# 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 2006-07

## SOUTH DAKOTA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28, 2007**
**PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2008**


**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:

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

The *NCLB* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2006-07 consists of two information collections.

**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.

Starting with SY 2005-06, collection of data for the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added to Part I in order to provide timely data for the program's performance measures. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0650. For SY 2006-07, Migrant Education Program child count information that is used for funding purposes is now collected via Part I. This change allowed ED to retire OMB collection 1810-0519

**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.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The CSPR is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2006-07 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, December 28, 2007**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 22, 2008**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2006-07, 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 2006-07 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 2006-07 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 |

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

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
   __X__Part I, 2006-07                              ___Part II, 2006-07

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

Address:
700 Governors Drive
Pierre, Sd 57501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Diane R. Lowery

Telephone: 605-773-6509

Fax: 605-773-3782

e-mail: diane.lowery@state.sd.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Dr. Rick Melmer


_____     __Wednesday, March 5, 2008, 11:55:53 AM__
   Signature                                                            Date

# CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

## For reporting on
# School Year 2006-07



## PART I DUE DECEMBER 28, 2007

**1.1  STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

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

**1.1.1  Academic Content Standards**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate specifically in what year your state expects the changes to be implemented.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Dakota has implemented a seven year content standards revision cycle. The reading/language arts content standards were recently revised and approved by the South Dakota Board of Education in May 2007. The next academic area to be revised is mathematics beginning winter 2011 followed by science in 2012, social studies in 2013 and reading/language arts again in 2014. South Dakota extended content for students with significant cognitive disabilities will be revised on the same seven year cycle, immediately following the approval of the general education content standards.

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

**Note:**  Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts has been added to this data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's assessments in mathematics or reading/language arts required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. 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*. 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 made or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Items aligned to the newly revised reading/language arts content standards are currently being developed. These items will be field tested during the 2008 Dakota State Test of Educational Progress (Dakota STEP) and will become operational on the 2009 Dakota STEP. The same process is occurring for the alternate assessment.

All norm-referenced items will be removed from the 2008 Dakota STEP resulting in a complete criterion-referenced assessment in reading and mathematics.

In addition, starting in 2008 30% of the reading and mathematics items will be refreshed annually.

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

**Note:**  The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

**1.1.3 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts**

In the space below, provide a description and timeline of any actions the State has taken or is planning to take to make revisions to or change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics or reading/language arts implemented to meet the requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities and modified academic achievement standards 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 <u>not</u> made or is not planning to make revisions or changes, respond "No revisions or changes to content standards taken or planned."

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

South Dakota has implemented a seven year content standards revision cycle. The reading/language arts content standards were recently revised and approved by the South Dakota Board of Education in May 2007. The next academic area to be revised is mathematics beginning winter 2011 followed by science in 2012, social studies in 2013 and reading/language arts again in 2014. The academic achievement standards will be revised concurrently with the change in standards. We expect the achievement levels to remain the same but achievement descriptors will be revised to align with the content standards. Cut scores will be determined through a standards setting process after the completion of the first administration of the revised assessment aligned to revised content standards.

South Dakota extended content and alternate academic achievement descriptors for students with significant cognitive disabilities will be revised on the same seven year cycle, immediately following the approval of the general education content standards and academic achievement descriptors. The academic achievement descriptors will be revised concurrently with the change in content standards. We expect the achievement levels to remain the same but achievement descriptors will be revised to align with the content standards. Cut scores will be determined through a standards setting process after the completion of the first administration of the revised assessment aligned to revised content standards

The state does not currently have modified achievement standards.

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

**Note:** The subject of science has been removed from this data element.

**1.1.4  Assessments in Science**

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing assessments in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones (e.g., field testing) and a timeline for them. 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*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

30% of the science items will be refreshed annually.

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.1.5  Academic Achievement Standards in Science**

In the space below, provide a description of the State's progress in developing and implementing academic achievement standards in science that meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels, including remaining major milestones and a timeline for them. As applicable, include alternate achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities implemented to meet the requirements of Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

The academic achievement standards are embedded in the content standards document and South Dakota is not planning on making any revisions apart from the existing timeline.

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly part of Section 1.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.2** PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

**1.2.1 Participation of All Students in Mathematics Assessment**

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 63500 | 63241 | 99.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7092 | 7036 | 99.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 680 | 672 | 98.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1196 | 1193 | 99.8 |
| Hispanic | 1396 | 1377 | 98.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 53136 | 52963 | 99.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 9055 | 9006 | 99.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2775 | 2757 | 99.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21746 | 21635 | 99.5 |
| Migratory students | 251 | 248 | 98.8 |
| Male | 32594 | 32456 | 99.6 |
| Female | 30906 | 30785 | 99.6 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested during the State's testing window for 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 were tested in mathematics for each type of assessment will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities (IDEA) tested will also be calculated automatically.

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 3665 | 40.7 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 4729 | 52.5 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | 0 | 0.0 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 612 | 6.8 |
| Total | 9006 | |
| **Comments:** We do not provide alternate assessment based on grade-level achievement standards or modified achievement standards. | | |

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

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

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

| Student Group | # Students Enrolled | # Students Tested | Percent of Students Tested |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 63500 | 63232 | 99.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 7092 | 7036 | 99.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 680 | 672 | 98.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1196 | 1193 | 99.8 |
| Hispanic | 1396 | 1377 | 98.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 53136 | 52954 | 99.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 9055 | 8997 | 99.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 2775 | 2757 | 99.4 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 21746 | 21630 | 99.5 |
| Migratory students | 251 | 248 | 98.8 |
| Male | 32594 | 32449 | 99.6 |
| Female | 30906 | 30783 | 99.6 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.2.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the total number of students enrolled has been added to this data collection.

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

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

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

| Type of Assessment | # Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested | Percentage of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Tested, Who Took the Specified Assessment |
|---|---|---|
| Regular Assessment without Accommodations | 3665 | 40.7 |
| Regular Assessment with Accommodations | 4720 | 52.5 |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards | | |
| Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards | 612 | 6.8 |
| Total | 8997 | |
| **Comments:** Our state does not provide assessment based on grade-level achievement standards or modified achievement standards. | | |

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly Section 1.2.2.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

## 1.3  STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

### 1.3.1  Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who were tested using regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments.

The student group "limited English proficient students (LEP)" does not include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months; and does <u>not</u> include monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students.

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

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

**1.3.1  Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3**

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8843 | 7075 | 80.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1111 | 587 | 52.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 92 | 75 | 81.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 204 | 116 | 56.9 |
| Hispanic | 229 | 158 | 69.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7207 | 6139 | 85.2 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1710 | 1030 | 60.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 537 | 273 | 50.8 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3458 | 2338 | 67.6 |
| Migratory students | 46 | 29 | 63.0 |
| Male | 4498 | 3593 | 79.9 |
| Female | 4345 | 3482 | 80.1 |
| **Comments:** The numbers provided in this file are generated from our State's All Assessed report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.2  Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3**

| Grade 3 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8843 | 7797 | 88.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1111 | 763 | 68.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 92 | 79 | 85.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 204 | 147 | 72.1 |
| Hispanic | 229 | 183 | 79.9 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7207 | 6625 | 91.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1710 | 1234 | 72.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 537 | 355 | 66.1 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3459 | 2763 | 79.9 |
| Migratory students | 46 | 38 | 82.6 |
| Male | 4498 | 3842 | 85.4 |
| Female | 4346 | 3955 | 91.0 |
| **Comments:** The numbers provided in this file are generated from our State's All Assessed report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8972 | 6976 | 77.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1075 | 537 | 50.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 100 | 82 | 82.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 189 | 109 | 57.7 |
| Hispanic | 229 | 134 | 58.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7379 | 6114 | 82.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1596 | 841 | 52.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 523 | 244 | 46.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3396 | 2191 | 64.5 |
| Migratory students | 49 | 37 | 75.5 |
| Male | 4617 | 3548 | 76.8 |
| Female | 4355 | 3428 | 78.7 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 4 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8972 | 7915 | 88.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1075 | 746 | 69.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 100 | 89 | 89.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 189 | 142 | 75.1 |
| Hispanic | 229 | 171 | 74.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7379 | 6767 | 91.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1596 | 1134 | 71.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 523 | 329 | 62.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3396 | 2721 | 80.1 |
| Migratory students | 49 | 38 | 77.6 |
| Male | 4617 | 3974 | 86.1 |
| Female | 4355 | 3941 | 90.5 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.5  Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5**

