STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Consolidated State Application
September 1, 2003 Submission

for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)

Due: September 1, 2003

SOUTH DAKOTA - TIMELINE WAIVER

Please note South Dakota was granted a timeline waiver by the USDOE, thus information presented in this report reflects baseline data for 2002-03 instead of 2001-02.

A. ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS

Baseline Data for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide baseline data from the 2001-2002 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2001-2002 school year. States should provide baseline data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during 2001-2002.

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 3

Grade 3 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	65
African American/Black	40
American Indian/Native Alaskan	34
Asian/Pacific Islander	66
Hispanic	47
White	70
Other	
Students with Disabilities	39
Students without Disabilities	69
Limited English Proficient	21
Economically Disadvantaged	50
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	75
Migrant	46
Male	65
Female	64

Grade 3 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	73
African American/Black	53
American Indian/Native Alaskan	45
Asian/Pacific Islander	75
Hispanic	56
White	78
Other	
Students with Disabilities	42
Students without Disabilities	77
Limited English Proficient	21
Economically Disadvantaged	60
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	82
Migrant	47
Male	71
Female	76

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 4

Grade 4 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	73
African American/Black	50
American Indian/Native Alaskan	43
Asian/Pacific Islander	74
Hispanic	47
White	77
Other	
Students with Disabilities	40
Students without Disabilities	77
Limited English Proficient	27
Economically Disadvantaged	59
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	82
Migrant	46
Male	73
Female	73

Grade 4 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	85
African American/Black	74
American Indian/Native Alaskan	66
Asian/Pacific Islander	88
Hispanic	68
White	89
Other	
Students with Disabilities	52
Students without Disabilities	90
Limited English Proficient	54
Economically Disadvantaged	76
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	92
Migrant	58
Male	83
Female	89

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 5

Grade 5 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	59
African American/Black	41
American Indian/Native Alaskan	24
Asian/Pacific Islander	66
Hispanic	35
White	64
Other	
Students with Disabilities	24
Students without Disabilities	62
Limited English Proficient	17
Economically Disadvantaged	43
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	68
Migrant	37
Male	60
Female	57

Grade 5 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	51
African American/Black	30
American Indian/Native Alaskan	23
Asian/Pacific Islander	58
Hispanic	34
White	57
Other	
Students with Disabilities	15
Students without Disabilities	56
Limited English Proficient	10
Economically Disadvantaged	37
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	60
Migrant	28
Male	49
Female	54

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 6

Grade 6 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	45
African American/Black	20
American Indian/Native Alaskan	16
Asian/Pacific Islander	50
Hispanic	21
White	50
Other	
Students with Disabilities	11
Students without Disabilities	48
Limited English Proficient	3
Economically Disadvantaged	30
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	54
Migrant	21
Male	46
Female	44

Grade 6 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	76
African American/Black	61
American Indian/Native Alaskan	50
Asian/Pacific Islander	75
Hispanic	58
White	81
Other	
Students with Disabilities	28
Students without Disabilities	82
Limited English Proficient	31
Economically Disadvantaged	64
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	84
Migrant	53
Male	73
Female	81

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 7

Grade 7 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	48
African American/Black	22
American Indian/Native Alaskan	16
Asian/Pacific Islander	46
Hispanic	21
White	53
Other	
Students with Disabilities	7
Students without Disabilities	51
Limited English Proficient	10
Economically Disadvantaged	32
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	57
Migrant	28
Male	48
Female	48

Grade 7 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	73
African American/Black	50
American Indian/Native Alaskan	42
Asian/Pacific Islander	77
Hispanic	56
White	77
Other	
Students with Disabilities	11
Students without Disabilities	77
Limited English Proficient	26
Economically Disadvantaged	59
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	80
Migrant	49
Male	70
Female	76

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: GRADE 8

Grade 8 Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	56
African American/Black	331
American Indian/Native Alaskan	20
Asian/Pacific Islander	55
Hispanic	29
White	61
Other	
Students with Disabilities	11
Students without Disabilities	60
Limited English Proficient	15
Economically Disadvantaged	38
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	65
Migrant	27
Male	56
Female	57

