South Dakota Department of Education

Consolidated State Application
Accountability Workbook

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

Approved by USDOE on June 15, 2008
Amended with Approval

Amendments to Critical Elements 1.5, 1.6, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2, and 5.3
Final Information as of May 27, 2008

U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202

Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems

Status		State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools			
F	1.1	Accountability system includes *all schools and districts in the state*.	Page 4
F	1.2	Accountability system holds *all schools to the same criteria*.	Page 5
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the *academic achievement standards*.	Page 5
F	1.4	Accountability system provides *information in a timely manner*.	Page 6
F	1.5	Accountability system includes *report cards*.	Page 6
F	1.6	Accountability system includes *rewards and sanctions*.	Page 8
Principle 2: All Students			
F	2.1	The accountability system includes *all students*	Page 11
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of *full academic year*.	Page 11
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes *mobile students*.	Page 12
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations			
F	3.1	Accountability system expects *all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14*.	Page 13
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether *student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress.*	Page 13
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a *starting point*.	Page 16
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes *statewide annual measurable objectives*.	Page 18
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes *intermediate goals*	Page 19
Principle 4: Annual Decisions			
F	4.1	The accountability system *determines annually the progress* of schools and districts.	Page 21
Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability			
F	5.1	The accountability system *includes all the required student subgroups*.	Page 22
F	5.2	The accountability system holds *schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups*.	Page 23

F	5.3	The accountability system includes *students with disabilities*.	Page 23
F	5.4	The accountability system includes *limited English proficient students*.	Page 24
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.	Page 26
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.	Page 26

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based *primarily on academic assessments*.	Page 27

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes *graduation rate for high schools*.	Page 28
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an *additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools*.	Page 30
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.	Page 31

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for *reading/language arts* and *mathematics*.	Page 32

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces *reliable decisions*.	Page 34
F	9.2	Accountability system produces *valid decisions*.	Page 34
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing *changes in assessment and student population*.	Page 35

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the *rate of participation* in the statewide assessment.	Page 36
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for *applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools.*	Page 37

STATUS Legend:
F – Final policy
P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval
W– Working to formulate policy

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?

All public schools and districts in the state are included in the state's accountability system.

1. School districts (LEAs) – The accountability system shall apply to all public school districts that have a school district ID code assigned by the Department of Education (DOE). As per SDCL 13-5-1, a school district is defined as any territory organized for the express purpose of operating not less than a thirteen-year school program and governed by an elected school board is defined to be a school district.

2. Schools – The accountability system shall apply to all public schools that have a school ID code assigned by the DOE. In South Dakota, "schools" are more accurately thought of as attendance centers. An attendance center is the primary location in which instruction is delivered. Schools will follow procedures to define the grade spans of elementary, middle, and high school attendances. Should school districts wish to change their current grade span definition of an attendance center, they must submit in writing the rationale for the change to the Secretary of Education.

3. Title I school and district – A school or district that receives Title I Part A funds shall be subject to the accountability provisions of section 1116 that apply to Title I schools and/or districts.

All public schools and districts will be accountable for the performance of student subgroups – including major racial/ethnic subgroups, students with disabilities, limited English proficient students, and economically disadvantaged students – through the AYP determination, provided the subgroup meets the minimum group size requirement. Both Title I and non-Title I schools and districts will be part of the single statewide accountability system.

For accountability purposes, schools that have no tested grades will be linked with the schools into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school feeds into a grades three through six school, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school will also apply to the feeder school. If placed in school improvement, all schools would write a combined school improvement plan encompassing all grade levels in the schools.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination

Special considerations of alternative instructional institutions.

In cases in which the school or district that serves a student's attendance area has a say in deciding to educate the student in another institution (e.g., the school /district decided to place students with a particular disability in a school other than the student's school of residence), the student will be counted at his/her resident school.

a) Rural attendance centers & colony schools (country schools) – Each rural attendance center shall be treated as a school for accountability purposes.
b) Alternative Schools – (Programs outside of the traditional setting whereby students receive instruction as an extension of the regular or traditional school environment.) If alternative schools are academic extensions of the public school, for accountability purposes, test scores will be mapped back to the original resident school.
c) Institutions for the blind and the deaf – These students will be included for accountability purposes in the resident school.
d) Students placed in South Dakota private/non-profit facilities will be included for accountability purposes in the resident district.
e) Students placed by other state agencies will be included for accountability purposes at the district level.

For accountability purposes, schools that have no tested grades will be linked with the schools into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school feeds into a grades three through six school, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school will also apply to the feeder school. If placed in school improvement, all schools would write a combined school improvement plan encompassing all grade levels in the schools.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of *basic*, *proficient* and *advanced* student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?

The State of South Dakota has defined four levels of student achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, and below basic.

Grade level content standards and achievement descriptors have been established for reading and math and approved by the State Board of Education. Definitions of achievement levels have been expressed through the performance descriptors. Cut scores for proficiency levels were established in the summer of 2003. The Buros Institute, University of Lincoln, Nebraska,

conducted a standards setting process with the Department of Education in establishing achievement levels for reading and math, grades 3-8 and 11.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?

South Dakota has invested heavily in a state-of-the-art technology-based score processing and reporting system. The system was fully implemented in 2002-03 and supports timely reporting and data usage by schools and districts throughout the state. The State plans to conduct its state assessment annually in the spring. The testing window will be approximately three weeks. A web-based reporting system that incorporates the State's AYP decision rule calculations has been created. The decision rules have been established to meet all of the requirements for determining AYP under No Child Left Behind. Accountability results will be available on-line by August each year. This is prior to the beginning of the school year for any school in the state.