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8976 | 6987 | 77.8 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1110 | 571 | 51.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 98 | 74 | 75.5 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 167 | 82 | 49.1 |
| Hispanic | 200 | 125 | 62.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7401 | 6135 | 82.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1411 | 685 | 48.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 477 | 211 | 44.2 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3399 | 2188 | 64.4 |
| Migratory students | 39 | 23 | 59.0 |
| Male | 4596 | 3557 | 77.4 |
| Female | 4380 | 3430 | 78.3 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.6  Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5**

| Grade 5 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8976 | 7746 | 86.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1110 | 746 | 67.2 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 98 | 81 | 82.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 167 | 123 | 73.7 |
| Hispanic | 200 | 152 | 76.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7401 | 6644 | 89.8 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1406 | 871 | 61.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 477 | 298 | 62.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3397 | 2650 | 78.0 |
| Migratory students | 39 | 23 | 59.0 |
| Male | 4596 | 3557 | 77.4 |
| Female | 4380 | 3430 | 78.3 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.7  Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6**

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9075 | 6835 | 75.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1046 | 468 | 44.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 82 | 65 | 79.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 201 | 111 | 55.2 |
| Hispanic | 214 | 123 | 57.5 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7532 | 6068 | 80.6 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1192 | 464 | 38.9 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 420 | 164 | 39.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3250 | 1996 | 61.4 |
| Migratory students | 33 | 20 | 60.6 |
| Male | 4677 | 3546 | 75.8 |
| Female | 4398 | 3289 | 74.8 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.8  Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6**

| Grade 6 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9075 | 7676 | 84.6 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1046 | 658 | 62.9 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 82 | 69 | 84.1 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 201 | 144 | 71.6 |
| Hispanic | 214 | 151 | 70.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7532 | 6654 | 88.3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1188 | 620 | 52.2 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 420 | 212 | 50.5 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3246 | 2384 | 73.4 |
| Migratory students | 33 | 22 | 66.7 |
| Male | 4677 | 3869 | 82.7 |
| Female | 4396 | 3807 | 86.6 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9315 | 6643 | 71.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1066 | 402 | 37.7 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 115 | 86 | 74.8 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 168 | 91 | 54.2 |
| Hispanic | 208 | 101 | 48.6 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7758 | 5963 | 76.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1153 | 331 | 28.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 396 | 129 | 32.6 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3193 | 1740 | 54.5 |
| Migratory students | 40 | 23 | 57.5 |
| Male | 4835 | 3454 | 71.4 |
| Female | 4480 | 3189 | 71.2 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

| Grade 7 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9315 | 7593 | 81.5 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1066 | 591 | 55.4 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 115 | 95 | 82.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 168 | 114 | 67.9 |
| Hispanic | 208 | 144 | 69.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7758 | 6649 | 85.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1153 | 539 | 46.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 396 | 170 | 42.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3193 | 2205 | 69.1 |
| Migratory students | 40 | 31 | 77.5 |
| Male | 4835 | 3783 | 78.2 |
| Female | 4480 | 3810 | 85.0 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.11  Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8**

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9544 | 6895 | 72.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1075 | 422 | 39.3 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 89 | 72 | 80.9 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 151 | 78 | 51.7 |
| Hispanic | 179 | 92 | 51.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 8050 | 6231 | 77.4 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1171 | 334 | 28.5 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 293 | 111 | 37.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3151 | 1769 | 56.1 |
| Migratory students | 31 | 15 | 48.4 |
| Male | 4949 | 3529 | 71.3 |
| Female | 4595 | 3366 | 73.3 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.12  Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8**

| Grade 8 | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 9544 | 7443 | 78.0 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 1075 | 548 | 51.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 89 | 75 | 84.3 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 151 | 95 | 62.9 |
| Hispanic | 179 | 102 | 57.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 8050 | 6623 | 82.3 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 1171 | 418 | 35.7 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 293 | 126 | 43.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 3151 | 2037 | 64.6 |
| Migratory students | 31 | 18 | 58.1 |
| Male | 4949 | 3695 | 74.7 |
| Female | 4595 | 3748 | 81.6 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**  The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.13 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School**

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8516 | 5511 | 64.7 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 553 | 155 | 28.0 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 96 | 73 | 76.0 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 113 | 38 | 33.6 |
| Hispanic | 118 | 46 | 39.0 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7636 | 5199 | 68.1 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 773 | 132 | 17.1 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 111 | 20 | 18.0 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 1788 | 808 | 45.2 |
| Migratory students | <N | <N | |
| Male | 4284 | 2766 | 64.6 |
| Female | 4232 | 2745 | 64.9 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X075 that is data group 583, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.3.14 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School**

| High School | # Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned | # Students Scoring at or Above Proficient | Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| All students | 8516 | 5951 | 69.9 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 553 | 244 | 44.1 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 96 | 65 | 67.7 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 113 | 45 | 39.8 |
| Hispanic | 118 | 63 | 53.4 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 7636 | 5534 | 72.5 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 773 | 158 | 20.4 |
| Limited English proficient (LEP) students | 111 | 21 | 18.9 |
| Economically disadvantaged students | 1788 | 981 | 54.9 |
| Migratory students | <N | <N | |
| Male | 4284 | 2858 | 66.7 |
| Female | 4232 | 3093 | 73.1 |
| **Comments:** All calculations provided from our State Assessment Report. | | | |

Source – Initially prepopulated by ED*Facts* in file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under NCLB, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:** The addition of the total number of students with an assigned proficiency level is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 school year. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| Entity | Total # | # That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Schools | 675 | 556 | 82.4 |
| Districts | 165 | 160 | 97.0 |
| **Comments:** | | | |

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

**1.4.2 Title I School Accountability**

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for the SY 2006-07 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 2006-07 | Percentage of Title I Schools That Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|---|---|---|
| All Title I schools | 337 | 271 | 80.4 |
| Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools | 156 | 113 | 72.4 |
| Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools | 181 | 158 | 87.3 |
| **Comments:** Data was submitted to EdFacts on 12/28/07 updating the Title I numbers to 344 with 306 making AYP. | | | |

Source – The table above is produced through ED*Facts.* The SEA submits the data in N/X101 for data group 22 and N/X103 for data group 32.

**Note:** New for the SY 2006-07 CSPR is the data collection requirement to report for public schools and to include data for schoolwide (SWP) and targeted assistance (TAS) Title I Schools.

**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 2006-07. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

| # Districts That Received Title I Funds | # Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 | Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2006-07 |
|---|---|---|
| 160 | 155 | 96.9 |
| **Comments:** | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X103 that is data group 32 and 582. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each school on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- School Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the school missed 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 missed 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 missed the other academic indicator for elementary/middle schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Whether the school missed the graduation rate for high schools (if applicable) as outlined in the State's Accountability Plan
- Improvement status for SY 2007-08 (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 the school is a Title I school (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all schools in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.4.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

**Note:**  Identification as Title I school is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

---

[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.

**1.4.4.2 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

In the space below, describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring. Include a discussion of the technical assistance provided by and supported by the State, including a description of the statewide systems of support under *NCLB* (e.g., the number of schools served, the nature and duration of assistance provided, etc.).

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Statewide System of Support

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

South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE)

1. SITAT (School Improvement Technical Assistance Team) represents the SD Department of Education and provides leadership and service in coordinating district/school improvement efforts. This group is currently working with the NCCC, McRel, and the Center on Innovation and Improvement to determine ways to build capacity at the school district level for school improvement.

2. Prioritize assistance to districts and schools.

3. Develop a statewide system of support that, at a minimum, includes the following

approaches:

a. Establishing school support teams for assignment to, and working in, districts and schools in school improvement.

b. Devising additional approaches to providing the assistance, such as providing assistance through institutions of higher education and educational service agencies or other local consortia, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance.