Grade 8 Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	78
African American/Black	63
American Indian/Native Alaskan	53
Asian/Pacific Islander	76
Hispanic	48
White	81
Other	
Students with Disabilities	28
Students without Disabilities	82
Limited English Proficient	36
Economically Disadvantaged	63
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	84
Migrant	43
Male	72
Female	83

BASELINE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA: HIGH SCHOOL

High School Math	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	71
African American/Black	45
American Indian/Native Alaskan	35
Asian/Pacific Islander	69
Hispanic	47
White	73
Other	
Students with Disabilities	13
Students without Disabilities	73
Limited English Proficient	19
Economically Disadvantaged	55
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	74
Migrant	39
Male	69
Female	72

High School Reading	Percent of Students at Proficient or Advanced
Student Group	02-03 Baseline
All Students	58
African American/Black	35
American Indian/Native Alaskan	32
Asian/Pacific Islander	48
Hispanic	43
White	60
Other	
Students with Disabilities	9
Students without Disabilities	60
Limited English Proficient	8
Economically Disadvantaged	43
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	61
Migrant	31
Male	53
Female	62

Performance Targets for Performance Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.2, and 2.3

In the following charts, please provide performance targets for the percentage of students who will be at or above the proficient level in mathematics and reading/language arts on the State's assessment, consistent with the State's annual measurable objectives. Three sets of charts have been provided to accommodate States' varying plans for setting annual measurable objectives, with some States having the same annual measurable objectives for all grade levels in the State and other States having separate annual measurable objectives for elementary, middle, and high schools. At the top of each set of charts, please indicate the grades levels to which your annual measurable objectives apply.

STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS (ANNUAL MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES)

Annual Measurable Objectives for each grade span and subject area

	K-8		9-12		District/State	
School Year	Reading	Math	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002-2003	65%	45%	50%	60%	69%	52%
2003-2004	65%	45%	50%	60%	69%	52%
2004-2005	71%	54%	58%	67%	74%	60%
2005-2006	71%	54%	58%	67%	74%	60%
2006-2007	71%	54%	58%	67%	74%	60%
2007-2008	77%	63%	67%	73%	79%	68%
2008-2009	77%	63%	67%	73%	79%	68%
2009-2010	77%	63%	67%	73%	79%	68%
20010-2011	83%	73%	75%	80%	85%	76%
2011-2012	88%	82%	83%	87%	90%	84%
2012-2013	94%	91%	92%	93%	95%	92%
2013-2014	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Performance Indicator 1.3

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and performance targets for the percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that made adequate yearly progress in the 2001-2002 school year, based upon the 2001-2002 school year test administration. For performance targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I schools that will make adequate yearly progress from the 2002-2003 school year through the 2013-2014 school year.

At the time of submission, there were problems with the state report card system. Title I status for schools was not being correctly displayed on the report card. Programmers are working on the problem and information for 1.3 will be submitted as soon as the data is known.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Title I Schools Making Adequate Yearly Progress
2001-2002 Baseline	69%
2002-2003 Target	69
2003-2004 Target	71.5
2004-2005 Target	74
2005-2006 Target	77
2006-2007 Target	81
2007-2008 Target	84
2008-2009 Target	87
2009-2010 Target	91
2010-2011 Target	94
2011-2012 Target	97
2012-2013 Target	97
2013-2014 Target	100%

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

South Dakota has been developing the content standards for two years. The decision in South Dakota was that the content standards are for all students including English language learners. Therefore, separate ELL standards have not been developed. However, since these students must overcome the additional barriers of learning a language other than their first language, a statewide task force was created to develop performance descriptors for each of the five domains to demonstrate levels of English language proficiency towards mastering English as they require academic achievement proficiency.

The task force is made up of national and local experts. These experts include practitioners, administrators, higher education personnel, consultants and parents. The task force represents various language groups from across the state.