Once AYP decisions are determined relative to school performance, the web-based reporting system will allow schools to inform parents in a timely manner to make informed decisions and to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services. AYP status will be determined and identification of schools in school improvement will be made in order that districts and schools will be notified in August each year. DOE will send each district an official notice if AYP is not met for the second consecutive year. School improvement status will be clearly stated for the district and each school within the district as appropriate. It is the responsibility of each individual district to report AYP status and identification for school improvement to its schools, parents, and the community.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?

A web-based reporting system has been developed that includes all of the data elements required under NCLB and for reporting assessment results. The State maintains a statewide student information system, called SIMS Net (Student Information Management System), where student data records are stored in a centralized data warehouse. Each student has been assigned a unique identifier that matches student demographics with each assessment result, having the capacity for tracking the status and location of each student.

All report card data will be accessible through portals for public consumption. The South Dakota state report card is available to all stakeholders. The State also provided a report card for every district and every school using this same format. Report cards have been and will continue to be available to the public and school districts on the Department's web site and will be sent to

local media. Districts will be required to disseminate both district and school level report cards to parents; local school boards are required to review results at a public meeting.

The report card will include:

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race/ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.)

2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students.

3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.

5. Attendance rates for elementary school students for the school as a whole and disaggregated by student subgroups. Attendance for district elementary grade spans (K-5 and 6-8) for the grade span as a whole and disaggregated by student groups.

6. Graduation rates for secondary school students for each secondary school and each district disaggregated by student subgroups.

7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.

8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State and district, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State and district.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs?[1]

South Dakota did not have a state-level school and district accountability system. It required statutory changes which were accomplished in the 2003 legislative session. DOE convened a state-representative Advisory Group on Accountability to advise on the design of the State's school and district accountability systems. That advisory group included members of the state legislature. The new legislation mandates that all public schools will be governed under the same accountability system. The South Dakota Board of Education will promulgate rules defining AYP procedures for all public schools.

Rewards and Sanctions

The State will use the school and district accountability system primarily to promote enhanced learning and teaching.
State sanctions will apply to all public districts and schools.
Federal sanctions outlined in Title I, Part A, Section 1116 will apply only to schools and districts receiving Title I Part A funds.

All public schools	
Rewards	
Recognition of Distinguished Schools	Distinguished Schools will be identified using the following criteria: a. Met AYP for two consecutive years in both reading, math, and the other academic indicator **AND** b. Significantly closed the achievement gap between the disaggregated groups of students. A school will be considered to have significantly reduced the achievement gap if the gap between the identified group and the non-identified group decreases by 10% over a two year period for one or more of the subgroups. Only subgroups meeting the minimum n size of 10 will be considered. i. Students with disabilities ii. Economically disadvantaged students iii. Limited English Proficient students iv. Major racial / ethnic groups **OR** c. The percentage of students in the "all student" group that have met the State's proficient and advanced levels of student performance in both reading and math is 10 percentage points higher than the current year's AMO for each subject.

	To be eligible for the Distinguished Schools award, a school must have 10 or more students in the grades tested in that school.	
Sanctions		
	State Requirements	**Federal Requirements (Title I Schools)**
Alert Status -- 1 Year No AYP	None	None
School Improvement Level 1 – Fail to meet AYP two years in a row	Develop & implement 2-year school improvement plan, participate in a peer review of the plan, plan approved by the SEA.	School improvement plan, offer public school choice (transportation paid by Title I funds)
Level 2 – Fail to meet AYP one additional year	Evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the plan and continue implementation of school improvement plan.	Choice & supplemental services from state-approved list (paid by district)
Level 3 – Fail to meet AYP one additional year	Evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the plan, revise as necessary, and continue implementation of a 2-year school improvement plan.	Choice, supplemental services & corrective actions
Level 4 – Fail to meet one additional year	District will conduct a school audit, inform SEA of recommendations. School evaluates and continues implementation of the school improvement plan.	Choice, supplemental services, corrective action & school restructuring plan
Level 5 – Fail to meet AYP one additional year	Implement recommendations of audit, district monitors implementation.	Implement restructuring plan

All public districts		
Rewards		
Recognition	Distinguished Districts will be identified using the following criteria: a. Met AYP for two consecutive years in reading, math, and the other academic indicator for all three grade spans **AND** b. At least 85% of the students in the "all student" group have met the State's proficient and advanced levels of student performance in both reading and math. To be eligible for the Distinguished District award, a district must have 30 or more students in each of the 3-5 and 6-8 grade spans and 10 or more students in the 11th grade.	
Sanctions	**State Requirements**	**Federal Requirements (Title I Districts)**
Alert Status -- 1 Year No AYP	None	None
District Improvement Level 1 – Fail to meet AYP two years in a row	District must submit a 2-year district school improvement plan to DOE. SEA will provide technical assistance if requested.	District must submit a 2-year district school improvement plan to the Department. SEA will provide technical assistance if requested.
District Improvement Level 2 – Fail to meet AYP one additional year	Evaluate implementation and effectiveness of plan, revise and continue implementation of school improvement plan.	First full year after identification not making AYP. Continue to implement school improvement plan.
District Improvement Level 3 – Fail to meet AYP one additional year	Receive district audit from SEA and implement recommendations as determined by the Secretary, with follow up as necessary. The State will establish a plan to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the recommendations.	Corrective action – SEA continues technical assistance and takes at least one corrective action.
State – Level		
	USDOE will provide technical assistance to the state if it does not make AYP for two consecutive years.	

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?

