in grade 6. | | | |

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,249 | 7,093 | 76.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,089 | 451 | 41.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 123 | 92 | 74.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 228 | 139 | 61.0 |
| Hispanic | 246 | 147 | 59.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,563 | 6,264 | 82.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 996 | 361 | 36.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 190 | 34 | 17.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,569 | 2,199 | 61.6 |
| Migratory students | 12 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,740 | 3,565 | 75.2 |
| Female | 4,509 | 3,528 | 78.2 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,235 | 6,772 | 73.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,088 | 472 | 43.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 118 | 84 | 71.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 221 | 138 | 62.4 |
| Hispanic | 246 | 152 | 61.8 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,562 | 5,926 | 78.4 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 995 | 348 | 35.0 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 180 | 25 | 13.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,556 | 2,100 | 59.1 |
| Migratory students | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,733 | 3,258 | 68.8 |
| Female | 4,502 | 3,514 | 78.1 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science -Grade 7

| Grade 7 | #Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | #Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|--|--|---|
| All students | | | |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | | | |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | | | |
| Black, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Hispanic | | | |
| White, non-Hispanic | | | |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | | | |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | | | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | | | |
| Migratory students | | | |
| Male | | | |
| Female | | | |
| Comments: Science is not tested in grade 7. | | | |

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,284 | 7,259 | 78.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,115 | 513 | 46.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 132 | 91 | 68.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 206 | 125 | 60.7 |
| Hispanic | 233 | 169 | 72.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,598 | 6,361 | 83.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,027 | 381 | 37.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 218 | 50 | 22.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,558 | 2,298 | 64.6 |
| Migratory students | 16 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,721 | 3,556 | 75.3 |
| Female | 4,563 | 3,703 | 81.2 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,266 | 6,996 | 75.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,115 | 562 | 50.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 124 | 86 | 69.4 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 199 | 117 | 58.8 |
| Hispanic | 233 | 147 | 63.1 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,595 | 6,084 | 80.1 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,026 | 331 | 32.3 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 201 | 39 | 19.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,542 | 2,186 | 61.7 |
| Migratory students | N<10 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,714 | 3,395 | 72.0 |
| Female | 4,552 | 3,601 | 79.1 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|--|--|--|
| All students | 9,280 | 6,775 | 73.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1,108 | 479 | 43.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 132 | 79 | 59.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 207 | 105 | 50.7 |
| Hispanic | 233 | 142 | 60.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,600 | 5,970 | 78.6 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 1,027 | 343 | 33.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 217 | 35 | 16.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3,554 | 2,072 | 58.3 |
| Migratory students | 16 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,720 | 3,478 | 73.7 |
| Female | 4,560 | 3,297 | 72.3 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 8,538 | 5,805 | 68.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 641 | 223 | 34.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 88 | 53 | 60.2 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 149 | 62 | 41.6 |
| Hispanic | 168 | 75 | 44.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,492 | 5,392 | 72.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 682 | 132 | 19.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 98 | N<10 | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 2,133 | 1,078 | 50.5 |
| Migratory students | 11 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,371 | 2,940 | 67.3 |
| Female | 4,167 | 2,865 | 68.8 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next.

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

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 8,535 | 5,965 | 69.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 642 | 288 | 44.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 88 | 59 | 67.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 149 | 80 | 53.7 |
| Hispanic | 167 | 89 | 53.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,489 | 5,449 | 72.8 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 682 | 165 | 24.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 97 | N<10 | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 2,133 | 1,169 | 54.8 |
| Migratory students | 10 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,368 | 2,953 | 67.6 |
| Female | 4,167 | 3,012 | 72.3 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

| High School | # Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|--|---|---|---|
| All students | 8,534 | 5,807 | 68.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 639 | 231 | 36.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 88 | 57 | 64.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 149 | 67 | 45.0 |
| Hispanic | 168 | 79 | 47.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7,490 | 5,373 | 71.7 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 682 | 147 | 21.6 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 98 | N<10 | |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 2,130 | 1,114 | 52.3 |
| Migratory students | 11 | N<10 | |
| Male | 4,369 | 3,044 | 69.7 |
| Female | 4,165 | 2,763 | 66.3 |

Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of LEP students over the past year. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of the low student numbers.