School Support Team (SST)

School Improvement:

1. SST person assigned to each district with a school(s) in school improvement:

a. SST will contact the assigned school to check on development and implementation of the school improvement plan.

b. Assist with school data retreat.

c. Participate in and/or facilitate a school-level audit.

d. Collaborate with ESA personnel.

2. Recommend approval of the school improvement plan to DOE.

3. Monitor and support implementation of the improvement plan.

Schoolwide:

1. SST person assigned to schools planning a schoolwide program:

a. Assist with the annual schoolwide conference.

b. Provide technical assistance with writing of schoolwide plan.

c. Recommend schoolwide plan approval to DOE.

d. Monitor the implementation of the schoolwide plan.

Education Service Agencies (ESA)

1. Provide technical assistance to schools as requested by the district.

2. Provide professional development in curriculum areas.

3. Coordinate school activities with SST.

4. Participate in school audits.

5. Assist with development of formative assessments using the Achievement Series.

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

**Note:** The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by and supported by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.4.3  Corrective Action**

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|---|---|
| Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program | 2 |
| Extension of the school year or school day | 2 |
| Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance | 0 |
| Significant decrease in management authority at the school level | 0 |
| Replacement of the principal | 1 |
| Restructuring the internal organization of the school | 0 |
| Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school | 2 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.4.4  Restructuring – Year 2**

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

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

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 2007-08 based on the data from SY 2006-07. For each district on the list, provide the following:

- District Name and NCES ID Code
- Whether the district missed 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 missed 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 2007-08 (Use one of the following improvement status designations: Improvement or Corrective Action[2])
- Whether the district is a district that received Title I funds (This column is optional and is used only by States that choose to list all districts in improvement.)

See attached for blank template that can be used to enter School Data.
Download template: Question 1.4.5.1_0607.xls (Get MS Excel Viewer)

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

**Note:**  Identification of a district as receiving Title I funds is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

---

[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 Identified for Improvement**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

Statewide System of Support

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

South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE)

1. SITAT (School Improvement Technical Assistance Team) represents the SD Department of Education and provides leadership and service in coordinating district/school improvement efforts. This group is currently working with the NCCC, McRel, and the Center on Innovation and Improvement to determine ways to build capacity at the school district level for school improvement.

2. Prioritize assistance to districts.

3. Conduct district audit for districts in corrective action and determine corrective action to be taken.

4. Develop a statewide system of support that, at a minimum, includes the following

a. approaches:

b. Establishing school support teams for assignment to, and working in, districts and schools in school improvement.

c. Devising additional approaches to providing the assistance, such as providing assistance through institutions of higher education and educational service agencies or other local consortia, and private providers of scientifically based technical assistance.

School Support Team (SST)

1. SST members review the district improvement plan to ensure that all sections of the plan are addressed.

2. Recommend approval of the improvement plan to DOE.

3. Monitor and support implementation of the improvement plan.

4. Monitor progress of the improvement plan.

5. Make recommendations for further assistance.

6. Participate in and/or facilitate a district on-site audit.

Education Service Agencies (ESA)

1. Provide professional development in curriculum areas.

2. Coordinate district activities with SST.

3. Participate in district audits.

4. Assist with development of formative assessments using the Achievement Series.

---

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

**Note:**  The inclusion of the discussion of technical assistance provided by the State is a new data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.5.3  Corrective Action**

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *NCLB* are being implemented.

| Corrective Action | # of Districts in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action Is Being Implemented |
|---|---|
| Implementing a new curriculum based on State standards | 0 |
| Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district | 0 |
| Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds | 2 |
| Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP | 0 |
| Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district | 0 |
| Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district | 2 |
| Restructured the district | 0 |
| Abolished the district (list the number or districts abolished between the SYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 as a corrective action) | 0 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.6  Dates of AYP and Identification Determinations**

In the table below, provide the dates (MM/DD/YY) when your State provided final school and district AYP and identification for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring to schools and districts based on SY 2006-07 assessments. If applicable, also provide the dates for preliminary determinations provided to schools and districts.

|  | Districts | Schools |
|---|---|---|
| Final AYP and identification determinations | 10/19/07 | 10/19/07 |
| Preliminary school AYP and identification determinations (if applicable) | 08/15/07 | 08/15/07 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 2006-07 data and the results of those appeals.

|  | # Appealed Their AYP Designations | # Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation |
|---|---|---|
| Districts | 15 | 5 |
| Schools | 25 | 9 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

| Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2006-07 data was complete | 09/26/07 |
|---|---|

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.8  Section 1003(a) Funds**

In the space below, describe your State's use of Section 1003(a) of ESEA funds. Specifically, address the following:

- Describe briefly any priorities the State uses in allocating these funds to schools.
- Describe briefly the State's methods for distributing these funds (e.g., formula, competitive, etc.).
- Describe briefly the types of activities supported by the Section 1003(a) funds.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs with Title I schools identified for school improvement under Section 1116 - Title I, Part A are eligible to receive Title I School Improvement funds under section 1003(a). The allocation formula takes three factors into consideration to determine need: poverty, enrollment, and level of need. Grant awards have been set at a minimum of $5000 and capped at $50,000. LEAs will receive an allocation of at least $5000 for each Title I school in school improvement. Some of the Title I schools in improvement are quite small with only one or two teachers. The small grant award has been proven over the past several years to be sufficient to meet the needs of these small schools.

POVERTY

One half of the School Improvement funds are allocated to eligible schools based on the number of children eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program at each school. Each school is allocated funds based on its proportionate share of the total free and reduced price lunch count at eligible schools.

ENROLLMENT

One half of the School Improvement funds are allocated to eligible schools based on weighted school enrollment counts. Enrollment counts are weighted depending on each eligible school's "Level of Need". The "Level of Need" determination process is described below. The enrollments are weighted according to the factors in the following table:

LEVEL OF Weighting

NEED Factors

Level 1 1.00

Level 2 1.25

Level 3 1.50

Level 4 1.75

Level 5 2.00

The funds are allocated to eligible schools based on each school's proportionate share of the total weighted enrollment count for eligible schools.

LEVEL OF NEED

The level of need is computed using a formula that was developed by a study group within the Comprehensive Assessment System for ESEA Title I (CAS) SCASS project through CCSSO. This formula takes into account several factors including how far each student group's performance on the state test is from the AMO as well as the distance from each student group's target for making safe harbor provisions. The scores of these calculations are added together to compute the priority point score. Schools are then rank-ordered according to the priority point score. Schools that have generated the largest points, indicating that the student groups the school is accountable for (groups that meet the minimum N size of 10) are performing the furthest from the goals. The program used to run these calculations was developed in partnership with Edvantia (formerly AEL) and can be downloaded from the Edvantia website at: http://www.edvantia.org/aypmetric. The publication, District Audit Tool: A Method for Determining Level of Need for Support to Improvement, describes the priority point system in Stage 1 and is available on the CCSSO website at: http://www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=295.

Once the priority point values are determined, the schools are then divided into quintiles with the highest point schools in quintile one. The school improvement status for each school is also noted. The number of schools in each quintile, separated by the level of school improvement, is then placed on the matrix. A performance-standard setting process is then conducted, determining the level

of need for each of the cells in the matrix. Schools in the fifth level of need are considered those with the highest need. Each school is then assigned a level of need that can be incorporated into the allocation formula for school improvement funds. Determining the level of need is further explained in the publication, District Audit Tool, in Stage 1.

