



south dakota
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Learning. Leadership. Service.

ESEA Consolidated State Application

September 1, 2003 Submission

Updated March 28, 2005

Updated April 14, 2006

Updated June 29, 2010

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

**Title III Consolidated Application
Submitted June 2002**

d. In the June 2002 submission, identify the languages present in the student population to be assessed, the languages in which the State administers assessments, and the languages in which the State will need to administer assessments. Use the most recent data available and identify when the data were collected.

The following assessments are administered by the State of South Dakota, Dakota State Test of Educational Performance (Dakota STEP,) ACCESS, assessment and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). All the above assessments are administered in English. When necessary, a translator may be provided as an assessment accommodation.

It has been determined that no language is prevalent in a large and commanding quantity in any one school district in South Dakota. One language present in large numbers in a few school districts is Lakota. Due to the definition of limited English proficient (LEP) students contained in Title IX, Native American students are often identified as LEP because of the influence that speakers of a Native language have on their daily lives. They are, however, not fluent speakers of a Native language and would not be able to take a large-scale assessment in a Native language. As a result, all state-mandated assessments in South Dakota will be provided in English.

The following language data was collected in the spring of 2010. Currently we have 84 different languages spoken in South Dakota school districts.

The following is a list of languages spoken in South Dakota School Districts. Languages with fewer than 10 speakers are not included in the list:

Language: # of Students:

(Afan) Oromo 58	Kurdish 12
Amharic 68	MaiMai 53
Arabic 143	Mandarin 12
Chinese-Zhongwen 20	Myanmasa 27
Croatian-Hrvatski 37	Nepali 79
Dinka 37	Neur 22
English 491	Russian 45
French 98	Serbo-Croatian 18
German 176	Somali 100
Hmong 11	Spanish 1076
Hutterish 661	Swahili 175

Laothian-Pah Xa Lao 24 **Tagalog 24**
Kayah 22 **Thai 143**
Kirundi 81 **Tigrinya 64**
Krahn 74 **Ukranian 80**
Kunuma 48 **Vietnamese 72**

The following is a list of Native American languages for some students in South Dakota School Districts who come from an environment where a language other than English had a significant impact on the level of English language proficiency:

Language and # of Students
Lakota 1279
Dakota 167

In the June 2002 submission, provide evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of section 1111(b)(7) and 3116(d)(4), including assessment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. Identify the assessment(s) the State will designate for this purpose.

The student population in South Dakota is becoming increasingly diverse. Some areas of the state have large numbers of immigrant and refugee students whose first language is not English. South Dakota joined the WIDA (World Class Instructional Design and Assessment) Consortium beginning with the 2008-09 school year and the W-APT (WIDA-ACCESS Placement Test™) is used to identify students as LEP.

In the summer of 2008, the SD DOE conducted an alignment study to determine the degree of linkage between the SD academic content standards and the WIDA English Language Proficiency standards. Results of the alignment study indicated strong alignment. The SD State Board of Education adopted the WIDA English Language Proficiency standards as the ELP standards for South Dakota in November 2008. The WIDA Consortium maintains the alignment of the ACCESS for ELLs® (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners) and the WIDA English language

proficiency standards. For identified LEP students, the ACCESS test will be administered annually, prior to the administration of Dakota STEP statewide assessment. Results of the ACCESS for ELLs® assessment will be reported to the district and State by the contractor. The SD DOE completed a provisional standard-setting in the summer of 2009 after the first administration of the test to establish exit criteria. LEP students who attain a 4.8 on the overall composite score of the ACCESS English language proficiency assessment and a minimum of 4.0 on both the reading and writing sections of the test will be considered proficient and will no longer be considered an active LEP student. After the second administration of the ACCESS for ELLs® in 2010, SD DOE will review the exit criteria to ensure consistency with the state's English language proficiency standards.

All students identified as LEP 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.