New legislation mandates that all public school children will be tested and all public school districts will be held accountable for proficiency scores on state specified content standards. The legislation also requires that all students in grades 3-8 and grade 11 in reading and math will be tested. All public school children are also included in other academic indicators.

In cases where a student has been assigned out of district and is enrolled in a South Dakota school operated to serve the special needs of the student (e.g., special education or alternative programs) the student will be counted at the resident district level. In cases where a student has been placed by a state agency and enrolled in a South Dakota school operated to serve the special needs of the student, the student will be counted at the resident district level.

When a student is dually enrolled, the results will be accountable at the public school where the student spends greater than 50% of their day. For accountability purposes, schools that have no tested grades will be linked with the school into which their students feed. For example, where a kindergarten through grade two school feeds into a grades three through six school, the AYP determinations for the grades three through six school will also apply to the feeder school building.

DOE has implemented a system of statewide student identification that makes it possible to accurately track student information across public schools and districts in the state, and supports the inclusion of every student in the state's school and district accountability system.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
2.2 How does the State define "full academic year" for identifying students in AYP decisions?

For a student's assessment results to be included in a school's performance, the student must have been enrolled a substantial portion of the year in a single school. For accountability purposes, a substantial portion or full academic year is defined as a student being continuously enrolled from October 1 to the last day of the testing window to be counted in the accountability formula. This will assure that the annual progress of a student can be attributed to a single school. With the statewide student information management system in place that has given each student a unique student identifier number, it is possible for the State to easily track and determine that students test in only one school.

Students who transfer to another school during the testing window and would therefore not meet the full academic year requirement at the school for which they have been enrolled, will be counted toward AYP at the district level if their transfer is within their current school district.

Students who transfer from one school district to another within the state will be counted at the state level for AYP purposes.

A student enrolled in a school for the full academic year but was not identified as a student with disabilities until after December 1 will be counted in the "all" group for the school and district but will not be counted in the subgroup for students with disabilities.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?

A student is placed in the accountability formula as follows:

- at the school level if she/he is enrolled for the full academic year, or
- at the district level if she/he has been enrolled in two or more schools operated by the district for the full academic year, or
- at the state level if she/he has been enrolled in public schools in the state but not consecutively enrolled at any one school or district.

The statewide student information management system will track student enrollment from one public school to another, and will be used to determine which students meet the definition of a full academic year.

- During testing window, all students will be required to test at their current school. However, if a student moves during the testing period and has not been previously tested, the receiving school is obligated to test the student. Students who have tested at their previous attendance center and have moved to a new school are not required to re-test.
- Students moving into a district that do not meet the full year academic definition are required to be tested but scores will not be counted in the district adequate yearly progress.

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?

South Dakota will include two academic content areas in its school and district accountability system: reading and mathematics.

The state's assessment, Dakota STEP, has been aligned to the state academic standards in reading and math. The state assessment will be administered to every student enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11. An alternate assessment, Dakota STEP-A, is available for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Adequate yearly progress will be determined for State grade spans, for each public district grade span, and for each public school, including all student groups. Annual measurable objectives and intermediate goals have been determined as specified in regulation.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?

AYP will be determined for reading and math separately. AYP for the other academic indicator (attendance or graduation rate) will also be determined for each school. A school, each district grade span, and each student group will be declared as having met AYP if its performance meets the applicable Annual Measurable Objective (AMO), meets the AMO with the confidence interval, meets the AMO using the 2-year average, or demonstrates substantial improvement consistent with NCLB provisions **and** meets or exceeds a participation rate of at least 95%. Specifically, a school, district grade span, or student subgroup will be declared as having met the student performance requirements of AYP if it meets at least one of the following conditions:

Status

1. The school, district grade span, or student group's status score meets or exceeds the AMO for that year **OR**
2. If the school, district grade span, or student group's score (including the use of a confidence interval) in the most recent year is equal to or greater than the target AMO **OR**
3. If the school, district grade span, or student group's average score over the two most recent years is equal to or greater than the target AMO (including confidence intervals), **AND**

4. The school, district grade span, or student group has a participation rate of at least 95%. The school, district grade span, or student group must have at least 95% of the students enrolled in the tested grades on the last day of the testing window participate in the state assessments. If a school, district grade span, or student group has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.

The overall confidence interval of p = .01 will be applied to the available status score data (i.e., most recent single year or average of two years).

School Improvement (Safe Harbor)

5. If in any particular year the school, district grade span, or student group does not meet those annual measurable objectives as described above, the school, district grade span, or student group may be considered to have made AYP if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment. In determining if the school, district grade span, or student group has met the 10% reduction in the percent not proficient, a 75% confidence interval will be applied.

Other Academic Indicators

AYP for the Other Academic Indicators is determined for each school and district grade span for its student group of all students.

6. A school or district grade span that includes grade 12 will be expected to meet or exceed the State's graduation rate of 80% or show progress. This minimum graduation rate for AYP may be increased over time. A school or district grade span that does not enroll students in grade 12 shall have an average daily attendance rate that will meet or exceed the state's minimum attendance rate expectations of 94% or show progress. This minimum attendance rate for AYP may be increased in the future.

Student Groups -- The State will disaggregate test data for all public schools to report the progress of student subgroups and to determine whether or not each subgroup has met or exceeded the State's annual measurable objectives. South Dakota will use current census definitions for major racial/ethnic groups: White, Black, Asian/Pacific, Hispanic, and Native American. Students with free and reduced lunch status will be the basis for determining the subgroup of economically disadvantaged status. Students identified through the test to identify students as LEP will be assigned to the LEP subgroup. Students qualifying for an IEP (Individualized Education Plan) will be categorized in the students with disabilities subgroup.