Title I schools use their school improvement funds to support the goals, objectives, and strategies outlined in their school improvement plan. Professional development and student materials such as leveled reading books and manipulatives are provided to support reading and math goals. Additional instructional staff and home/school liaisons are supported with these funds. Extended day and year programs are among the strategies supported by school improvement funds. Costs related to supplemental educational services are also included in expenses paid with these funds.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.1 Schools Using Public School Choice**

In the table below, provide the number of public schools *from which* and *to which* students transferred under the provisions for public school choice in Section 1116 of ESEA.

|  | # Schools |
|---|---|
| Title I schools *from which* students transferred for public school choice | 5 |
| Public Schools *to which* students transferred for public school choice | 5 |
| **Comments:** no comment | |

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

**Note**: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students**

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

Students who are eligible for public school choice includes:
(1) Students currently enrolled in a school identified for improvement
(2) Students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of section 1116, and
(3) Students who previously transferred under section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under section 1116.

|  | # Students |
|---|---|
| Eligible for public school choice | 13119 |
| Who applied to transfer | 11 |
| Who transferred to another school under Title I public school choice provisions | <N |

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

|  | Yes/No |
|---|---|
| 1. Enrolled in a school identified for improvement | Yes |
| 2. Transferred in the current school year, only | No Response |
| 3. Transferred in a prior year and in the current year | No Response |
| **Comments:** We have not asked districts to provide us with this information. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X010 that includes data groups 579, 574 and 544. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note**: This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.1 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.3  Funds Spent on Public School Choice**

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

| | Amount |
|---|---|
| Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice | $ 24345 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data group 652. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note**: New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.4.9.1.4  Availability of Public School Choice Options**

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

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

| | # LEAs |
|---|---|
| LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice | 13 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**FAQs about public school choice:**

a. *How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs?* An LEA may consider a student as eligible for and participating in Title I public school choice, and may consider costs for transporting that student towards its funds spent on transportation for public school choice, if the student meets the following conditions:

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

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

[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.

**1.4.9.2.1 Schools with Students Eligible for Supplemental Educational Services**

In the table below, provide the number of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement, corrective action, or restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of ESEA. A Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) section related to supplemental educational services is below the table.

|  | # Schools |
|---|---|
| Title I schools whose students received supplemental educational services | 20 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**   This table was formerly part of section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**FAQ about supplemental education services**

*How should a State define the phrase "students who received supplemental educational services"?* States should consider students who "received" supplemental educational services as those students who enrolled and participated in some hours of services. States have the discretion to determine the minimum number of hours of participation necessary for a student to have "received" 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 | 7720 |
| Who applied for supplemental educational services | 273 |
| Who received supplemental educational services | 239 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102 that includes data groups 578, 575, and 546. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online CSPR collection tool.

**Note:**   This table was formerly part of Section 1.4.5.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 | $ 261248 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X102, which includes data group 651. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**   New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.5**  TEACHER QUALITY

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

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

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

| School Type | # of Core Academic Classes (Total) | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified | # of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified | Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are <u>NOT</u> Highly Qualified |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All schools | 16208 | 15863 | 97.9 | 345 | 2.1 |
| Elementary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 1607 | 1590 | 98.9 | 17 | 1.1 |
| Low-poverty schools | 907 | 893 | 98.5 | 14 | 1.5 |
| All elementary schools | 5290 | 5245 | 99.1 | 45 | 0.9 |
| Secondary level | | | | | |
| High-poverty schools | 1251 | 1190 | 95.1 | 61 | 4.9 |
| Low-poverty schools | 2293 | 2225 | 97.0 | 68 | 3.0 |
| All secondary schools | 10918 | 10618 | 97.3 | 300 | 2.7 |
| **Comments:** High poverty elementary schools have a lower %NHQ than low poverty elementary schools. | | | | | |

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain:

| |
|---|

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.

| A full day self-contained classroom equals one class. |
|---|

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

**Note**: The data collection requirement to submit data for core classes taught by teachers who are NOT highly qualified has been added for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 percent 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. See Question A-14 in the August 3, 2006, Non-Regulatory Guidance for additional information. Report classes in grade 6 though 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

e. *How should States count teachers (including specialists or resource teachers) in elementary classes?* States that count self-contained classrooms as one class should, to avoid over-representation, also count subject-area specialists (e.g., mathematics or music teachers) or resource teachers as teaching one class. On the other hand, States using a departmentalized approach to instruction where a self-contained classroom is counted multiple times (once for each subject taught) should also count subject-area specialists or resource teachers as teaching multiple classes.

f. *How should States count teachers in self-contained multiple-subject secondary classes?* Each core academic subject taught for which students are receiving credit toward graduation should be counted in the numerator and the denominator. For example, if the same teacher teaches English, calculus, history, and science in a self-contained classroom, count these as four classes in the denominator. If the teacher were Highly Qualified to teach English and history, he/she would be counted as Highly Qualified in two of the four subjects in the numerator.

g. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

h. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. The poverty quartile breaks are reported later in this section.

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

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

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

|  | Percentage |
|---|---|
| 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 | 55.6 |
| Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE | 0.0 |
| Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 44.4 |
| Other (please explain) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

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

|  | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Secondary School Classes | |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers) | 78.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects | 2.0 |
| Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program) | 20.0 |
| Other (please explain) | 0.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.5.3  Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used**

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

| | High-Poverty Schools (more than what %) | Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary schools | 51.1 | 13.2 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent of students on free or reduced price lunch in that school. | |
| Secondary schools | 37.7 | 15.7 |
| Poverty metric used | Percent of students on free or reduced price lunch in that school. | |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

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

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

b. *Since the poverty data are collected at the school and not classroom level, how do we classify schools as either elementary or secondary for this purpose?* States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools) and would therefore include as secondary schools those that exclusively serve children in grades 6 and higher.

**1.6  TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

Throughout this section:

- "AYP grades" is sometimes used to reference grades used for accountability determinations (grades 3 through 8 and one year of high school)
- "Non-AYP grades" is used to reference grades not used for accountability determinations.

**1.6.1  Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 1.1. of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of Title III subgrantees that use each type of language instruction educational program, as defined in Section 3301(8).

**Note:** Numbers reflected in 1.6.1 can be duplicative due to subgrantees' use of more than one type of program. The number for each type of program should be equal to or less than the total number of subgrantees in 1.6.4.1.

**Table 1.6.1 Definitions:**

1. **# Using Program =** Number of subgrantees that reported using a specific type of language instruction educational program. Subgrantees may use multiple programs. **(a.)** If multiple programs are used, count one for each program type used. **(b.)** Consortium is always counted as **one if all members used the same type of program**. If consortium members used different types of programs, count all members using the same type of program as one for each type. Do not count the members of the consortium individually as one, unless each member used a different type of program (e.g., use the same method of counting as one subgrantee using multiple types of programs in **(a.)**)
2. **Type of Program =** Type of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html.
3. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the program.
4. **% Language of Instruction =** Average percentages of English and the other language used as a language of instruction in the program or use the percentage of the most common practice in the State (applies **only** to the first five bilingual program types).
5. **OLOI =** Other Language of Instruction used in the bilingual language instruction educational program.

| # Using Program | Type of Program | Other Language | % Language of Instruction | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | **English** | **OLOI** |
| 1 | Dual language | Lakota | 75.0 | 25.0 |
| 0 | Two-way immersion | N/A | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Transitional bilingual | N/A | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Developmental bilingual | N/A | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 0 | Heritage language | N/A | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | Sheltered English instruction | | | |
| 4 | Structured English immersion | | | |
| 0 | Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE) | | | |
| 2 | Content-based ESL | | | |
| 3 | Pull-out ESL | | | |
| 1 | Other (explain) | | | |
| **Comments:** Balanced Literacy | | | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.2 Student Demographic Data**

**1.6.2.1 Number of LEP Students Who Received Title III Language Instruction Educational Program Services**

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year. | 3648 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.2.2 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State**

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State. The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of those languages listed.

| Language | # LEP Students |
|---|---|
| Lakota | 1926 |
| Dakota | 164 |
| Spanish | 688 |
| German | 164 |
| Hutterish | 468 |

For additional significant languages please use comment box.

| **Comments:** |
|---|

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

**Note:** This table was formerly in Section 1.6.3.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.3  Student Performance Data**

This section collects data on LEP student English language proficiency and LEP academic content performance data (e.g., LEP tested in native language tables and MFLEP/AYP Grades results table).

**1.6.3.1  Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

This section collects data on the number of ALL LEP students and Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

**1.6.3.1.1  ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency. ALL LEP students includes the following students:

- Newly enrolled and continually enrolled LEP students in the State for the year of this report, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language Instruction educational program;
- All students assessed for English language proficiency (ELP) using an annual State English Language proficiency (ELP) assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the ESEA in the reporting year and who meet the LEP definition in Section 9101 (25).