The K-12 ELL performance descriptors include communication arts, reading and mathematics. The performance descriptors address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, comprehension and writing. An ELL guidebook is being developed which will address the needs of ELL students as well as provide support for classroom teachers.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);

3, 361 students were assessed for annual progress in acquiring. All of these students were identified as limited English language learners using the LAS or IPT during the school year 2002-2003.

- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and

Students in South Dakota are identified as LEP on one of two recognized English language proficiency assessments, the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) or the Language Assessment Scale (LAS). The results of these assessments determine immediate services for English language acquisition. Those students who are determined to be English language learners as a result of these identifying assessments are assessed each spring on the Stanford ELP. The Stanford ELP is used as an annual assessment of student progress in acquiring English language proficiency.

- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

All English Language Learners who have been identified with the LAS or IPT will participate in the administration of the Stanford ELP in the spring of each year to track annual progress and determine the level of English language proficiency. This will include any students who reach proficiency and for two years following the movement to proficient.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.

Table 1: Baseline Data for 2002-2003						
ELP Assessment(s) (1)*	Total number of LEP Identified (2)	Number and Percentage at **Pre-Emergent** (3)	Number and Percentage at **Emergent** (4)	Number and Percentage at **Basic** (5)	Number and Percentage at **Intermediate** (6)	Number and Percentage at **Proficient** (7)
Stanford English Language Proficiency Test	**3,361**	**395** **11.7%**	**7** **.002%**	**296** **.088%**	**1540** **45.8%**	**1123** **33.4%**

- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:

  - Describe how the composite score was derived;
    The composite score is the sum total of all of the five sub-tests.

  - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
    Each sub-test has its own score to form the composite score. The oral language is assessed with the listening and speaking sub-tests. The writing is assessed with two components, they are written conventions and product writing. Reading has its own score. To derive comprehension scores the sub-test of listening and reading are added together.

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

Performance Level Descriptions

The five Performance Levels include Pre-Emergent, Emergent, Basic, Intermediate, and Proficient. Detailed below are the five Performance Level descriptions for each skill.

Listening

Pre-Emergent: This student's Listening Performance Level is Pre-Emergent. This student made very few or no responses. This student does not understand enough language to perform in English.

Emergent: This student's Listening Performance Level is Emergent. This student has very little ability to understand spoken English. This student understands only a few isolate words.

Basic: This student's Listening Performance Level is Basic. This student can understand simplified speech about a very familiar topic, especially in social situations. This student may be able to understand speech that is slower with frequent repetitions and/or paraphrasing.

Intermediate: This student's Listening Performance Level is Intermediate. This student understands familiar topics, some complex speech and may need some repetition to increase or achieve comprehension. This student has difficulty understanding unfamiliar topics in academic language.

Proficient: This student's Listening Performance Level is Proficient. This student understands informal conversation and many academic discussions conducted at a normal fate of speech. This student may have difficulty understanding some uncommon idioms and more complex concepts related to speech.

Speaking

Pre-Emergent: This student's Speaking Performance Level is Pre-Emergent. This student made very few or no responses. This student does not understand enough language to perform in English.

Emergent: This student's Speaking Performance Level is Emergent. This student may try to communicate mostly with gestures or in a language other than English. This student has very little speaking ability in English. This student is able to produce a few isolate words.

Basic: This student's Speaking Performance Level is Intermediate. This student uses single words or simple phrases to communicate basic concepts in a social context. This student can answer some routine questions;

especially memorized ritual turns. This student's speech contains linguistic errors and may not always be intelligible.

Intermediate: This student's Speaking Performance Level is Proficient. This student is becoming comfortable with routine social conversations, but still has difficulty with academic topics. This student speaks with some structure and uses informational appropriate vocabulary, but may not always be precise. This student is somewhat fluent in English and generally comprehensible.

Proficient: This student's Speaking Performance Level is Proficient. This student can participate effectively in informal conversations and can discuss some academic topics. This student can produce some complex sentence structures and vocabulary that is often precise and varied. This student is able to speak English quite fluently and use come figurative language and idiomatic expressions. This student's occasional minor errors in pronunciation and grammar do not affect comprehensibility.

