

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:
Parts I and II**

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended in 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17

SOUTH DAKOTA



PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2017
PART II DUE THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2018

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, as amended in 2001 provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple *ESEA* programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and *ESEA* programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following *ESEA* programs:

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

The *ESEA* Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2016-17 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five *ESEA* Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the *ESEA*. The five *ESEA* Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- | **Performance Goal 1:** By SY 2016-17, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- | **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- | **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- | **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific *ESEA* programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required *EDFacts* submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2016-17 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 14, 2017**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, February 15, 2018**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2016-17, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2016-17 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2016-17 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

		OMB Number: 1810-0724
		Expiration Date: 5/31/2018
<p>Consolidated State Performance Report For State Formula Grant Programs under the Elementary And Secondary Education Act as amended in 2001</p>		
Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: <input type="checkbox"/> Part I, 2016-17 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Part II, 2016-17		
Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report: South Dakota Department of Education		
Address: 800 Governors Drive Pierre, SD 57501		
Person to contact about this report:		
Name: Mary Stadick Smith		
Telephone: 605-773-7228		
Fax: 605-773-6139		
e-mail: mary.stadicksmith@state.sd.us		
Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type): Mary Stadick Smith		
		<u>Monday, February 12, 2018, 12:27:44 PM</u>
Signature		Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2016-17



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 15, 2018
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,720	2,065	43.75
4	4,622	1,897	41.04
5	4,472	1,461	32.67
6	2,436	761	31.24
7	1,744	584	33.49
8	1,678	470	28.01
High School	393	98	24.94
Total	20,065	7,336	36.56
Comments:			

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	4,694	1,795	38.24
4	4,600	1,880	40.87
5	4,453	1,834	41.19
6	2,415	906	37.52
7	1,728	745	43.11
8	1,659	601	36.23
High School	393	183	46.56
Total	19,942	7,944	39.84
Comments:			

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA*. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	3,503	2,107	60.15
4	3,304	1,877	56.81
5	2,745	1,308	47.65
6	1,173	604	51.49
7	568	287	50.53
8	549	261	47.54
High School	444	166	37.39
Total	12,286	6,610	53.80
Comments:			

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or above Proficient	Percentage at or above Proficient
3	3,503	1,932	55.15
4	3,302	1,839	55.69
5	2,742	1,633	59.56
6	1,173	648	55.24
7	568	347	61.09
8	549	342	62.30
High School	444	305	68.69
Total	12,281	7,046	57.37
Comments:			

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Special Services or Programs	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	7,039
Limited English proficient students	2,697
Students who are homeless	921
Migratory students	307
Comments:	

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	11,397
Asian	855
Black or African American	1,381
Hispanic or Latino	3,070
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	47
White	24,195
Two or more races	1,984
Total	42,929
Comments:	

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age Birth through 2	0	49	0	0	49
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0	944	0	0	944
K	659	5,216	40	10	5,925
1	963	4,798	56	26	5,843
2	837	4,808	49	33	5,727
3	700	5,067	16	39	5,822
4	584	4,965	36	43	5,628
5	513	4,810	26	49	5,398
6	173	2,604	26	46	2,849
7	81	1,923	13	54	2,071
8	64	1,852	8	40	1,964
9	67	656	0	18	741
10	57	566	0	15	638
11	36	461	0	0	497
12	7	462	0	0	469
Ungraded	0	0	0	13	13
TOTALS	4,741	39,181	270	386	44,578
Comments:					

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections collect data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Instructional Service	# Students Served
Mathematics	2,016
Reading/language arts	3,440
Science	
Social studies	
Vocational/career	
Other instructional services	0
Comments: Our schools do not offer Title services in any subjects other than Reading or Math.	

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

TAS Support Service	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	0
Supporting guidance/advocacy	0
Other support services	0
Comments: We do not have any LEAs providing these services through a Targeted Assistance program.	

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	133.24	
Paraprofessionals ¹	23.43	100.00
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	0.00	
Clerical support staff	0.50	
Administrators (non-clerical)	5.69	
Comments:		

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?"* An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:
- (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?"* Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional?* A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

¹ Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

² Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of *ESEA*. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

Paraprofessional Information	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals ³	1,046.00	100.00
Comments:		

³ Consistent with *ESEA*, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.1.4 Parental Involvement Reservation Under Title I, Part A

In the table below provide information on the amount of Title I, Part A funds reserved by LEAs for parental involvement activities under Section 1118 (a)(3) of the ESEA. The percentage of LEAs FY 2016 Title I Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement will be automatically calculated from the data entered in Rows 2 and 3.