The test will be administered in February of each school year to all LEP students. Following the administration of the test, a composite of each student's level of English language proficiency will be determined.

d. In the June 2002 submission, describe the status of the State's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives under section 3122(a) of the ESEA that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient children. These standards and objectives must relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension, and be aligned with the State academic content and student academic achievement standards as required by section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the State's plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.

The department established a statewide workgroup of educators, all of whom work in the field of English Language Acquisition, to help develop English language proficiency (ELP) standards that are linked to the reading, language arts, math, and science content standards. The workgroup consisted of elementary, middle, and high school teachers as well as a school district administrator and a university administrator, both of whom are responsible for the development and delivery of English Language Acquisition classes to elementary, secondary and postsecondary students.

The ELP standards are presented in the following grade spans: PK-K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. These standards define progressive levels of competence in the acquisition of English in four domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. For each standard, Can Do descriptors for increasing levels of proficiency are given indicating progress toward the state English language proficiency standard. The English language proficiency standards are linked to the content area standards in reading, math social studies and science.

The department presented the ELP standards at the November 17-18, 2008, State board meeting. The South Dakota Board of Education adopted the ELP standards established by the department on November 17-18, 2008.

The ACCESS was administered in February 2009. The curriculum of the English language-learning program can be 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.

1. Title III, Part A -- English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement [Goals 1,2,3,5]

- h. Describe how the SEA will ensure that LEAs use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing LEAs flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that the grantees determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.**

The SEA will ensure that subgrantees use Title III program funds to carry out only those activities that reflect scientifically-based research. Each subgrantee will complete an application for Title III funds that is part of their Consolidated Plan. Within this plan a subgrantee will need to explain the types of programs and services that will be implemented with Title III funds. The LEA's Consolidated Plans will be reviewed by SEA staff for compliance with all federal requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. SEA staff will conduct on-site reviews of all funded programs on a three year rotation.

- i. Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress that raises**

the achievement of limited English proficient children.

LEAs are held accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient students and for making adequate yearly progress that raises the achievement of limited English proficient students. LEAs will annually assess the English proficiency of all LEP students. LEAs will also annually assess the academic achievement of LEP students. The LEA must describe to the SEA how the eligible entity will hold elementary schools and secondary schools receiving funds accountable for meeting the annual measurable achievement objectives and for making adequate yearly progress. If an LEA fails to make progress toward meeting AMAOs for two consecutive years, the SEA will require the LEA to develop an improvement plan that will ensure that the entity meets the AMAO objectives. The improvement plan shall specifically address the factors that prevented the LEA from achieving such objectives.

- j. **Specify the percentage of the State’s allotment that the State will reserve and the percentage of the reserved funds that the State will use for each of the following categories of State-level activities: professional development; planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination; technical assistance; and providing recognition to subgrantees that have exceeded their annual measurable achievement objectives. A total amount not to exceed 5 percent of the State’s allotment may be reserved by the State under section 3111(b)(2) to carry out one or more of these categories of State-level activities.**

The State of South Dakota receives minimum Title III-funding. The State will reserve \$120,000 of the maximum amount allowed of \$175,000.00, for state-level activities.

The state-level activities that will be carried out will be professional development, planning and interagency coordination, evaluation, administration, recognition of subgrantees and technical assistance. The funds will be allocated as follows:

Category: Budgeted Amount:

Administration	\$40,000
Recognition of Subgrantees	\$5,000
Evaluation	\$5,000
Professional Development	\$25,000
Technical Assistance	\$30,000

Planning & Interagency Coordination	\$5,000
Indirect Costs (proposed 12.1%)	<u>\$10,000</u>
Total Amount:	\$120,000

- k. **Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth. A total amount not to exceed 15 percent of the State's allotment must be reserved by the State under section 3114(d)(1) to award this type of subgrant.**

The State will reserve a minimum of 2% not to exceed 15% of the State's allotment for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.