<u>Reading</u>

Pre-Emergent: This student's Reading Performance Level is Pre-Emergent. This student made very few or no responses. This student does not understand enough written language to perform in English.

Emergent: This student's Reading Performance Level is Emergent. This student may be able to understand visual universal symbols and graphics associated with a text. This student understands almost no written English, or only a few isolated words.

Basic: This student's Reading Performance Level is Basic. This student is able to read some simple words, including sight vocabulary and very common phrases. This student can slowly read very simple texts, but often with only partial comprehension.

Intermediate: This student's Reading Performance Level is Intermediate. This student usually understands English texts made up of simple constructions that are based on topics related to daily life experiences. This student has only partial comprehension of more structurally complex texts dealing with somewhat difficult topics. This student sometimes constructs meaning of unfamiliar words from context.

Proficient: This student's Reading Performance Level is Proficient. This student can read a variety of grade-appropriate texts with considerable comprehension and speed. This student can understand texts with complex structures and abstract vocabulary, but may still have some comprehension

difficulties. This student often determines meanings of unfamiliar words from context.

Writing Conventions and Writing

Pre-Emergent: This student's Writing Conventions and Performance Level is Pre-Emergent. This student made very few or no responses. This student does not understand enough written language to perform in English.

Emergent: This student's Writing Conventions and Performance Level is Emergent. This student has almost no mastery or understanding of the English Writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling. This student may be able to write or print his or her own name and copy words directly from the prompt. This student's writing is mostly comprehensible.

Basic: This student's Writing Conventions and Performance Level is Basic. This student is beginning to show some understanding of the English Writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling. This student is able to write some simple words, very common phrases and may even be able to produce a simple sentence. This student's writing is limited and contains numerous errors.

Intermediate: This student's Writing Conventions and Performance Level is Intermediate. This student generally shows some mastery of understanding of the English writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling, although there may still be a number of errors. This student is able to write about familiar, concrete topics, but with some word choice or vocabulary errors. This student is able to express ideas using somewhat complex structures.

Proficient: This student's Writing Conventions and Performance Level is Proficient. This student shows an understanding of sentence structure. This student has good mastery and understanding of grade-appropriate basic composition skills, including the English writing conventions of usage, mechanics, and spelling. This student expresses more abstract ideas using complex structures and accurate and varied vocabulary, and with only occasional errors in spelling, word choice, and sentence structure. These errors do not distract readers or cause confusion about the meaning.

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

Students in South Dakota are identified as LEP on one of two recognized English language proficiency assessments, the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT) or the Language Assessment Scale (LAS). The results of these assessments determine

immediate services for English language acquisition. Those students who are determined to be English language learners as a result of these identifying assessments are assessed each spring on the Stanford ELP. The Stanford ELP is used as an annual assessment of student progress in acquiring English language proficiency.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

3, 361 students were assessed for annual progress in acquiring All of these students were identified as limited English language learners using the LAS or IPT during the school year 2002-2003.

(3-7) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

See Table 1

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

   Measurement of Annual Progress:

   Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (SELP)-published by Harcourt
   Content measured: Listening, Writing Conventions, Reading, Free Response Reading, Speaking and Comprehension
   Grade levels evaluated: Primary (K-2), Elementary (3-5), Middle Grades (6-8), and High School (9-12)

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

   Total number of students assessed for annual progress in acquiring ELP: 3,361 students.

   3.Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

Total number of students identified as LEP after the annual assessment of progress using the Stanford ELP during spring 2003: 2,238 students.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments

The test score range and cut scores are as follow:

Table 2: Total Test						
	Performance Levels					
Grade	Emergent	Basic	Intermediate	Proficient		Max
K	**15**	**26**	**56**	**82**		**102**
1	**18**	**28**	**59**	**84**		**102**
2	**20**	**31**	**61**	**87**		**102**
3	**15**	**26**	**56**	**82**		**102**
4	**18**	**28**	**59**	**84**		**102**
5	**20**	**31**	**61**	**87**		**102**
6	**17**	**28**	**61**	**88**		**110**
7	**19**	**30**	**63**	**91**		**110**
8	**22**	**33**	**66**	**94**		**110**
9	**17**	**28**	**61**	**88**		**110**
10	**18**	**29**	**62**	**90**		**110**
11	**20**	**31**	**64**	**92**		**110**
12	**22**	**33**	**66**	**94**		**110**

- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.