**Table 1.6.3.1.1. Definitions:**

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) of the *ESEA* in this reporting year.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment as required under Section 1111(b)(7) for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| ALL LEP Testing Status | # |
|---|---|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 3859 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 415 |
| Subtotal | 4274 |
|  |  |
| LEP/One Data Point | 120 |
| **Comments:** The not tested students attend 20 Tribal / Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools and 4 non-public school systems. | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.1.2 Title III Student English Language Proficiency Testing Status**

In the table below, provide the <u>unduplicated</u> number of Title III-served LEP students in the State by testing status for English language proficiency.

**Table 1.6.3.1.2. Definitions:**

- **Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Not Tested/State Annual ELP =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing but did not take the annual State English language proficiency assessment.
- **Subtotal =** Sum of "Tested/State Annual ELP" and "Not Tested/State Annual ELP" (i.e., the number of LEP students in Title III language instruction educational programs enrolled at the time of testing).
- **LEP/One Data Point =** Number of LEP students in Title III language instructional programs who took the annual State English language proficiency assessment for the first time in this reporting year. Note that "LEP/One Data Point" is a subset of those students reported as Tested on the annual State English Language proficiency assessment.

| Title III LEP Testing Status | # |
|---|---|
| Tested/State annual ELP | 3076 |
| Not tested/State annual ELP | 572 |
| Subtotal | 3648 |
| | |
| LEP/One Data Point | 110 |
| **Comments:** The not tested students attend 20 Tribal / Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools and 4 non-public school systems. | |

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.2  Student English Language Proficiency Results**

This section collects data on the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for LEP students. Before completing Table 1.6.3.2.2 or 1.6.3.2.3, please indicate your State's use of the flexibility to apply annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to all LEP students.

**1.6.3.2.1  Application of Title III English Language Proficiency Annual Assessment and AMAOs** (formerly 1.6.8 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, indicate the State application of the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| State applied the Title III English language proficiency annual assessment to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | ___Yes__ |
| State applied the annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to ALL LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds. | ___Yes__ |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.2.2 All LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "Yes" in section 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), that annual measurable achievement objectives are applied to all LEP students in LEAs receiving Title III funds.

Report the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment(s) for ALL LEP students in grades K through 12.

**Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress =** Number of LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N" = did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

| | Target | Results | | Met |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | # | % | Y/N |
| Making progress | 65.0 | 1788 | 49.0 | N |
| No progress | | 729 | | |
| ELP attainment | 25.0 | 1131 | 31.0 | Y |
| **Comments:** | | | | |

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does <u>not</u> count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus the number "Making Progress" <u>and</u> "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.1 minus "Making Progress".

**1.6.3.2.3  Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results**

Please report information in this section **ONLY** if the State checked "No" in section in 1.6.3.2.1 (row 2), reporting that annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) are applied to LEP students served by Title III.

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

**Table 1.6.3.2.3 Definitions:**

1. **Making Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
2. **No Progress =** Number of Title III LEP students who did not meet the State definition of "Making Progress."
3. **ELP Attainment =** Number of Title III LEP students who attained English language proficiency as defined by the State and submitted to OELA in the State Consolidated Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Target =** AMAO target for the year as established by the State and submitted to OELA in the CSA (September 2003 submission), or as amended, for each of "Making Progress" and "Attainment" of ELP.
5. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students who met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.
6. **Met/Y =** Met the annual target, "Met/N **=** did not meet annual target. This cell will be automatically populated, based on the Target % and the Results %.

|  | Target | Results | | Met |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | % | # | % | Yes/No |
| Making progress | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | Y |
| No progress |  | 0 |  |  |
| ELP attainment | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | Y |
| **Comments:** | | | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

If a State does <u>not</u> count "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus the number "Making Progress" <u>and</u> "Attainment." If a State counts "ELP attainment" students as also "Making Progress", the number for "No Progress" should be the "Subtotal" in 1.6.3.1.2 minus "Making Progress".

**1.6.3.4 LEP Subgroup Academic Content Assessment Results** (formerly 3.2.3/MFLEP of the Title III Biennial Collection)

This section collects data on the academic content assessment results for LEP students.

**1.6.3.4.1 LEP Subgroup Flexibility**

In the table below, report whether the State exercises the LEP flexibility afforded States through the new regulation for monitored former LEP (MFLEP), in AYP determination.

| MFLEP | No |
|---|---|
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.3  Status of Monitored Former LEP Students (MFLEP)** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the <u>unduplicated</u> count of MFLEP students in K-12 for each of the two years monitored during the SY 2006-07, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades in row 1 and MFLEP students only in AYP grades in row 2.

**Table 1.6.3.4.3 Definitions:**

1. **Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) includes:**
   - Students that have transitioned into classrooms that are not designed for LEP students;
   - Students that are no longer receiving LEP services; and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after transition.
2. **Total MFLEP =** State aggregated number of all MFLEP students in grades K through 12.
3. **MFLEP/AYP Grades =** State aggregated number of MFLEP students in grades used for accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school). These students may be included in the LEP subgroup AYP calculations.

| | # |
|---|---|
| Total MFLEP | 119 |
| MFLEP/AYP grades | 56 |
| **Comments:** 119 students are identified as the MFLEP K-12 students<br><br>56 students are in grades 3-5, and 11 that are used for AYP accountability | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X126, which contains data group 668, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.4.4  LEP Students in Non-AYP Grades** (formerly 2.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the total number of LEP students in grade ranges that were not tested for AYP in SY 2006-07.

**Table 1.6.3.4.4 Definitions:**

1. **LEP K-2 =** All LEP students in these grades. Do <u>not</u> include pre-K students.
2. **LEP HS/Non-AYP =** High school students (grades 9 through 12 or 10 through 12 [State specific]) who are in the high school grades that are not tested for AYP in the State (e.g., if the State tested grade 10 for AYP, then the State should provide the aggregated number of LEP students in grades 9, 11 and 12).
3. **LEP Other Grades =** Number of LEP students enrolled in public schools but <u>not</u> in grades K through 12. Students in non-graded grades or grade spans. Do not report LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) in this row.

| Grade | # |
|---|---|
| LEP K-2 | 21 |
| LEP HS/Non-AYP | 42 |
| LEP other grades | 56 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 1.6.3.5  Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language.

#### 1.6.3.5.1  LEP Students Assessed in Native Language (formerly 2.4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

| | |
|---|---|
| State offers the State mathematics or reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s). | No |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

* If "No", proceed to 1.6.3.6.

#### 1.6.3.5.2  Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

| Grade | Language |
|---|---|
| 3 | N/A |
| 4 | N/A |
| 5 | N/A |
| 6 | N/A |
| 7 | N/A |
| 8 | N/A |
| HS | N/A |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

#### 1.6.3.5.3  Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given (formerly 2.4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

| Grade | Language |
|---|---|
| 3 | N/A |
| 4 | N/A |
| 5 | N/A |
| 6 | N/A |
| 7 | N/A |
| 8 | N/A |
| HS | N/A |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.4  Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Mathematics Assessment Results** (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a mathematics assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.4 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the mathematics assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the mathematics assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| **Comments:** | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.5.5  Native Language Version of State *NCLB* Reading/Language Arts Assessment Results** (formerly 2.4.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of LEP students who took a reading/language arts assessment in their native language across all grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school).

**Table 1.6.3.5.5 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested =** Number of LEP students in grades used for NCLB accountability determinations (3 through 8 and once in high school) who took the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** Number of students tested through the native language version of the reading/language arts assessment who scored at or above proficient.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on the number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results |
|---|---|---|
| 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| **Comments:** | | |

Source – Initially pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X049 that is data group 272, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6  Title III Served Monitored Former LEP Students**

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students.

**1.6.3.6.1  Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored** (formerly 3.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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.

**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 |
|---|---|---|
| 302 | 268 | 570 |
| **Comments:** Students were no longer enrolled in the state (ex. moved out of state). | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.2 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Mathematics** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual mathematics assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics for AYP.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLELP 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. This will be automatically calculated.

| # Tested | # At or Above Proficient | % Results | # Below Proficient |
|---|---|---|---|
| 98 | 32 | 32.7 | 66 |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:** The 98 students reflects the MFLEP students from 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.3.6.3 Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students in AYP Grades Results for Reading/Language Arts** (formerly 3.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of monitored former LEP (MFLEP) students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment.

**Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:**

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts for AYP.
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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 98 | 29 | 29.6 | 69 |

The number tested should be the same or near the total in 1.6.3.4.3 row 2, if not explain the difference in the comment box below.

**Comments:** The 98 students reflects the MFLEP students from 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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** (formerly 4.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Use the same method of counting consortia as in 1.6.1 (consortia regardless of number of members is only counted as one). 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. The total of the # met all three AMAOs + # met 2 AMAOs only + # Met one AMAO + # Met zero AMAOs=total # of subgrantees for the year.

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

| | # |
|---|---|
| Total number of subgrantees for the year | 9 |
| | |
| Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs | 1 |
| | |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 2 AMAOs | 2 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and ELP Attainment | 0 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of Making Progress and AYP | 1 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAOs of ELP Attainment and AYP | 1 |
| | |
| Number of subgrantees that met only 1 AMAO | 2 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Making Progress | 1 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAO of Attainment of ELP | 0 |
|    Number of subgrantees that met AMAO AYP | 1 |
| | |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet any AMAOs | 4 |
| | |
| Number of subgrantees that did not meet AMAOs for two consecutive years | 3 |
| Number of subgrantees with an improvement plan for not meeting Title III AMAOs | 3 |
| Number of subgrantees who have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (beginning in SY 2007-08) | 0 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly in section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.2  State Accountability** (formerly 4.2 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, indicate whether the State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs.
**Note:** Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup.

| State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs | __No__ |
|---|---|
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly in Section 1.6.10 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.4.3  Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs** (formerly 6.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students** (formerly 5.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

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

**1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students**

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

**Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:**

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth in Section 3301 (6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who receive services in Title III LIEPs under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) ONLY.
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 <u>not</u> include Title III LIEP subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) & 3115(a) that have immigrant students enrolled in them.

| # Immigrant Students Enrolled | # Students in 3114(d)(1) Program | # of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants |
|---|---|---|
| 979 | 952 | 1 |

If state reports zero (0) students in programs or zero (0) subgrants, explain in comment box below.

| **Comments:** |
|---|

Source – Initially, the first column of the table is pre-populated by ED*Facts* file N/X045 that contains data group 519, grand total. The second and third columns are manual entry by the SEA.

**Note:** This table was formerly in section 1.6.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**1.6.5.2 Distribution of Immigrant Funds** (formerly 5.3 of the Title III Biennial Collection, reformatted)

In the table below, report how the State distributes the funds reserved for the education of immigrant children and youth to subgrantees.

| Subgrant award cycle | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Annual | _Yes_ | Multi-year | _No_ |
| Type of subgrant awarded | | | |
| Competitive | _No_ | Formula | _Yes_ |

If the State checked more than one item in each category, explain in the comment box.

| **Comments:** |
|---|

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.6.6  Teacher Information and Professional Development**

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction education programs.

**1.6.6.1  Teacher Information** (formerly 7.1 of the Title III Biennial Collection, modified)

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined in Section 3301(8) and reported in table 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs).

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

|  | # |
|---|---|
| Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs. | 25 |
| Number of certified/licensed/endorsed ESL/BE teachers in the state currently working with LEP students (e.g., ESL/BE teachers for ALL LEP students), if the State has such requirements. Or number of teachers with professional development points or course work in ESL/BE, if the State does not require such certification/licensure/endorsement. | 115 |
| Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*. | 3 |

Explain in the comment box below if there is a zero for any item in the table above.

| Comments: |
|---|

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

**1.6.6.2 Professional Development (PD) Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students**
(formerly 7.4 of the Title III Biennial Collection)

In the table below, provide the number of professional development activities that specifically address only the teaching of LEP students or are related to the learning of LEP students. These professional development activities must meet the requirements of the Title III subgrantee required activities.

**Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:**

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

| Type of Professional Development Activity | # Subgrantees | |
|---|---|---|
| Instructional strategies for LEP students | 9 | |
| Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students | 9 | |
| Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students | 9 | |
| Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards | 9 | |
| Subject matter knowledge for teachers | 9 | |
| Other (Explain in comment box) | 0 | |
| **Participant Information** | **# Subgrantees** | **# Participants** |
| PD provided to content classroom teachers | 9 | 55 |
| PD provided to LEP classroom teachers | 9 | 75 |
| PD provided to principals | 3 | 18 |
| PD provided to administrators/other than principals | 5 | 32 |
| PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative | 3 | 30 |
| PD provided to community-based organization personnel | 3 | 15 |
| Total | | 225 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 2006-07 funds July 1, 2006, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2006, for SY 2006-07 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

| Date State Received Allocation | Date Funds Available to Subgrantees | # of Days/$$ Distribution |
|---|---|---|
| 07/01/07 | 08/01/07 | 30 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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 SD DOE has an online consolidated application (e-grant system). Once the district submits the title III section it is approved (approval is completed in 30 days) and funds are available to the district. Many districts did not submit the application until after the July 1st date.

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.7  PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS**

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

| Persistently Dangerous Schools | 0 |
|---|---|
| **Comments:** | |

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

**1.8 GRADUATION RATES AND DROPOUT RATES**

This section collects graduation and dropout rates.

**1.8.1 Graduation Rates**

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **previous school year** (SY 2005-06). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Graduation Rate |
|---|---|
| All Students | 93.2 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 67.5 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 84.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 78.2 |
| Hispanic | 72.2 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 92.7 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 82.1 |
| Limited English proficient | 72.3 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 80.9 |
| Migratory students | 70.0 |
| Male | 89.3 |
| Female | 90.6 |
| **Comments:** Graduation rate calculations based on State's Grad Rate Formula. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X041 that is data group 563, category sets A, B, C, D, E, and F. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. If the SEA has additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups in its accountability plan under *NCLB*, the SEA will report the above data for those groups through the online CSPR collection tool.

**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.

**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 2005-06). Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

| Student Group | Dropout Rate |
|---|---|
| All Students | 1.3 |
| American Indian or Alaska Native | 3.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.6 |
| Black, non-Hispanic | 1.7 |
| Hispanic | 1.7 |
| White, non-Hispanic | 0.9 |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 0.4 |
| Limited English proficient | 7.7 |
| Economically disadvantaged | 3.3 |
| Migratory students | 4.1 |
| Male | 1.3 |
| Female | 1.2 |
| **Comments:** Drop data calculations made from state's formula. | |

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

**FAQ on dropout rates:**

*What is a dropout?* A dropout is an individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

## 1.9  EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

| | # | # LEAs Reporting Data |
|---|---|---|
| LEAs without subgrants | 163 | 163 |
| LEAs with subgrants | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 165 | 165 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:**  This table was formerly Section 1.9.1.2 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants | # of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants |
|---|---|---|
| Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten) | 0 | 32 |
| K | 14 | 63 |
| 1 | 18 | 80 |
| 2 | 12 | 80 |
| 3 | 30 | 81 |
| 4 | 46 | 78 |
| 5 | 44 | 61 |
| 6 | 25 | 67 |
| 7 | <N | 60 |
| 8 | 11 | 63 |
| 9 | <N | 93 |
| 10 | <N | 23 |
| 11 | <N | 15 |
| 12 | <N | 11 |
| Ungraded | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 231 | 807 |
| **Comments:** | | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.3 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 | 14 | 120 |
| Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family) | 180 | 504 |
| Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings) | <N | 34 |
| Hotels/Motels | 26 | 149 |
| Total | | 807 |
| **Comments:** There were 6 students in non-subgrant LEAs with unknown living situation at the time of identification. | | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly section 1.9.1.4 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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) | 115 |
| K | 60 |
| 1 | 77 |
| 2 | 76 |
| 3 | 79 |
| 4 | 76 |
| 5 | 60 |
| 6 | 35 |
| 7 | 59 |
| 8 | 61 |
| 9 | 92 |
| 10 | 22 |
| 11 | 15 |
| 12 | <N |
| Ungraded | <N |
| Total | 837 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category set A. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**1.9.2.2  Subpopulations of Homeless Students Served**

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

| | # Homeless Students Served |
|---|---|
| Unaccompanied youth | <N |
| Migratory children/youth | <N |
| Children with disabilities (*IDEA*) | 115 |
| Limit English proficient students | 44 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X043 that is data group 560, category sets B, C, D, and E. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**  This table was formerly Sections 1.9.2.3, 1.9.2.4, and 1.9.2.5 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. For the SY 2006-07 CSPR, the data collection has been changed to show the total number of students served.