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 public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | Total # that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|------------------|---------|--|---|
| Schools | 668 | 563 | 84.3 |
| Districts | 154 | 146 | 94.8 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 | Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|--|-------------------|---|--|
| All Title I schools | 342 | 274 | 80.1 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 175 | 123 | 70.3 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 167 | 151 | 90.4 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 2009-10. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2009-10 | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2009-10 |
|--|---|---|
| 154 | 145 | 94.2 |
| Comments: | | |

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District NCES ID Code
- School Name
- School 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 2010-11 (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)¹)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

¹ 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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

| Corrective Action | # of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2009-10 |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 5 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | 1 |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | |
| Replacement of the principal | |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 5 |
| Comments: | |

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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) | 1 |
| Reopening the school as a public charter school | |
| Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school | |
| Takeover the school by the State | |
| Other major restructuring of the school governance | 7 |
| Comments: | |

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.

There are seven schools implementing the 'other major restructuring option'. Two have hired outside consultants; two have restructured their internal organization by implementing BLT (building leadership teams) and PLC (professional learning communities); two have restructured their hiring criteria based on their LEP needs; and one has restructured the school day.

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 2010-11 based on the data from SY 2009-10. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name
- District 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 2010-11 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action²)
- 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 \(Get MS Excel Viewer\)](#).

² 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.

The state provides technical assistance to the six districts in improvement through the School Support Team (SST) and six regional Educational Service Agencies (ESAs). SD DOE is also supported in its work by its national comprehensive center and (Mid-Central Regional Education Lab (MCREL).

Each district is assigned an SST. The SST contacts the assigned district to check on development and implementation of the improvement plan; assists with data analysis participate in and/or facilitate a district-level program audit; recommends approval of the improvement plan; and monitors and supports the implementation of the improvement plan.

ESA agencies provide fee-based technical assistance to districts as requested by the district; provide fee-based professional development in curriculum areas; coordinate activities with SST members; and assist with development of formative assessments using the Achievement Series (fee-based).

Two districts are continuing their second two-year corrective action plan. The increased actions imposed on these districts were:

- a) A technical advisor was appointed by the department to ensure alignment of district decisions with improving student achievement. The technical advisor works with the school district and consultant, but is responsible to the State Department of Education. This technical advisor will serve the school district for a two-year period; the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. The Department of Education will determine the amount of time the technical advisor will be required to be on-site within the district and the amount of time to be devoted to the project.
- b) A consultant approved by the department assists the district improvement initiatives. The consultant works with the technical advisor and the local school district, but is responsible to the State Department of Education. The consultant will serve the district for a two-year period; the 2009-10 and 2010-11 school years. The Department of Education will determine the amount of time the consultant will be required to be on-site within the district and the amount of time to be devoted to the project.
- c) District Title I expenditures will be approved by the technical advisor, the consultant, the superintendent, the business manager, and the district's Title I Director.
- d) District Title I funds will be deferred to support the work of both the technical advisor and consultant within the district.
- e) The district will annually receive, and incur the cost for both a fiscal and program audit.
- f) A Memorandum of Understanding will be developed between the Department, the District, the Technical Advisor, and the Consultant outlining the responsibilities of each entity.
- g) The department, with the assistance of the technical advisor and consultant, will develop measurable goals for the corrective action plan.

Of the remaining districts in corrective action, three are continuing their two-year corrective action plan and will participate in a district program audit in the 2010-11 school year. One district is continuing to implement a two year improvement plan with technical assistance provided as stated above coordinate

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 *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2009-10 (based on SY 2008-09 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 2009-10 |
|--|---|
| Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards | 3 |
| 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 2008-09 and beginning of SY 2009-10 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| Comments: | |

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 SY 2009-10 data and the results of those appeals.

| | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|------------------|--|--|
| Districts | 23 | 0 |
| Schools | 33 | 15 |
| Comments: | | |

| | |
|---|----------|
| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2009-10 data was complete | 09/01/10 |
|---|----------|

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 2009-10.

Note: With the exception of 1.4.8.5.3, in section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean refers to FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10.

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 2009-10.

Note: In section 1.4.8 references to 1003(g) mean FY 2008 and/or FY 2007 1003(g) funds that may have been used to assist schools during SY 2009-10

Instructions for States that during SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA after fall 2009 (i.e., non fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in SY 2009-10.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* in SY 2009-10.
 - In SY 2008-09 column, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported for SY 2009-10.