The South Dakota Content Standards, May 2003 states the following regarding English Language Learner Performance Descriptors:

The content standards for South Dakota students who are English language learner (ELL) are the same as those specified for all students. However, these students must overcome the additional barrier of learning in a language other than their first language. For this reason, performance descriptors are included in this document to demonstrate levels of English language proficiency that reflect the progress of these students toward mastering English as they acquire academic achievement proficiency.

This document further states:

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

In addition the document describes the proficiency levels of the performance descriptors as follows:

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

The test developer, Harcourt Educational Measurement, determined the cut score based on the state's definition for each level of proficiency. Proficiency is defined as attaining Level 5 on the Stanford ELP.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that State's annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

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

Making progress is advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by Stanford ELP composite score each school year (see table 2).

- **Proficient: An ELL student performing at the proficient level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet expectations for the student's grade level.**
- **Intermediate: An ELL student performing at the intermediate level reads, writes, speaks and listens in English with language proficiency adequate to meet some expectations for the student's grade level, but is not yet fluent enough to sufficiently to meet grade-level expectations.**
- **Basic: An ELL student performing at the basic level is starting to read, write, speak and listen in English, but is not fluent enough to function in English without assistance.**
- **Emergent: An ELL student performing at the emergent level has very little ability to read, write, speak, and listen to English. The student has a few isolated words.**
- **Pre-emergent: An ELL student performing at the pre-emergent level does not understand enough language to read, write, speak, or listen in English.**

The Stanford English Language Proficiency Test (Stanford ELP), published in 2003 by Harcourt Educational Measurement (Harcourt) measures the English language ability of students in kindergarten through grade 12 for South Dakota students who have previously been identified as English language learners by one of two recognized and approved assessments, IPT or LAS. The Stanford ELP is designed for students whose first language is not English. This test directly fulfills the requirement of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) which states that beginning in the 2002 school year, an annual assessment of English proficiency is required of each limited English proficient (LEP) student. LEP students must be assessed in the areas of oral language (listening and speaking) reading and writing skills, and comprehension. Harcourt describes the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next in their discussion of Performance levels in their technical reports which states:

> **Grouping test results by performance level corresponds to a level of mastery as judged by teachers and provides information about what students should know and be able to do in a particular subject area and at a particular grade level. The range of scores corresponding to each performance level is determined by a procedure that results in the identification of cut scores. A modified-Angoff procedure (Angoff, 1984) was used to produce the recommended cut scores for the Stanford ELP. The modified-Angoff procedure has a long and successful history in similar applications for both educational and professional certification assessments. The use of the procedure by Harcourt provided a systematic technique for eliciting judgments from panels of experts (i.e., standard setting committees), produced consensus among these experts, and quantified the results of the judgments. The modified-Angoff procedure is widely recognized as the simplest method to use (Norcini, et al., 1987;Shepard, 1980). Moreover, research has shown that the modified-**

Angoff method produces ratings with better reliability and smaller variability among the ratings of judges than other standard setting procedures (Andrew and Hecht, 1976; Brennan and Lockwood, 1980; Cross, et al., 1984; Poggio, Glasnapp, and Eros, 1981; Skakun and Kling, 1980). This procedure represents an appropriate balance between statistical rigor and informed opinion.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English

Cohort 1

2003-2004 School Year: 75% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP each school year or maintain at level 5.

2004-2005 School Year: 80% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Standard ELP each school year or maintain at level 5.

2005-2006 School Year: 85% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP each school year or maintain at level 5.

2006-2007 School Year: 90% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP each school year or maintain at level 5.

2007-2008 School Year: 95% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP each school year or maintain at level 5.