**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 |
|---|---|
| 1. Tutoring or other instructional support | 2 |
| 2. Expedited evaluations | 2 |
| 3. Staff professional development and awareness | 2 |
| 4. Referrals for medical, dental, and other health services | 2 |
| 5. Transportation | 2 |
| 6. Early childhood programs | 2 |
| 7. Assistance with participation in school programs | 2 |
| 8. Before-, after-school, mentoring, summer programs | 2 |
| 9. Obtaining or transferring records necessary for enrollment | 1 |
| 10. Parent education related to rights and resources for children | 1 |
| 11. Coordination between schools and agencies | 2 |
| 12. Counseling | 2 |
| 13. Addressing needs related to domestic violence | 2 |
| 14. Clothing to meet a school requirement | 2 |
| 15. School supplies | 2 |
| 16. Referral to other programs and services | 2 |
| 17. Emergency assistance related to school attendance | 2 |
| 18. Other (optional) | 0 |
| 19. Other (optional) | 0 |
| 20. Other (optional) | 0 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.6 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR.

**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 |
|---|---|
| 1. Eligibility for homeless services | 0 |
| 2. School Selection | 0 |
| 3. Transportation | 1 |
| 4. School records | 0 |
| 5. Immunizations | 0 |
| 6. Other medical records | 0 |
| 7. Other Barriers | 0 |
| **Comments:** | |

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

**Note:** This table was formerly Section 1.9.2.7 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Immunizations and Other Medical Records have been changed to two separate data collections for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.9.2.5 Academic Progress of Homeless Students**

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

**1.9.2.5.1 Reading Assessment**

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

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Reading Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 30 | 24 |
| 4 | 56 | 47 |
| 5 | 53 | 43 |
| 6 | 52 | 45 |
| 7 | 48 | 36 |
| 8 | 54 | 44 |
| High School | <N | <N |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X076, N/X077, or N/X078 that are data group 584, category set G. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.9.2.5.2 Mathematics Assessment**

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

| Grade | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Taking Mathematics Assessment Test | # Homeless Children/Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Who Scored At or Above Proficient |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 30 | 19 |
| 4 | 56 | 44 |
| 5 | 53 | 41 |
| 6 | 54 | 42 |
| 7 | 48 | 34 |
| 8 | 54 | 42 |
| High School | <N | <N |
| Comments: | | |

Source – Similar to 1.9.2.5.1 but the file specification is N/X075 that is data group 583, category set G.

**Note:** This table was formerly part of section 1.9.2.9 of the SY 2005-06 CSPR. Grades 9 through 12 have been changed to High School for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

**FAQs on Child Count:**

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

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

**1.10.1  Category 1 Child Count**

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> 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, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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 <u>not</u> 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) | 55 |
| K | 29 |
| 1 | 49 |
| 2 | 53 |
| 3 | 49 |
| 4 | 49 |
| 5 | 37 |
| 6 | 39 |
| 7 | 35 |
| 8 | 41 |
| 9 | 19 |
| 10 | 38 |
| 11 | 20 |
| 12 | 14 |
| Ungraded | 27 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 554 |
| **Comments:** Out of school youth count is intended to be coded as a zero. | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X121 that is data group 634, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

During the 2006-07 School Year the South Dakota Office of Educational Services and Support Migrant Education Program changed the way in which the Identification and Recruitment activities were conducted. In previous years recruiters would visit a school on a two year cycle to complete Certificates of Eligibility for all students found to be an eligible migrant student. Many students were missed due the long period of time between on-site visits. In SY 2006-07 we began an Identification and Recruitment program that would teach key staff in every school district about the South Dakota Migrant Program. The purpose of the program is to teach key personnel in each school district how to identify students who might be migratory and how to complete the necessary Certificate of Eligibility. The program also provides school district staff with an in-depth training on the Non-Regulatory Guidance Section II. Child Eligibility and III. Identification and Recruitment.

The result has been a reduction in the time it takes to identify eligible migrant children and students and provide them with the program's benefits. The training is timely, well received, and acquaints key school staff with the benefits of a migrant identification and recruitment system. When school staff are well trained the benefits are experienced by the district's migratory students.

It has not, however, increased the number of migratory students identified as eligible. I can only summize that the continued political pressures the program has encountered during the last several years is still taking a toll on the number of families moving across the border from Mexico to perform temporary and seasonal work in the U. S. Families that are already in South Dakota are beginning to seek more permanent work and have not been moving as frequently as they might have in previous years. Employers are also more careful to check the legal status of the employees they hire for temporary or seasonal work.

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

**Note:**  New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count**

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2006 through August 31, 2007. 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 <u>not</u> 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) | 21 |
| K | <N |
| 1 | 13 |
| 2 | <N |
| 3 | <N |
| 4 | <N |
| 5 | <N |
| 6 | <N |
| 7 | <N |
| 8 | <N |
| 9 | <N |
| 10 | <N |
| 11 | <N |
| 12 | 0 |
| Ungraded | 0 |
| Out-of-school | 0 |
| Total | 89 |
| **Comments:** | |

Source – Initially, pre-populated by EDFacts file N/X122 that is data group 635, Subtotal 1. If necessary, it is updated through manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**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%.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have had a decrease in the number of sites that operate a regular school year migrant education program. We now have only 8 sites that operate a regular school year migrant education program. Of those eight sites 4 sites agreed to operate a summer progam. One of those sites experienced a dramatic decrease in the migratory student population at the end of the regular school year, leaving only 3 sites operating a summer program. The result is fewer students that can participate in the summer migrant education program, statewide. However, we did experience a slight increase in the number of students participating in summer intersession. I think it might be due to the fact that we used the Consortium program Migrant Reading Net as the basis for our summer program. All the teachers that used the program really liked it and participating students exhibited positive gains in reading achievement as a result of the program.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.3  Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures**

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

**1.10.3.1  Student Information System**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

What system(s) did your state use to compile and generate its 2006-2007 category 1 child count and the category 2 child count? (e.g. NGS MIS 2000 COEStar manual system)?

Category 1: MIS 2000

Category 2: SY 2006-2007 MEP Program Evaluation Report &

SY 2006 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 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 2006-2007 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2007) and the 2007 Summer MEP Project Report. The program evaluation report contains the number of eligible migrant students served in an extended year program and the types of services provided. The summer MEP project report contains the names of all the eligible migrant students who were provided with extended year services and their progress in attaining

proficiency in reading and math (pre/post test scores).

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures**

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?

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

What data were collected?

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

a) Names of legal parents or guardians address and phone number;

b) Name of self-eligible youth address and phone number;

c) Name of child/youth including: gender birth date grade in school ethnicity place of birth etc;

d) Verification which indicates how children's data was obtained;

e) Eligibility data which includes: last school and residence of children current school district qualifying arrival date status of children's residency qualifying activity of the children's parent or legal guardian and place of employment (if applicable) to help determine PMOL date of enrollment in school the assigned Student Information Management System (SIMS) number any other work performed by members of the household is noted and interviewer comments/verification statements;

f) Type of work performed at previous place of residence and number of months family resided at previous residence;

g) Assurance of PMOL assurance that work is temporary/seasonal assurance that FERPA rights have been explained to worker and assurance that parent engages in a migratory lifestyle;

h) Parent recruiter and LEA representative signatures and dates.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

School district staff that are designated as the contact person for the identification and recruitment of migrant students are trained by SEA recruiters in the collection and reporting of child and family data. LEA designees conduct family interviews review school records and use family data from all availabale 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 Catgory 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 eligiblity and resloves all data anonolies 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 2006-2007 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2007) and the 2007 Summer MEP Project Report. The program evaluation report contains the number of eligible migrant students served in an extended year program and the types of services provided. The Summer MEP Project Report contains the names and unique identification number of all the eligible migrant students who were provided with extended year services and reports their progress in attaining proficiency in reading and math using pre and post test scores.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