States that in SY 2009-10 administered assessments required under section 1116 of ESEA during fall 2009 (i.e., fall-testing states):

- In the **SY 2009-10 column**, provide the total number and percentage of students in schools receiving School Improvement funds in SY 2009-10 who were:
 - Proficient in mathematics as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - Proficient in reading/language arts as measured by your State's assessments required under section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* that were administered in fall 2010.
 - In the **SY 2008-09 column**, provide the requested data for the same schools whose student proficiency data are reported in the SY 2009-10 column.

| Category | SY 2009-10 | SY 2008-09 |
|---|------------|------------|
| Total number of students who completed the mathematics assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 7,615 | 7,757 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 4,099 | 3,930 |
| Percentage of students who were proficient or above in mathematics in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 53.8 | 50.7 |
| Total number of students who completed the reading/language arts assessment and for whom proficiency level was assigned and were enrolled in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 7,564 | 7,717 |
| Total number of students who were proficient or above in reading/language arts in schools that received assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds in SY 2009-10 | 4,107 | 4,209 |
| 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 2009-10 | 54.3 | 54.5 |
| Comments: | | |

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 2009-10 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 2009-10 that made adequate yearly progress based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 13 |
| Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that exited improvement status based on testing in SY 2009-10 | 2 |

Number of schools receiving assistance through Section 1003(a) and/or 1003(g) funds during SY 2009-10 that **did not make adequate yearly progress** based on testing in SY 2009-10

Comments:

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.

For fall-testing States, responses for this item would be based on assessments administered in fall 2010. For all other States the responses would be based on assessments administered during SY 2009-10.

| Column 1 | Column 2 | Column 3 | Column 4 | Column 5 | Column 6 | Column 7 |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 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. | Description of "Other Strategies" This response is limited to 500 characters. | Number of schools in which the strategy (strategies) was(were) used | Number of schools that used the strategy(strategies) and exited improvement status based on testing after the schools received this assistance | Number of schools that used the strategy (strategies), made AYP based on testing after the schools received this assistance, but did not exit improvement status | Most common other Positive Outcome from the strategy (strategies) (See response options in "Column 6 Response Options Box" below) | Description of "Other Positive Outcome" if Response for Column 6 is "D" This response is limited to 500 characters. |
| 1 | | 2 | 0 | 1 | A | |
| 2 | | 16 | 0 | 4 | A | |
| 3 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | D | No schools used this strategy. |
| 4 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | D | No schools used this strategy. |
| 5 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | D | No schools used this strategy. |
| 6 = Combo 1 | Combination of Strategy 1 & 2 | 36 | 2 | 8 | A | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

| 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

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 during its school improvement webinars held during the fall. The strategies are also shared during technical assistance that is provided resulting from a monitoring visit.

1.4.8.5 Use of Section 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds**1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations**

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2009 (SY 2009-10) 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:

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

For SY 2009-10 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to ED Facts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to ED Facts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools- CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the ED Facts Reporting System.

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 2009-10.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SO 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 are used to develop monitoring and evaluation documents as well as to provide for the monitoring of the grants.

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 2009-10 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.

No other funds are available to assist with school improvement efforts.

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 to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

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

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

| | # Students |
|---|-------------------|
| Eligible for public school choice | 13,960 |
| Applied to transfer | 43 |
| Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions | 43 |
| Comments: | |

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 under Section 1116 of ESEA.

| | Amount |
|--|---------------|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | \$ 30,183 |

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 to eligible students due to any of the following reasons:

1. All schools at a grade level in the LEA 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.

| | # LEAs |
|---|---------------|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | 11 |

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? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of ESEA, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

- Has a "home" or "neighborhood" school (to which the student would have been assigned, in the absence of a school 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 that has not been so identified and is attending that school; and
- Is using district transportation services to attend such a school.