Cohort 2

2004 – 2005 School Year: 75% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP or maintain at level 5.

2005-2006 School Year: 80% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP or maintain at level 5.

2006-2007 School Year: 85% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP or maintain at level 5.

2007- 2008 School Year: 90% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP or maintain at level 5.

2008-2009 School Year: 95% will make progress by advancing at least one proficiency level as measured by the Stanford ELP or maintain at level 5.

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Percent or Number of LEP Students, (those not proficient in 2003-2004) attaining English Language Proficiency as measured by Stanford ELP.

<u>Cohort 1</u>
2003-2004 20% of Cohort 1 will attain proficiency
2004-2005 20% of those remaining in Cohort 1 will attain proficiency
2005-2006 20% of those remaining in Cohort 1 will attain proficiency
2006-2007 20% of those remaining in Cohort 1 will attain proficiency
2007-2008 15% of those remaining in Cohort 1 will attain proficiency

<u>Cohort 2</u>
2004-2005 20% of Cohort 2 will attain proficiency
2005-2006 20% of those remaining in Cohort 2 will attain proficiency
2006-2007 20% of those remaining in Cohort 2 will attain proficiency
2007-2008 20% of those remaining in Cohort 2 will attain proficiency
2008-2009 15% of those remaining in Cohort 2 will attain proficiency

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s)s in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

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

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

South Dakota decided to include all LEP students in a single cohort since there were relatively few LEP students across all grades. In 2003, approximately 3,361 students were identified as LEP and then tested for proficiency using the Stanford ELP. If cohorts were based on grade spans or proficiency levels, the numbers of students in some of the levels would be too small for reliability over

time. Anecdotal evidence indicates that subsequent assessments will result in more students identified as LEP.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.
The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term "core academic subjects" means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography *(Section 9101(11*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by "highly qualified" teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualifed Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003	85.70%	16.40%
2003-2004	90.47%	44.00%
2004-2005	95.23%	72.00%
2005-2006	100.00%	100.00%

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

Meeting NCLB Highly Qualified Requirements for New and Experienced Teachers

Teachers new to the profession, existing teachers and alternative education teachers teaching a core content area must meet the following to be highly qualified according to Title I Part A, Section 1119 and the corresponding regulations, 200.56.

TEACHERS NEW TO THE PROFESSION		EXISTING TEACHERS		ALTERNATIVE CERTIFICATION
Elementary School	*Middle & High School*	*Elementary School*	*Middle & High School*	*See State Rules*
Full State Certification	Full State Certification	Full State Certification	Full State Certification	Full State Certification within three years of alternative certification program
AND	AND	AND	AND	AND
Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree	Bachelor's Degree
AND	AND one of the following:	AND either the	AND one of the following:	AND
State Test	State Test	State Test	State Test	Receives high-quality professional development that is: sustained, intensive and classroom-focused on classroom instruction before & while teaching
	OR		OR	AND
	• Major in content area or • Graduate Degree in content area		• Major in content area or • Graduate Degree in content area or • National Board Certification in content area	Participates in a teacher mentoring program or receives intensive supervision that consists of structured guidance and regular ongoing support
		OR one of the following HOUSE Rules:	OR one of the following HOUSE Rules:	AND
		• Fully authorized by State of SD for teaching elementary **AND** have at least 3 years of teaching experience or • Passes subject specific state test in content & pedagogy or • Fully authorized by State of SD for teaching elementary **AND** have a Graduate Degree in content area or • Reading Specialist or • Holds National Board Certification in a specific or broad discipline	• Fully authorized by State of SD for all teaching assignments in core content areas **AND** have at least 3 years of teaching experience or • Passes subject specific state test in content & pedagogy or • Graduate Degree in content area or • Reading Specialist or • Holds National Board Certification in a specific or broad discipline	State Test

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term "high-quality professional development" means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received "high-quality professional development" in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive "high-quality professional development" through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	**22%**
2003-2004 Target	**46%**
2004-2005 Target	**72%**
2005-2006 Target	**100%**