Each subgroup in the school or district grade span must have at least 95% of the students enrolled in the tested grades on the last day of the testing window participate in the state

assessments. If a subgroup has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.

Uniform averaging procedure – To provide greater reliability, the higher of the following shall be used to determine if a school, district grade span, or student group has made adequate yearly progress for reading or math:

1. Data from the school year for which a determination is being made.
2. Average data from the two most recent years of student assessment.

Scores will be combined from the two most recent years and a percentage proficient calculated from that data (see Table 1 for illustration). This two-year average will be calculated separately for reading and mathematics.

In the initial year of the assessment (2003) for any school, the AYP determination will be based on a single year of data since multiple years of data is not available.

To meet the student performance requirements of AYP, a school, district grade span, or student group will be counted as meeting AYP for reading or math if it meets one of the following conditions including participation rate requirement:

- If the school, district grade span, or student group's average score over the two most recent years is equal to or greater than the target AMO (including confidence intervals), or
- If the school, district grade span, or student group's observed score (including confidence intervals) in the most recent year is equal to or greater than the target AMO.

Table 1: Example of Two-Year Averaging Applied to AYP Status Decision

Year	Percent Proficient	Number of Students Proficient	Number of Students
2003	57%	26	46
2004	65%	35	54
	Total	61	100
2-year average	61%	30.5	50

Year	Percent Proficient	AMO for current year	AYP Decision (Status)
2003-04 Avg.	61%	63%	(Did not meet)
2004	65%	63%	Met

In the example, the school's two-year average percent proficient is 61%. If the AMO were 63%, the school would not meet AYP on the basis of its two-year average, but it would meet AYP on the basis of its most-recent year (65%). This approach rewards schools and district grade spans for efforts that result in strong single-year achievement gains and minimizes the potential for falsely inferring that a school or district grade span has failed to meet AYP standards.

The State's statewide student information management will track this information at the school, district, and state levels.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?

South Dakota will hold schools accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14 in two academic content areas in its school and district grade span accountability systems: reading and mathematics. Schools will be required to show that they have at least a minimum status score, beginning in 2002-03, which will be raised over time. The starting point for 2002-03 will be calculated by ranking schools in terms of the school status score, and denoting the school status score of the school enrolling the 20th percentile student in terms of overall school enrollment for 2002-03. Starting points, intermediate goals, and AMOs will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools. Every subgroup, school, and district grade span in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school AMOs.

District and state grade spans will be held to the applicable AMOs established. Both the elementary (grades 3-5) and middle school (grades 6-8) grade spans will be held to the starting point and the subsequent AMOs established for the K-8 group. The district and state high school grade span will be held to the AMO set for the 9-12 grade span as established.

Due to a timeline waiver approved by USDOE, the initial AYP starting point was determined for reading and mathematics in the summer of 2003. The State determined the starting points for reading/math using the NCLB prescribed methodology for 2 different methods. Both methods were calculated, and then the higher of the two used. In all cases, the higher calculation was the school status score of the school enrolling the 20th percentile student in terms of overall school enrollment. The following chart shows the results of the calculations for each grade span and subgroup.

Starting Point Calculations: Based on 2002-2003 Data

Grouping	Subject	% Based on 20% Enrollment	Lowest Subgroup %	Sub-Group Description
K-8	Reading	65.9%	29.5%	State K-8 LEP Reading
K-8	Math	45.9%	16.9%	State K-8 LEP Math
9-12	Reading	50.0%	7.5%	State 9-12 LEP Reading
9-12	Math	60.2%	12.9%	State 9-12 IEP Math

The starting points for 2003 for each grade span are as follows:

Grouping	Subject	Starting Points
K-8	Reading	65%
K-8	Math	45%
9-12	Reading	50%
9-12	Math	60%

Due to a change in the academic content and achievement standards as well as the assessment for reading, the AYP starting point for reading was revised during the summer of 2005. The State determined the starting point for reading using the NCLB prescribed methodology for 2 different methods. Both methods were calculated, and then the higher of the two used. The following chart shows the results of the calculations for each grade span and subgroup.

Starting Point Calculations: for Reading Based on 2004-2005 Data

Grouping	Subject	% Based on 20% Enrollment	Lowest Subgroup %	Sub-Group Description
K-8	Reading	78.5%	41.3%	State K-8 LEP
9-12	Reading	66.5%	13.5%	State 9-12 LEP

The 2005 starting points for Reading for each grade span are as follows:

Grouping	Subject	Starting Points
K-8	Reading	78%
9-12	Reading	66%

Content standards and achievement descriptors for mathematics have been revised and were implemented during the 2005-06 school year. The Dakota STEP assessment was revisioned to ensure alignment with these revised standards and the revised assessment was administered in spring 2006. Cut scores for the revised math assessment were set in May 2006. South Dakota followed the established procedure for re-establishing the starting point for mathematics as described above for reading. The new target for mathematics has been implemented for determining accountability based upon the Dakota STEP assessment results from the 2005-06 school year.

Starting Point Calculations: for Math Based on 2005-2006 Data

Grouping	Subject	% Based on 20% Enrollment	Lowest Subgroup %	Sub-Group Description
K-8	Math	65.8%	36.2%	State K-8 LEP
9-12	Math	54.5%	13.2%	State 9-12 SPED

The 2005 starting points for Math for each grade span are as follows:

Grouping	Subject	Starting Points
K-8	Math	65%
9-12	Math	54%

CRITICAL ELEMENT
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?