In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

- b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments:

³ 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 | 7,624 |
| Applied for supplemental educational services | 1,252 |
| Received supplemental educational services | 1,252 |
| Comments: | |

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 | \$ 1,734,338 |
| Comments: | |

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 the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, 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.

| | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified |
|------------------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| All classes | 27,261 | 27,014 | 99.1 | 247 | 0.9 |
| All elementary classes | 12,957 | 12,854 | 99.2 | 103 | 0.8 |
| All secondary classes | 14,304 | 14,160 | 99.0 | 144 | 1.0 |

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. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes |
|---|---|

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

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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, K-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 once per each assignment. |
|--|

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 is 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 the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

In the tables 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 |
|--|------------|
| Elementary School Classes | |
| 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 | 76.0 |
| 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) | 11.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 10.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those classes which are taught by teachers who do not meet both full-state certification and competency.

| | 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) | 89.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 3.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 5.0 |
| Other (please explain in comment box below) | 3.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those classes which are taught by teachers who do not meet both full-state certification and competency.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

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. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, 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).

| School Type | Number of Core Academic Classes (Total) | Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified |
|---|---|---|---|
| Elementary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty Elementary Schools | 2,118 | 2,092 | 98.8 |
| Low-poverty Elementary Schools | 3,623 | 3,603 | 99.4 |
| Secondary Schools | | | |
| High Poverty secondary Schools | 1,979 | 1,947 | 98.4 |
| Low-Poverty secondary Schools | 3,310 | 3,287 | 99.3 |
| 1.5.3.1 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. | | | |

1.5.3.1 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 | 59.6 | 27.2 |
| Poverty metric used | Free and Reduced Meals | |
| Secondary schools | 39.9 | 22.3 |
| Poverty metric used | Free and Reduced Meals | |

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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/files/uploads/5/Language_Instruction_Educational_Programs.pdf.
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 |
|------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Dual language | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Two-way immersion | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Transitional bilingual programs | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Developmental bilingual | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Heritage language | Lakota and Dakota |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Sheltered English instruction | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Structured English immersion | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Content-based ESL | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Pull-out ESL | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | Other (explain in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 who meet the LEP definition under 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 under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

| | |
|---|-------|
| Number of ALL LEP students in the State | 4,406 |
| Comments: | |

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 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. | 3,525 |
| Comments: | |

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 |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Siouan languages | 912 |
| Spanish; Castilian | 845 |
| German | 685 |
| Swahili | 136 |
| Thai | 124 |

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

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(a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

| | # |
|--|-------|
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 4,316 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 68 |
| Total | 4,384 |
| Comments: | |

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

| | # |
|---|-----|
| Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 356 |
| Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment | 8.2 |
| Comments: | |

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessment

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

| | |
|---|----------|
| | # |
| Number tested on State annual ELP assessment | 3,447 |
| Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment | 67 |
| Total | 3,514 |
| Comments: | |
| In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO1/ making progress (# and % making progress). | |
| | # |
| Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. | 1,158 |

1.6.3.2.2**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

- Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs)** = State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
- Making Progress** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- ELP Attainment** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that meet the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
- Results** = Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percentage of States making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, 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. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

| | Results | | Targets | |
|----------------------|---------|------|---------|-------|
| | # | % | # | % |
| Making progress | 1,032 | 45.1 | 1,724 | 50.00 |
| Attained proficiency | 258 | 7.5 | 138 | 4.00 |
| Comments: | | | | |

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 |
| Comments: | |

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 *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

| Language(s) |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| Comments: No assessments are given in any language but English. |

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) 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 students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- 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 |
|------------------|------------|-------|
| 92 | 442 | 534 |
| Comments: | | |

1.6.3.6.2 In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 of MFLEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who did not score proficient on the State NCLB mathematics assessment.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 443 | 259 | 58.5 | 184 |
| Comments: | | | |

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

In the table below, report results MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations(3 through 8 and once in high school) 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 |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 444 | 264 | 59.5 | 180 |
| Comments: | | | |

1.6.3.6.4 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for monitored former LEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs 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 total number tested.
4. **# Below proficient** = State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|------------------|--------------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| 143 | 61 | 42.7 | 82 |
| Comments: | | | |

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 | 7 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 2 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1 | 3 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2 | 6 |
| # - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3 | 7 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs | 0 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2008-09 and 2009-10) | 1 |
| # - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2009-10 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years | 1 |
| # - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09, and 2009-10) | 4 |

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

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> </u> No |
| Comments: | |

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 <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals? | <u> </u> N |
| If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated. | |
| Comments: | |

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 schools 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 under 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 Language Instruction Educational Program (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 |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1,163 | 6 | 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.