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	**54%**
2003-2004 Target	**69%**
2004-2005 Target	**84%**
2005-2006 Target	**100%**

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

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

http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

South Dakota has implemented the Unsafe School Choice Option policy and for the 2003-04 school year no schools have been identified as persistently dangerous. We also are projecting based on our analysis at this point that no schools will be identified in the future.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	**0**
2004-2005 Target	**0**
2005-2006 Target	**0**
2006-2007 Target	**0**
2007-2008 Target	**0**
2008-2009 Target	**0**
2009-2010 Target	**0**
2010-2011 Target	**0**
2011-2012 Target	**0**
2012-2013 Target	**0**
2013-2014 Target	**0**

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: "The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data." However, 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 the school year, 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.

The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: Graduation Rates

High School Graduates Student Group	2002-2003 Base-line	2003-2004 School Year	2004-2005 School Year	2005-2006 School Year	2006-2007 School Year	2007-2008 School Year	2008-2009 School Year	2009-2010 School Year	2010-2011 School Year	2011-2012 School Year	2012-2013 School Year	2013-2014 School Year
All Students	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
African American/Black	91%	92%	93%	94%	94%	95%	96%	97%	98%	98%	99%	100%
Am Indian/Native Alaskan	85%	86%	87%	89%	90%	92%	93%	94%	96%	97%	99%	100%
Asian/Pacific Islander	92%	92%	93%	94%	95%	95%	96%	97%	98%	98%	99%	100%
Hispanic	90%	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%	96%	97%	97%	98%	99%	100%
White	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
Students with Disabilities	95%	95%	96%	96%	97%	97%	98%	98%	99%	99%	100%	100%
Students without Disabilities	96%	97%	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
Limited English Prof.	89%	90%	91%	92%	93%	94%	95%	96%	97%	98%	99%	100%
Econ. Disadvantaged	93%	94%	95%	95%	96%	96%	97%	98%	98%	99%	99%	100%
Non-Econ Disadvantaged	97%	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
Migrant	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Male	97%	97%	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	99%	100%	100%
Female	96%	96%	97%	97%	97%	98%	98%	98%	99%	99%	100%	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

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

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

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts / Student Group	2002-2003 Baseline	2003-2004 School Year	2004-2005 School Year	2005-2006 School Year	2006-2007 School Year	2007-2008 School Year	2008-2009 School Year	2009-2010 School Year	2010-2011 School Year	2011-2012 School Year	2012-2013 School Year	2013-2014 School Year
All Students	2.8%	2.5%	2.3%	2.0%	1.8%	1.5%	1.3%	1.0%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%
African American/Black	5.7%	5.1%	4.6%	4.1%	3.6%	3.1%	2.6%	2.1%	1.5%	1.0%	0.5%	0.0%
Am Indian/Native Alaskan	10.9%	9.9%	8.9%	7.9%	6.9%	5.9%	4.9%	3.9%	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.6%	3.2%	2.9%	2.6%	2.3%	1.9%	1.6%	1.3%	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Hispanic	6.8%	6.2%	5.6%	4.9%	4.3%	3.7%	3.1%	2.5%	1.9%	1.2%	0.6%	0.0%
White	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.4%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%
Students with Disabilities	3.3%	3.0%	2.7%	2.4%	2.1%	1.8%	1.5%	1.2%	0.9%	0.6%	0.3%	0.0%
Students without Disabilities	2.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.0%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.0%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%
Limited English Prof.	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Econ. Disadvantaged	4.8%	4.3%	3.9%	3.5%	3.0%	2.6%	2.2%	1.7%	1.3%	0.9%	0.4%	0.0%
Non-Econ Disadvantaged	2.0%	1.9%	1.7%	1.5%	1.3%	1.1%	0.9%	0.7%	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	0.0%
Migrant	2.9%	2.7%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%
Male	3.0%	2.7%	2.4%	2.2%	1.9%	1.6%	1.3%	1.1%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	0.0%
Female	2.6%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	1.6%	1.4%	1.2%	0.9%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%	0.0%