South Dakota will hold schools and districts accountable for having 100% of the students reach proficiency by 2013-14. Starting points, intermediate goals, and AMOs will be calculated separately for two grade spans—high schools (schools that enroll students in grade 12) and elementary/middle schools, and for districts /State. Every subgroup, school, and district grade span in the state will be accountable for meeting the high school or elementary/middle school AMOs.

The starting point for reading was recalculated July 2005 to reflect changes in academic content and achievement standards as well as the assessment for reading. AMOs were also recalculated, preserving the 100% proficiency requirement no later than the 2013-2014 school year. Likewise, the starting point for mathematics was recalculated June 2006 to reflect the revisions to the mathematics content and achievement standards as well as the assessment for math. AMOs for math were recalculated.

Annual measurable objectives for each grade span and subject area:

	K-8		9-12	
School Year	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002-2003	65%	45%	50%	60%
2003-2004	65%	45%	50%	60%
2004-2005	78%	54%	66%	67%
2005-2006	78%	65%	66%	54%
2006-2007	82%	65%	72%	54%
2007-2008	82%	72%	72%	63%
2008-2009	82%	72%	72%	63%
2009-2010	86%	72%	77%	63%
2010-2011	90%	79%	83%	72%
2011-2012	94%	86%	89%	81%
2012-2013	96%	93%	94%	90%
2013-2014	100%	100%	100%	100%

CRITICAL ELEMENT
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?

Intermediate goals will be established that require schools to increase their minimum performance from the starting point to 100% in five equal intervals, with each increase occurring no more than three years apart. South Dakota will increase the first intermediate goal for math in 2004-2005, then in 2007-08, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-2014. Annual measurable objectives (AMO) will be established that reflect this schedule for increasing the intermediate goals.

The starting point for reading was recalculated in July 2005 to reflect changes in the state's academic content and achievement standards for reading as well as the reading assessment. Intermediate goals were re-established, once the revised starting point was calculated, that requires schools to increase their minimum performance from the starting point to 100% in equal intervals, with each increase occurring no more than three years apart. This same procedure was followed in setting intermediate goals for math once the starting point was recalculated in July 2006. South Dakota has devised the following schedule that will synchronize the increases for reading and math during the 2010-11 school year.

Schedule for Intermediate Goal Increases

	K-8		9-12	
School Year	Reading	Math	Reading	Math
2002-2003	65%	45%	50%	60%
2004-2005	78%	54%	66%	67%
2005-2006	78%	Reset	66%	Reset
2006-2007	Increase	Same as '06	Increase	Same as '06
2007-2008	Same as '07	Increase	Same as '07	Increase
2008-2009	Same as '07	Same as '08	Same as '07	Same as '08
2009-2010	Increase	Same as '08	Increase	Same as '08
2010-2011	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase
2011-2012	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase
2012-2013	Increase	Increase	Increase	Increase
2013-2014	100%	100%	100%	100%

Intermediate Goals for Reading:

	K-8	9-12
School Year	Reading	Reading
2002-2003	65%	50%
2004-2005	78%	66%
2006-2007	82%	72%
2009-2010	86%	77%
2010-2011	90%	83%

2011-2012	94%	89%
2012-2013	96%	94%
2013-2014	100%	100%

Intermediate Goals for Math

	K-8	9-12
School Year	Mathematics	Mathematics
2002-2003	45%	60%
2004-2005	54%	67%
2005.2006	65%	54%
2007-2008	72%	63%
2010-2011	79%	72%
2011-2012	86%	81%
2012-2013	93%	90%
2013-2014	100%	100%

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?

A school, district grade span, or student group will be declared to having met AYP if it meets the provisions defined in element 3.2 and have the sum of 10 or more students in the most recent two years in the grades tested.

For schools and districts who have fewer than ten students in the grades tested in the most recent two years, AYP will be determined by the DOE. DOE will implement a review or "small school audit". This audit will include, but is not limited to, a review of other assessment data that may be available to DOE for this school or district and also a request for additional information that may assist in this review of educational progress.

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?

All decision rules for AYP in math and reading also apply to the defined subgroups:

- All public school students
- US Census report definitions are used to define the major racial/ethnic groups to include White, Black, Asian/Pacific, Hispanic, and Native American.
- Students with free and reduced lunch status will be the basis for determining the subgroup of economically disadvantaged.
- Students identified through the State's required test of Limited English Proficiency will be identified for the LEP subgroup.
- Students qualifying for an IEP will be categorized under the students with disabilities subgroup.

The following table indicates the areas in which subgroups will be held accountable:

	Reading		Mathematics		Other Academic Factor
	Performance (Status and Improvement)	Participation Rate	Performance (Status and Improvement)	Participation Rate	
All students					
Economically Disadvantaged					
White					
Black					
Asian/Pacific					
Hispanic					
Native American					
Students with Disabilities					
LEP Students					

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?

The same tests that will be applied to the school and district grade spans as a whole will be applied to each subgroup in the school and district to determine if each meets AYP. An overall confidence interval will be used (p = .01) to increase the reliability of these tests. Using SIMS Net, we are able to match student data with test results and calculate results for all required subgroups

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?

All students with disabilities participate in the statewide assessment program either by taking the Dakota STEP or by taking the South Dakota alternate assessment entitled Dakota STEP-A.

Test scores of students with disabilities who are assessed using the Dakota STEP will be included in the assessment data for the grade in which the student is enrolled for purposes of calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP). Students included in the December 1st Child Count will be included in the students with disabilities subgroup.