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 under 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 as a second language.

| | # |
|--|----|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 41 |
| Estimate number of additional certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 75 |

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.

* 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 Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet 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 activities reported.
4. **Total** = Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 7 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 7 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 7 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 7 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 7 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 7 | |
| Participant Information | # Subgrantees | # Participants |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 7 | 80 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 7 | 40 |
| PD provided to principals | 7 | 10 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 7 | 10 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 7 | 4 |
| PD provided to community based organization personnel | 7 | 2 |
| Total | 42 | 146 |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In December of 2009, the Title III and SPED offices conducted a joint conference for teachers, principals, administrators, community based personnel, college professors, and state education employees. The conference presenter was Dr. Catherine Collier. She presented on Separating Difference and Disability.

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 2009-10 funds July 1, 2009, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2009, for SY 2009-10 programs. Then the "# of days/\$\$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/\$\$ Distribution |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 07/01/10 | 07/01/10 | 15 |
| Comments: | | |

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.

| |
|--|
| The state will work with Title III Districts prior to the submission date to determine specific needs of districts and make sure the needs are being met using the appropriate funding source. |
|--|

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 | |

Comments: There were 0 schools identified as persistently dangerous for school year 2009-2010.

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 2008-09). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|--|-----------------|
| All Students | 89.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 66.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 90.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 85.7 |
| Hispanic | 75.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 92.0 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 82.2 |
| Limited English proficient | 63.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 80.9 |
| Migratory students | 20.0 |
| Male | 88.0 |
| Female | 90.5 |
| Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. Actual populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. South Dakota has limited diversity within the state and small student groups such as our migrant population and LEP student group, may show greater fluctuations in graduation rates because of low student numbers. | |

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 2008-09). Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|--|--------------|
| All Students | <3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 10.6 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | <3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | <3 |
| Hispanic | 5.3 |
| White, non-Hispanic | <3 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 3.3 |
| Limited English proficient | 7.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3.3 |
| Migratory students | 4.0 |
| Male | <3 |
| Female | <3 |
| Comments: Data has been verified and determined to be correct. Small student populations may show greater fluctuations. | |

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 automatically calculated.

| | # | #LEAs Reporting Data |
|------------------------|-----|----------------------|
| LEAs without subgrants | 154 | 154 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 156 | 156 |
| Comments: | | |

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths Enrolled in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 | 52 |
| K | 59 | 87 |
| 1 | 36 | 127 |
| 2 | 40 | 100 |
| 3 | 35 | 95 |
| 4 | 48 | 76 |
| 5 | 35 | 82 |
| 6 | 47 | 68 |
| 7 | 19 | 52 |
| 8 | 27 | 75 |
| 9 | 27 | 91 |
| 10 | 14 | 75 |
| 11 | 21 | 45 |
| 12 | 26 | 49 |
| Ungraded | N<10 | N<10 |
| Total | 438 | |
| Comments: | | |

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 <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|---|--|---|
| Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care | 86 | 225 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 304 | 607 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | N<10 | 19 |
| Hotels/Motels | 46 | 223 |
| Total | | 1,074 |
| Comments: | | |

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) | 109 |
| K | 92 |
| 1 | 131 |
| 2 | 103 |
| 3 | 96 |
| 4 | 79 |
| 5 | 84 |
| 6 | 69 |
| 7 | 53 |
| 8 | 77 |
| 9 | 92 |
| 10 | 75 |
| 11 | 45 |
| 12 | 49 |
| Ungraded | N<10 |
| Total | |
| Comments: | |

1.9.2.2 Subgroups 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 | 97 |
| Migratory children/youth | N<10 |
| Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>) | 187 |
| Limited English proficient students | 82 |
| Comments: | |

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 | 2 |
| Clothing to meet a school requirement | 2 |
| School supplies | 2 |
| Referral to other programs and services | 2 |
| Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 2 |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |
| Other (optional – in comment box below) | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 | |

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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 *ESEA* 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 *ESEA*.

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|
| 3 | 72 | 45 |
| 4 | 59 | 37 |
| 5 | 67 | 36 |
| 6 | 47 | 21 |
| 7 | 42 | 19 |
| 8 | 57 | 28 |
| High School | 22 | N<10 |
| Comments: | | |

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 *ESEA* mathematics assessment.