- l. **Describe the process that the State will use in making subgrants under section 3114(d) to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.**

Each subgrantee that has experienced a significant increase, as compared to the two preceding years, in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth, who have enrolled during the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the subgrant is made may qualify for this allotment. Recent data reflects minimal increases in immigrant children and youth. The SEA will consider the quality of the local plan and ensure that each subgrant is of sufficient size and scope to meet the purpose intended. Within this plan a subgrantee will need to explain the types of programs and services that will be implemented with Title III funds. The LEA's Consolidated Plans will be reviewed by SEA staff for compliance with all federal requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act

- m. **Specify the number of limited English proficient children in the State. (See definitions of "child" in section 3301(1), and "limited English proficient" in section 9101(25).)**

South Dakota reports LEP data for students in public schools for the current school year through the use of a Student Information Management System, Infinite Campus. The enrollment for Kindergarten through Grade 12 (excluding PreK and including ungraded) as of June 15, 2010 is 5169 students.

Provide the most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the State. (See definition of "immigrant children and youth" in section 3301(6).)

1053 immigrant youth and children were reported in 2008-2009 with 1002 served by Title III.

Consolidated State Application June 22, 2010 Submission

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

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)

The department established a statewide workgroup of educators, all of whom work in the field of English Language Acquisition, to help develop English language proficiency (ELP) standards that are linked to the reading, language arts, math, and science content standards. The workgroup consisted of elementary, middle, and high school teachers as well as a school district administrator and a university administrator, both of whom are responsible for the development and delivery of English Language Acquisition classes to elementary, secondary and postsecondary students.

The ELP standards are presented in the following grade spans: PK-K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. These standards define progressive levels of competence in the acquisition of English in four domains: listening, speaking, reading and writing. For each standard, descriptors for increasing levels of proficiency are given indicating progress toward the state English language proficiency standard. The English language proficiency standards are linked to the content area standards in reading, math, social studies and science.

The department presented the ELP standards at the November 17-18, 2008, State board meeting. The South Dakota Board of Education adopted the ELP standards established by the department on November 17-18, 2008. South Dakota joined the WIDA Consortium in May, 2008.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2009-2010 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);

4386 students were assessed for annual progress in acquiring proficiency. All of these students were identified as limited English language learners using the W-APT during the school year 2009-2010.

- 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 the W-APT English language proficiency assessments. The results of this assessment is used to determine immediate services for English language acquisition. Those students who are determined to be English language learners as a result of this identifying assessment will be assessed each winter on the ACCESS test. The ACCESS test 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 W-APT will participate in the administration of the ACCESS test during the winter of each year to track annual progress and determine the level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

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

Table 1: Baseline Data for 2009-2010

ELP Assessment(s) (1)*	Total number of LEP Identified as of June 15, 2010	Total number of LEP Students tested	Number and Percentage		Number and Percentage		Number and Percentage		Number and Percentage	
			Entering	Beginning	Developing	Expanding	Bridging	Reaching		
	5169	4386	99 2.25%	593 13.50%	603 13.75%	1481 33.77%	1318 30.05%	292 6.66%		

- 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;

ACCESS for ELLs® scores are reported as both scale scores and proficiency level scores. Scores are given for all four language domains. In addition, four composite scores are now given: Oral Language (based on performances in Listening and Speaking), Literacy (based on performances in Reading and Writing), Comprehension (based on performances in Listening and Reading) and an Overall score (based on performances in all four domains). Raw scores are converted to scale scores through processes called equating and scaling (see section 1.3.2 for details). These processes allow us to report scores on a standard scale that is familiar to test users and that remains constant across test forms and grade-level clusters. Scale scores range from 100 to 600. Beginning with Series 102, the center point of the scale, 350, which formerly represented the cut score between language proficiency levels 3 and 4 for the grade 3-5 cluster, represents the same cut score for grade 5 only. In determining the Oral Language and Literacy composite scores, equal weight is given to each domain. However, in determining the Comprehension and Overall composite scores, more weight is given to literacy skills than to oral skills. The scores are weighted as follows:

Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening

Overall = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

(WIDA Annual Technical Report 2008-09)

- Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and

Language Domains and Composite Scores

Scores for individual language domains: Students receive scale scores and corresponding language proficiency level designations for each language domain: Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. Listening and Reading scores are capped at language proficiency level 4.0 (Expanding) for students who took the Tier A form and at language proficiency level 5.0 (Bridging) for students who took the Tier B form of *ACCESS for ELLs*®. (See *Special Notes* on p. 8 for more information about why a maximum language proficiency level has been established for these tiers.)

Composite Scores: Students receive four different composite scores derived from a combination of weighted scale scores from the language domains: 1). Oral Language; 2). Literacy; 3). Comprehension; and 4). Overall Score. Table 1 presents the percent contribution, or the weighting, of language domains for each composite score. **Composite scores are compensatory.** Compensatory means that a high score in one language domain could inflate the composite score, compensating for a low score in another language domain; conversely, a low score in a language domain could bring down the composite. Composite scores should be used with caution after careful consideration of their compensatory nature. Attention must be given to the individual language domain scores that comprise the composite score.

1. Oral Language: The Oral Language composite score combines equally weighted scale scores from Listening and Speaking. In other words, 50% of the Oral Language Score is attributed to Listening and the other 50% to Speaking. The language proficiency level designation corresponds to the scale score for Oral Language; it is *not* derived from a combination or average of proficiency level designations for Listening and Speaking.

2. Literacy: The Literacy composite score combines equally weighted scale scores from Reading (50%) and Writing (50%). The proficiency level designation corresponds to the scale score for Literacy; it is *not* derived from a combination or average of proficiency level designations of these two language domains. © 2010 The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, on behalf of the WIDA Consortium **3. Comprehension:** The Comprehension composite score combines the scale scores for Listening and Reading. The Comprehension Score is comprised of 30% Listening and 70% Reading.

4. Overall Scale Score: The Overall Scale Score reflects a weighted score based on a student's scores in Listening, Speaking, Reading, and Writing. It is the Listening scale score multiplied by .15, plus the Speaking scale score multiplied by .15, plus the Reading scale score multiplied by .35, plus the Writing scale score multiplied by .35, rounded to the nearest whole number. The weighting of the scores reflects the differential contributions of each language domain required for academic success, with heavier emphasis placed on literacy development.

The same Overall Scale Score can reflect two very different student profiles. For example, one student may be very strong in Listening and Reading, but weaker in Speaking and Writing, while another student with the same Overall Scale Score is strong in Reading and Writing, but weaker in Listening and Speaking. A student's individual performance in each language domain provides a more comprehensive and realistic profile than that from a single overall score.

Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening

Overall = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2009-2010 school year to assess LEP students.

The ACCESS is used as the annual assessment of student progress in acquiring English language proficiency.

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

4,386 students were assessed for annual progress in acquiring English. Students identified as limited English language learners prior to the 2007-08 school year were identified using the LAS or IPT. Students identified since the start of the 2007-08 school year were identified using the W-APT.

(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:

English Language Proficiency Test (ACCESS)-published by WIDA

Content measured: Listening, Writing, Reading, and Speaking.

Grade levels evaluated: PK-K, 1-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12.

South Dakota adopted the ACCESS in November 2008. In September 2008 an alignment study was completed between the South Dakota ELP standards and the ACCESS assessment. Please see the timeline below for the ACCESS augmentation program:

- Alignment study for augmentation June 2008
- First administration of augmented test Feb. 2008

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: 4,386 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 administration of the ACCESS test using the W-APT is 783 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:

- 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 WIDA ELP Standards describe the continuum of language development with five language proficiency levels that are fully delineated in the standards document. These levels are "Entering," "Beginning," "Developing," "Expanding," and "Bridging." There is also a final exit stage, known as Level 6, "Reaching," that describes students who have progressed across the entire WIDA English language proficiency continuum.