A small number of students take the alternate assessment. The Dakota STEP-A is based on alternate academic content standards and alternate academic achievement standards, both aligned to the State's academic content standards, assessing student performance in reading and mathematics. The alternate assessment is available for students K -12 with results from grades 3 through 8 and grade 11 used for accountability purposes, consistent with the State's standards and assessment plan.

Alternate academic achievement standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities will be reset for the 2005-06 school year as cut scores will be determined to align with the revised Alternate Academic Content Standards and achievement descriptors and the revised Alternate Assessment. These will be used in the determination of adequate yearly progress for the 2005-06 school year. The alternate achievement standards are aligned with South Dakota's academic content standards; promote access to the general curriculum for such students; and reflect professional judgment of the highest learning standards possible for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

For purposes of determining adequate yearly progress, the state will use alternate academic achievement standards to evaluate the performance of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and give equal weight to "proficient" and "advanced" performance based on the alternate academic achievement standards in calculating student group, school, district

grade span, and state AYP. The number of "proficient" and "advanced" scores based on the alternate academic achievement standards will not exceed 1.0 percent of all students in the grades tested at the State and district level. All districts will be held to the one percent cap except for the following exceptions:

- Districts with 200 or fewer students eligible for testing (enrolled in grades assessed) would be able to count as proficient up to 2 scores of students who score proficient on an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards.

- The group of districts with more than 200 students eligible for testing would be held to an overall one percent cap on the number of scores of students who score proficient on an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards as proficient.

Any scores that exceed the percentage limitation and for whom no exception is granted will be counted as non-proficient for accountability purposes. South Dakota would have the excess, up to 1 percent of the small districts' number of students eligible for testing, available to grant exceptions that might be needed by other districts.

Former Students with Disabilities

South Dakota will take advantage of the flexibility offered by USDOE allowing the state to include former students with disabilities as part of that subgroup for two years in determining the status score for that subgroup in meeting the AMO for reading and math. A student who's IEP has been terminated by the December 1st Child Count will be considered as a former student with disabilities. The former students would be included in the determining AYP for the students with disabilities subgroup for a maximum of two test administrations.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?

A student will be identified as limited English proficient (LEP) when the student meets the criteria for LEP as established by the federal definition for LEP and by the administration of the test used to identify LEP students in South Dakota. LEP students who attain a proficient achievement level for two consecutive years on the overall composite score of the English language proficiency assessment will no longer be considered an LEP student.

For identified LEP students, the Dakota English Language Proficiency (DELP) test will be administered annually, prior to the administration of Dakota STEP statewide assessment. Results of the DELP assessment will be reported to the district and State by the contractor.

All students identified as LEP, except those who are in their first 12 months of enrollment in a U.S. school, will participate in all statewide assessment programs with accommodations as necessary. The State will not be providing a native or first language version of any state mandated assessment instruments. An alternate assessment for LEP students will not be made available.

LEP students enrolled for less than one full academic year must participate in all statewide assessment programs. However, their test results will not be included in the district and school determination of adequate yearly progress.

First Year in Country

LEP students in their first 12 months of enrollment in a school in the United States:

- will not be required to take the reading test, if that student has participated in the State-mandate, annual test of English Language Proficiency, DELP. Participation in the DELP test will constitute participation in reading for purposes of determining AYP. Students who enroll for the first time in a school in the U.S. after the testing window for the ELP test has ended in South Dakota will meet participation requirements for reading through the completion of the LEP eligibility assessment.

- will be required to take the state's mathematics test, indicating participation for AYP determination. The results of the math test for LEP students in their first year of enrollment in a U.S. school will not be included in the determination of AYP for the school, district, or state, even if the student meets the requirements of attendance for a full academic year.

- the English language proficiency test will be administered annually, prior to the administration of Dakota STEP statewide assessment. Results of that assessment will be reported to the district and State by the contractor and used to determine AYP status for the state.

Former LEP Students

South Dakota will take advantage of the flexibility offered by USDOE February 20, 2004, allowing the state to include these former LEP students as part of that subgroup for two years after reaching proficiency in determining the status score for that subgroup in meeting the AMO for reading and math.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?

The minimum size of subgroups will be 10 for the purpose of reporting results and accountability.

Minimum Size for Reporting purposes: For reporting purposes we will employ a minimum size of 10 for all subgroups. This minimum-n will enable the state's reports to maintain individual student confidentiality, in accordance with federal FERPA privacy requirements. The state will also employ additional rules to maintain confidentiality of individual student results under special situations (e.g., all students proficient).

Minimum Size for Accountability Purposes
For AYP calculations, South Dakota will use a confidence interval combined with a minimum n of 10 for all subgroups This will allow schools of all sizes, even very small schools, to be included in the accountability system with reasonable reliability.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?

The state will maintain the privacy of students when reporting results and determining AYP by using a minimum number of 10 when reporting results, including subgroups. The state will also incorporate additional rules to safeguard privacy in situations such as when all or almost all students have the same score.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?

South Dakota will include two academic content areas in its school and district accountability system: reading and mathematics.

The state's assessment, Dakota STEP, has been aligned to the state content standards in reading and math. The state assessment will be administered to every student enrolled in grades 3-8 and 11 starting. An alternate assessment, Dakota STEP-A, is available for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

Adequate yearly progress will be determined for the State, and for each district grade span and school, including all student groups. Annual measurable objectives and intermediate goals have been determined as specified in regulation.

Dakota STEP and Dakota STEP-A test data will be used to determine the percentage of students proficient and advanced for each school, district grade span, or student group. This information will then be applied to decision rules in determining adequate yearly progress.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT
7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?