In the space below, describe how the child count data are inputted, updated, and then organized by the student information system for child count purposes at the State level

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count information is updated daily or as new COEs are submitted by LEAs or ID & R recruiters and verified by SEA staff. The SEA is the sole data entry point for all COEs verified and encoded into the MIS 2000 data management system. Two staff persons at the SEA will verify all COEs and reconcile any discrepancies in data or information. Once all discrepancies are resolved the individual COE data will be recorded into the MIS 2000 data base. After the end of the "count year" (August 31 of each year) the person who encodes all data into the MIS 2000 generates a report of all identified migrant children by school district of residence. That report is sent to each LEA superintendent or the MEP project director of each school district in the state for updating and verification. If a student's parent(s) maintains residence in the district and the student's eligibility has not expired district personnel return the list of eligible students with a request to re-enroll the eligible migrant student(s). If a student has moved out of the district during the count year, the date of the move and the eventual residence (if known) are submitted to the SEA. An authorized representative of the district must sign this report and return it to the SEA. Once that information is verified by SEA staff encoding the updated COE information the MIS 2000 is updated with the eligible migrant students residing in South Dakota's school districts during the count year. The MIS 2000 runs a report of duplicate names; those duplications are eliminated by checking both SEA and LEA data bases. The data is compiled using the MIS 2000 the Category 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 on-going basis throughout the year. An MEP or local school district might update their information by conducting home visits when appropriate or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the school year. Preschool student information is verified by the school district through home visits when appropriate by making a phone call or by visiting with the parent during school hours. Self-eligible youth are usually verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is normally done with a phone call to the last known residence. If the State of South Dakota cannot verify a residence the child or youth is not included in the Category 1 Child Count.

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

comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student in a report of duplicates generated by the MIS 2000. All duplicated names are researched, eligibility verified and duplications resolved.

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

Category 2 data are collected when project reports and the annual MEP Evaluation Reports are completed by district MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names and unique identification number of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP must complete the annual MEP Evaluation Report. The evaluation report contains the Participation Table for Summer Services used to report the number of children served during summer intersession. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked to verify that the count of students reported in the project report matches the count reported on the MEP Evaluation Report.

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

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

**1.10.3.3  Methods Used To Count Children**

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

-How was each child count calculated?

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

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

Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS 2000 tracking system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts are provided with an MIS 2000 printout of all students in the district identified as eligible migratory students. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Discrepancies are discussed and resolved with the LEA administrator.

Category 2 data are collected when project reports submitted as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP completes the MEP Evaluation Report and summer intersession partipation 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 dates (qualifying arrival date) and who remain eligible. Duplicate names and birth date are generated by an MIS 2000 report asking for duplicate names and dates. If determined necessary the data entry personnel will call the school district of record to discuss duplicate students. The SEA also uses the unique SIMS number of each identified migrant student to locate any duplicate students or to verify the existence of duplicate students. We added the SIMS number, a unique stuent number currently assigned to all school age children in South Dakota, to the COE during the summer of 2003.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- Category 1 count:

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

- Category 2 Count:

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

Currently we are providing summer services to those eligible migrant students who were enrolled in an MEP during the recent school year (August 15 through June 15) and who still reside in the district or to migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during

the summer intersession and verified to be eligible by the SEA. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students can be provided with summer intersession services.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

### 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. Verification of parent/guardian qualifying activity takes place at the recruitment location (usually the school district) and again during data entry at the SEA. An MIS 2000 report is generated that searches the data base for duplicate names and birth dates. The COE beginning in 2003 includes the unique SIMS number of every identified migrant child enrolled in South Dakota's schools. Use of this unique number insures that an identified migrant child is counted only once for Category 1 and 2 Child Counts.

The State of South Dakota is the only data entry point for the MIS 2000. At the time data is entered by the Department of Education data entry person all information contained in the COE is scrutinized for accuracy by both the state director and data entry personnel. If the director or data entry person suspects that data is inaccurate or incomplete, a phone call is made to the LEA district administrator, employer, parent, or recruiter to re-verify the COEs data. All discrepancies are rectified before the student(s) listed on the COE can be encoded as eligible migratory students in the MIS 2000 data base.

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

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

---

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

---

The following re-interview process was initiated with the 2004-05 child count and continued with the 2005-06 child count. The re-interview process for 2006-2007 will begin after the count is verified and during the summer of 2008.

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 2005-2006 the re-interview process was completed in the Fall of 2007. A QAD report generated by MIS 2000 indicated that 139 new families had been verified as eligible migrant families during the count year of September 1 2005 through August 31 2006. That would generate a re-interview process for 14 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 14 randomly selected numbers between 1 and 139. The BIT used a computer generated RAND function to select the 14 numbers.

Listed alphabetically by last name, the 14 numbers selected the families that would receive a re-interview from the state office. All families were contacted personally, when available, by staff from the state office. Alternate methods of contact were used when the families had moved to other locations out-of-state. Those contacts consisted of school district administrators or employers in the recieving school district.

Results of the re-interview process indicated that all 14 families had been appropriately identified as migratory. The defect rate was determined to be zero.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children determined to be eligible migratory students during the previous school year have been re-verified as eligible migratory children residing in the school district of residence. This verification is certified by an LEA Representative (school superintendent school principal or MEP director) following September 1 of each school year. The MIS 2000 also contains built-in edit checks to help determine which students qualify for the Category 1 Child Count. Duplicate names and missing data are located by the edit checks and data entry staff is alerted to the problem. The Category 2 Child Count submitted by MEPs are unduplicated counts provided by the MEPs implementing summer services. Only children and youth already served by a regular-term MEP program or determined to be eligible during summer intersession are served by a summer program. Student eligibility is verified when an MEP participating in the summer program reports the names and SIMS numbers of the participating students. Children not documented as an eligible migrant student are not served with MEP funds. The names and unique identification numbers of each student reported in the Category II count is cross-checked with 3 reports. The Summer Project Report, the annual MEP Evaluation Report and the MIS 2000 data base.

Annual migrant program evaluation reports and project reports completed by the MEP document only those students who have received summer intersession services. Guidance provided to MEP sites includes information on the provision of summer programs and completion of child count data. Included in the guidance and instructions for completion of the MEP Evaluation Report is the process each MEP uses for category 1 and 2 child count reporting. Guidance provided indicates that children not yet graduated within a 36 month QAD or children who are at least 3 years of age can be counted as participating students. The count period established for the summer program was June 1 through August 31 2006.

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:

c. student's name is checked for exact spelling using original COE;

d. student's SIMS number is checked;

e. student's birth date is checked;

f. student's grade level is checked;

g. names of the student's parents or guardians are checked;

h. names of siblings if available are checked;

i. if unresolved the school district of residence is contacted to verify additional student information.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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 2005 have been producing positive results and the changes to the identification and recruitment process have produced positive results. No changes to the current identification and recruitment system are planned and no changes to the current quality control procedures will be implemented for SY 2007-2008.

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.

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.

Initially we were concerned that the child count has been fluctuating since the first re-interview process was completed in 2004. There are lots of external reasons for the fluctuation in the number of migratory workers entering South Dakota. One major reason that may account for the change in the child count from 2005-06 to 2006-07 is the change in the way identification and recruitment takes place in South Dakota. Previously recruiters would visit each school district in the spring and summer of each year. Schools were on a 2 year recruitment cycle. Lots of kids were missed and lots of kids were not afforded the benefit of receiving free school meals. Last year we decided to use the identification and recruitment process as a technical assistance and in-service training program. We teach key personnel in every school district how to appropriately recruit and identify migrant families how to conduct interviews and how to document information on the required COE. Using our internal quality control process all COE information is then verified by state office personnel prior to final determination of eligibility and the school food service personnel are notified that the family is eligible for free meals within 2 weeks of transmittal of the original COE to the state office. The result has been quicker identification of migrant families better school/parent involvement and a working quality control process that meets the needs of all involved.

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

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

**Note:** New data collection for the SY 2006-07 CSPR.