In determining the Oral Language and Literacy composite scores, equal weight is given to each domain. However, in determining the Comprehension and Overall composite scores, more weight is given to literacy skills than to oral skills. The scores are weighted as follows:

Comprehension = 70% Reading + 30% Listening

Overall = 35% Reading + 35% Writing + 15% Listening + 15% Speaking

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

DEFINITION OF PROGRESS (AMAO 1)

Making progress is defined as advancing at least 0.5 decimal gains on the ACCESS overall composite proficiency level from one year to the next. Achievement levels are expressed in increments of one tenth ranging from 1.0 to 6.0. (*Section 3122(a)(3)*).

Ex: Year 1 Composite Test Result - 1.3

Year 2 Composite Test Result – 1.8 = .5 gain = progress

Year 3 Composite Test Result – 2.2 = .4 gain = not making progress

- 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)

Proficiency Level Scores: The proficiency level scores are *interpretive scores*. That is, they are an interpretation of the scale scores. They describe student performance in terms of the six WIDA language proficiency levels (1-Entering, 2-Beginning, 3-Developing, 4-Expanding, 5-Bridging, and 6-Reaching). Proficiency Level Scores in the Parent/Guardian Report are represented by bar graphs. In the Teacher Report, they are presented as whole numbers followed by a decimal. The whole number indicates the student's language proficiency **level** as based on the WIDA ELP Standards. The decimal indicates the **proportion** within the proficiency level range that the student's scale score represents, rounded to the nearest tenth. Proficiency level scores do **not** represent interval data. The interval between corresponding scale scores for 2.2 to 3.2, for example, are not necessarily the same as between a 3.2 and a 4.2.

- A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next

The four domains in the ACCESS test that are used to determine the overall composite score are reading, writing, listening and speaking.

DEFINITION OF PROGRESS (AMAO 1)

Making progress is defined as advancing at least 0.5 decimal gains on the ACCESS overall composite proficiency level from one year to the next. Achievement levels are expressed in increments of one tenth ranging from 1.0 to 6.0. (*Section 3122(a)(3)*).

Ex: Year 1 Composite Test Result - 1.3

Year 2 Composite Test Result – 1.8 = .5 gain = progress

Year 3 Composite Test Result – 2.2 = .4 gain = not making progress

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

AMAOs are performance targets that include:

(AMAO 1) Making progress toward English language proficiency as measured by the state English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (*Section 3122(a)(3)*)

(AMAO 2) Attaining English language proficiency as measured by the ELP assessment(*Section 3122(a)(3)*)

(AMAO 3) Meeting AYP as measured by the state content assessment (Dakota STEP) (*Section 3122(a)(3)*).

Decision Rules for AMAO Calculations:

(AMAO 1) Making Progress

Denominator = All LEP students enrolled in a Title III District on the last day of the state’s ELP assessment testing window.

Numerator = All LEP students that made progress on the state’s ELP assessment.

SD will utilize a minimum n-size of 25 for each District or Consortia.

(AMAO 2) Attaining Proficiency

Denominator = All LEP students enrolled in a Title III District on the last day of the state’s ELP assessment testing window.

Numerator = All LEP students that met the state’s definition of proficiency on the state’s ELP assessment.

SD will utilize a minimum n-size of 25 for each District or Consortia.

(AMAO 3) Meeting AYP will be defined as using as minimum n-size of 25 to be applied to all districts and consortia.

South Dakota has defined the minimum n-size of 25 for the 2009-10 school year. The minimum n-size is consistent with the state’s approved Title I Accountability Workbook, Section 5.5.

AMAO Targets		
English Language Proficiency Targets. All new and re-enrolling students grades K-12	Percent of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
Baseline Year 2008-2009	80%	50%
2009-2010	50%	4%
2010-2011	52%	5%
2011-2012	55%	6%
2012-2013	58%	7%