Methodology for Calculating Graduation Rate:

The below formula will be fully implemented in four years. It is South Dakota's intention to build the database needed to calculate this rate for all subgroups over a four year period based on the following schedule. In school year 2003 include 12th grade data only; in school year 2004 include 11th and 12th grade data; in school year 2005 include 10th through 12th grade and in school year 2006 full implementation with the inclusion of data for grades 9th through 12th grades.

The formula to be utilized is as follows:

$$\frac{\text{High School Completers in Year 4}}{\text{Dropouts (Gr 9, year 1 + Gr 10, year 2 + Gr 11, year 3 + Gr 12, year 4) + HS Completers, Year 4}}$$

This calculation is based on the recommendation of NCES in a publication "Public High School Dropouts and Completers from Common Core of Data: School Year 1998-99 through 1999-2000".

This rate will be reported and utilized for purposes of determining AYP for all students (in the aggregate) and reported for the disaggregated subgroups.

Definition of Terms (based on NCES recommendations):
Dropout: An individual who

- Was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and
- Was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and
- Has not graduated from high school or completed a state approved educational program; and
- Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions:
    - Transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs);
    - Temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or
    - Death.

High School Completers:

- Diploma recipients – individuals who are awarded a high school diploma. This would not include students that may receive a non-standard diploma (e.g. a GED or certificate of completion).

Students with disabilities who complete the required coursework for graduation will receive a regular high school diploma. A student on an IEP who meets these criteria will be counted as a high school completer. However, students who are on an IEP who do not graduate in the standard number of years and who do not meet all required coursework for graduation will not be considered a high school completer.

A school and district grade span that includes grade 12 will be expected to meet or exceed the State's graduation rate. The graduation rate will be 80% based on a full implementation of a four year rate for the "all student" group following the 2003-2004 school year and set at one standard deviation from that statewide mean (see the below data analysis).

A school and district grade span will be said to have made AYP for the other indicator if the school meets or exceeds the 80% graduation rate threshold or improves its graduation rate over the previous year.

South Dakota intends to implement graduation rate calculations according to the formula promoted by the National Governors Association (NGA) effective the 2008-2009 school year. Graduation rates for all public high schools in the state will be calculated in July 2009, the mean rate determined, and the target set at one standard deviation below the mean. The new target will take effect in summer 2009 and be applied to calculations for the 2008-09 school year.

Graduation Rate (2002-2003 data)	
Mean	91.17
Median	94.17
Mode	100
Standard Deviation	11.77
Minimum	11.11
Maximum	100
Sum	14951.59
Count	164

1 Standard Deviation	79.4	**80%**

CRITICAL ELEMENT
7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?

South Dakota will use attendance rate as its additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools and district grade spans K-5 and 6-8...

Methodology for Calculation of Attendance Rate (reported as a percentage):

$$\frac{\text{Days of Attendance}}{\text{Days of Membership}}$$

This rate will be reported and utilized for purposes of determining AYP for all students (in the aggregate) and reported for the disaggregated groups.

A school or district grade span that does not enroll students in grade 12 (elementary/middle schools) shall have an average daily attendance rate that will meet or exceed the state's minimum attendance rate expectation of 94%. This rate was calculated based on a statistical review of district attendance rate data from the 2002-2003 school year. As per the data analysis included below, a rate of 94% represents 2 standard deviations from the mean.

A school or district grade span will be said to have made AYP for the other indicator if the school meets or exceeds the 94% attendance rate threshold or improves its attendance rate over the previous year.

District Attendance Rates (2002-2003)	
Mean	97.0133824
Median	97.0291877
Mode	100
Standard Deviation	1.63745061
Range	10.3148139
Minimum	89.6851861
Maximum	100
Sum	16492.275
Count	170
Confidence Level (95.0%)	0.24792066

2 Standard Deviation	93.7384812	**94%**

CRITICAL ELEMENT
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?

The State of South Dakota collects student data through SIMS Net, which has greatly enhanced the reliability of data reporting. South Dakota's graduation rate calculation complies with national standards and both the graduation and attendance rates are subject to audit and verification at the state level.

The graduation rate calculation is consistent with the methodology recommended by the National Center for Education Statistics.

The South Dakota Department of Education reviews data submitted by school districts relative to the graduation and attendance rates and identifies figures that represent substantial change from past performance. The South Dakota Department of Education engages individual school districts in verifying data that represents substantial change from past performance.

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?

The Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculation will examine separately the percent of students proficient and advanced in reading and mathematics, as well as the rates of participation in reading and mathematics. In determining whether each subgroup, school, and district grade span, as well as each State grade span meets the annual measurable objectives, South Dakota will calculate – separately for reading and for mathematics – the percent of the tested students who achieve the proficient level or higher, examine participation rates, implement a uniform averaging procedure, and employ the safe harbor provision.

South Dakota will establish separate reading and mathematics statewide annual measurable objectives for elementary/middle and high school grade spans that identify a minimum percentage of students that must meet the proficient level of academic achievement. The reading and mathematics annual measurable objectives will be applied to each school building and school district grade span, as well as to each subgroup at the school, district grade spans, and state grade spans to determine AYP status.

School Level Improvement Status
Two consecutive years of failing to make AYP in the same content area is the basis for identifying schools for reading or math improvement. Two consecutive years of failing to make AYP on the other academic indicator (attendance or graduation rate) will put a school into improvement status for the other indicator category.

Two consecutive years of making AYP in the same content area is necessary to be removed from the list of schools identified for improvement in reading or math. In addition, two consecutive years of making AYP in the other academic indicator will remove a school from improvement status for that indicator.