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|------------------|---|---|
| 3 | 71 | 38 |
| 4 | 59 | 35 |
| 5 | 67 | 30 |
| 6 | 48 | 23 |
| 7 | 42 | 19 |
| 8 | 57 | 30 |
| High School | 22 | N<10 |
| Comments: | | |

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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 under 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:

a. 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.

b. 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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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).

| Age/Grade | 12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 27 |
| K | 28 |
| 1 | 22 |
| 2 | 27 |
| 3 | 25 |
| 4 | 19 |
| 5 | 24 |
| 6 | 23 |
| 7 | 13 |
| 8 | 19 |
| 9 | 50 |
| 10 | 32 |
| 11 | 12 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | N<10 |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 331 |
| Comments: | |

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 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 training has been 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. This training is assisting in the identification of Migrant Students and has increased the number of migratory students identified as eligible. This year we also have been able to start a new program in Sioux Falls, our largest school district.

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, 2009 through August 31, 2010. 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).

| Age/Grade | Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | N<10 |
| K | 11 |
| 1 | 13 |
| 2 | 13 |
| 3 | 13 |
| 4 | 16 |
| 5 | 13 |
| 6 | 19 |
| 7 | N<10 |
| 8 | 12 |
| 9 | N<10 |
| 10 | N<10 |
| 11 | N<10 |
| 12 | N<10 |
| Ungraded | N<10 |
| Out-of-school | N<10 |
| Total | 137 |
| Comments: | |

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.

South Dakota had two districts that operated a regular school year Migrant Education Program in 2009-10. Both districts held a summer school. The number of students participating in the summer programs was considered strong. In addition to these 2 school districts, the Sioux Falls School District started a MEP in the summer. This added many new students. The Consortium program Migrant Reading Net was again used as the basis for their summer program. The evaluations of the program indicate that the materials gained through the participation of the Consortium are beneficial to the education of the Migrant Students.

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 the Category 1 and Category 2 child count for this reporting period (e.g., NGS, MIS 2000, COEStar, manual system)?

Category 1: MIS 2000

Category 2: SY 2009-2010 MEP Program Evaluation Report & SY 2010 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 2009-2010 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2010) and the 2010 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).

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 MIS2000 data management system for storage and eventual reporting. The SEA is the only data entry point for all data managed by the MIS2000.

What data were collected?

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

- Names of legal parents or guardians address and phone number;
- Name of self-eligible youth address and phone number;
- Name of child/youth including: gender birth date grade in school ethnicity place of birth etc;
- Verification which indicates how children's data was obtained;
- 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;
- Type of work performed at previous place of residence and number of months family resided at previous residence;
- 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;
- 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 2009-2010 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2010) and the 2010 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.

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 MIS2000 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 I 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 ongoing 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.

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;
- 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 data from the evaluation report and the project report to verify that only eligible migrant students are served during the summer intersession and counted as Category 2 children.-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 date (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.

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.

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.

South Dakota's re-interviewing process was initiated with the 2004-05 child count and continued with the 2005-06, child count. The reinterview process for 2009-2010 began after the count is verified and during the summer of 2010. 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 2009-2010 the re-interview process was completed in the Fall of 2010. The person conducting the re-interview process is an employee of the State of South Dakota and did not participate in the original interviewing process. She has received training at numerous OME Conferences and has conducted these re-interviews in the past. A QAD report generated by MIS 2000 indicated that 252 new families had been verified as eligible migrant families during the count year of September 1 2009 through August 31 2010. We generated a re-interview process for 25 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 25 randomly selected numbers between 1 and 252. The BIT used a computer generated RAND function to select the 25 numbers. Listed alphabetically by last name, the 25 numbers selected the families that would receive a re-interview from the state office. The re-interview process was conducted under the direct supervision of the State Director of Migrant Education. 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 25 families had been appropriately identified as migratory.

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, under the supervision of the State Director, 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 by the State Director 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.

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 are 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 2010. 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:

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

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 changed the way we identify qualifying migrant families. The biggest change in the regulations would be that in order to demonstrate a migratory life style, the 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 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.

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. However, it is sometimes difficult to identify children of Migrant parents because of the information required on the COE. Recent ICE raids have played a negative effect on the identification of Migrant children.