District Level Improvement Status
District AYP will be determined annually for districts as outlined in Element 3.2. A district will be identified for improvement status only if all grade spans, elementary (grades 3-5), middle (grades 6-8), and high school (grades 9-12) fail to make AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject or other academic indicator. However, if at least one of the grade spans makes AYP, the district will not be identified for improvement. AYP for each grade span will be calculated by considering the percent of students proficient and advanced for the grade span compared to the established AMO for that grade span. Confidence interval, minimum N size, Safe Harbor, and 2 year averaging provisions stated in Element 3.2 will also apply to this calculation.

A district identified for improvement status will be removed from that status if the district makes AYP for 2 consecutive years in the same subject or category for which it was identified as needing improvement.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?

South Dakota's school and district accountability system has two main features to allow reliable and valid accountability decisions to be made while including as many subgroups as possible.

- First, we will use a confidence interval approach to ensure decisions are acceptably reliable. When using a statistical test, one must specify the null hypothesis and the "confidence level," or amount of acceptable error. South Dakota's assumption (null hypothesis) will be that the school did make AYP. South Dakota's confidence level for the overall judgment about schools will be p=.01.

- Secondly, South Dakota will use a minimum-n of 10. This aligns the reporting requirements for confidentiality with the accountability requirements. However, South Dakota will test every student in grades 3-8 and 11 starting spring 2003, and will combine the results over two years, so that only extremely small schools will require a small school audit. The use of a confidence interval makes possible this low minimum-n, which is statistically a more valid way to include subgroups in the state.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?

The State will request that schools and districts examine their Dakota STEP data and analyze it for accuracy in order to validate (or challenge) the AYP decisions made by the state. In addition, the State will conduct validity analyses regarding which schools are or are not identified as meeting AYP, common characteristics, and so on, as the data becomes available.

South Dakota's appeal process will be consistent with the requirements of NCLB with regard to submission of evidence and timelines.

Districts and schools identified for school improvement are given an opportunity to review the assessment data (Dakota STEP). If the district or school believes that such identification for school improvement is in error for statistical or other substantive reasons, such district or school may provide evidence to the DOE to support such belief. In other words, a district or school may challenge the data and its analysis only, not the assessment or accountability system itself. If the district or school believes this identification is in error, the district must submit a letter stating such to the Department of Education. This letter must be postmarked no later than 10 business days after receiving notification of school improvement status.

Districts who submit a letter no later than 10 business days after notification will be given the opportunity to discuss the school improvement status with DOE officials and will be asked to

submit evidence to support their claim. A district or school will either be formally identified for school improvement or removed from school improvement status after consideration of the district's request. If no response is received by the said date, the department will formally identify the district or school for school improvement.

Schools may appeal AYP determinations to their district, submit evidence and expect a final determination within the 30 day timeline prescribed by the NCLB legislation. Similarly, districts may appeal an AYP determination to the State, submit evidence, and expect a final determination within 30 calendar days.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?

If a district/school is undergoing any change with grade span or physical building, the district will submit a request to DOE to explain the reasons for the change in their status; DOE will approve or disapprove the proposed change. Students attending public schools that are in their first year of operation will be included at the school, district, and state levels in determining AYP. AYP determinations for new schools will commence with their first year of operation, at which time students attending the new school will be included at the school, district, and state levels.

When school boundaries are dramatically altered within a large school district (a district with 2 or more schools per grade span), prior AYP status for the school(s) involved will be null and void. Dramatically altered is defined to mean at least 50% of the student population of the school building – or – grade spans tested in that building has been removed and replaced with students from another school within the district. The first year of the newly restructured school will become its first AYP status. It is the responsibility of district administration to inform DOE that such changes have taken place.

In a case where two or more districts consolidate, prior AYP status for all districts and schools involved will become null and void. The newly formed district and its schools will obtain its first AYP status based upon assessment results of its first full year of operation.

As South Dakota revises its academic standards and assessments system, the department will adjust the starting points and AMOs as described in elements 3.2a, b, and c, maintaining the timeline for all students to reach proficiency by 2013-14.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?

All students will be required by state law to take the Dakota STEP in grades 3-8 and grade 11 beginning in the spring of 2003. A minimum of 95% participation on the assessment is required for a school to have made AYP. The requirement of 95% participation may be determined based on one of the following calculations:

Current Year Determination:

- 95% participation rate is calculated using 95% of the total enrollment of the population of grades eligible at the end of the testing window in the current year.
- If a school has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.

Multiple Year Determination:

- If the district or school is unable to meet the 95% participation in the current year an average participation rate based on the past two or three years is determined and must meet or exceed 95%.

The 95% participation rate will be calculated for the state and each district grade span, school and student group. An eligible student is one that is enrolled in the school on the last day of the testing window in a grade identified for testing.

SIMS Net will be the vehicle for assuring accurate data collection of participation rate. Each student in the State has a unique identifier number that is linked to student assessment results and participation.

CRITICAL ELEMENT
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?

The participation rate for each school and district grade span, and for the state as a whole, as well as for each student group, will be based on the enrollment on the last day of the testing window. Subgroup, school and district grade span participation rates will be determined by comparing the number of students with test results to the number of students enrolled on the last day of the testing window. If a school, district grade span, or student group has 40 or fewer students enrolled in the tested grades, then it shall have no more than 2 (two) students not participate in the state assessments.

South Dakota will also utilize the recent flexibility provided by USDOE regarding students unable to be tested due to a significant medical emergency. Districts and schools that may not meet the 95% participation may request a recalculation omitting the specified student. Documentation of the medical emergency is required to request this recalculation.