Parental Involvement Reservation	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of \$500,000 or less	LEAs that Received a Federal Fiscal Year (FY) 2016 (School Year 2016-17) Title I, Part A Allocation of more than \$500,000
Number of LEAs*	132	18
Sum of the amount reserved by LEAs for parental involvement	0	274,280
Sum of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations	13,749,368	27,610,174
Percentage of LEAs' FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocations reserved for parental involvement	0.00	0.99

*The sum of Column 2 and Column 3 should equal the number of LEAs that received an FY 2016 Title I, Part A allocation.

In the comment box below, provide examples of how LEAs in your State used their Title I Part A, set-aside for parental involvement during SY 2016-17.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

LEAs in South Dakota use the set-aside funds for various activities, including the following:

1. Holding family events at various times of day and days of the week focused on activities that parents can do with their children to improve math skills and reading comprehension.
2. Inviting parents to eat lunch with their children.
3. Building relationships between teachers and parents through home visits.
4. Using communication software to get time sensitive information to families through the parent's preferred medium (telephone, text message, or email) and in the parent's primary language whenever possible.
5. Providing an opportunity for incoming kindergartners and their parents.
6. Holding a multicultural family event to share cultures.
7. Providing a weekly update to parents about school activities.
8. Encouraging classroom teachers to send a newsletter home to parents summarizing what students have been learning and sharing links to websites that families can explore with their children.
9. Supporting and developing services for Title 1 Schools.
10. Seeking external resources for continued support and growth of Title 1 Schools.
11. Offering professional development opportunities for staff and families.
12. Recruiting and coordinating the activities of individuals and organizations willing to offer programs and services at the school to meet the need of student, families, and community members.
13. Purchasing supplies and materials to facilitate activities.
14. Providing child care so families can attend meetings or activities.

LEAs also indicated that light meals and snacks were also included in some activities in order to encourage participation.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- | Population data of eligible migrant children
- | Academic data of eligible migrant students
- | Data of migrant children served during the performance period
- | School data
- | Project data
- | Personnel data

Report a child in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State during the performance period.

There are two exceptions to this rule. The first exception to this rule is a child who turns 3 during the performance period would be reported as "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)," **only if the child's residency in the state was verified after the child turned three.** The second exception to this rule may be a child who turns 22 years of age during the performance period, who would be reported at the appropriate age/grade category for the performance period.

2.3.1 Migrant Child Counts

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, reliable, and valid child counts.

To provide the child counts, each SEA should have implemented sufficient procedures and internal controls to ensure that it is counting only those children who are eligible for the MEP. Such procedures are important to protecting the integrity of the State's MEP because they permit the early discovery and correction of eligibility problems and thus help to ensure that only eligible migrant children are counted for funding purposes and are served. If an SEA has reservations about the accuracy of its child counts, it must disclose known data limitations to the Department, and explain how and when it will resolve data quality issues through corrective actions in the box below, which precedes Section 2.3.1.1 *Category 1 Child Count*.

Note: In submitting this information, the Authorizing State Official must certify that, to the best of his/her knowledge, the State has taken action to ensure that the child counts and information contained in the report are true, reliable, and valid and that any false Statement provided is subject to fine or imprisonment pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 1001.

FAQs on Child Count:

1. *How is "out-of-school" defined?* Out-of-school means children up through age 21 who are entitled to a free public education in the State but are not currently enrolled in a K-12 institution. This could include students who have dropped out of school, youth who are working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution, and youth who are "here-to-work" only. It does not include preschoolers, who are counted by age grouping, nor does it include temporary absences (e.g., summer/intersession, suspension or illness).
2. *How is "ungraded" defined?* Ungraded means the children are served in an educational unit that has no separate grades. For example, some schools have primary grade groupings that are not traditionally graded or ungraded groupings for children with learning disabilities. In some cases, ungraded students may also include special education children, transitional bilingual students, students working on a HSED through a K-12 institution, or those in a correctional setting. (Students working on a HSED outside of a K-12 institution are counted as out-of-school youth.)

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based and how and when these concerns will be resolved.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.1.1 Category 1 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children)

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include children age birth through 2 years.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	110
K	86
1	73
2	54
3	64
4	50
5	50
6	47
7	30
8	45
9	69
10	45
11	29
12	11

Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	1
Total	764
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.1.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 1 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: The Demkota beef plant in Aberdeen has stayed open and Dakota Provisions turkey plant in Huron is expanding. This has allowed for families to stay in their communities. We have had more workers move into the northeastern part of the state to work at dairies due to the Babybel Cheese factory in Brookings.

2.3.1.1.2 Birth through Two Child Count

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from birth through age 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age Birth through 2	59
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.1.2 Category 2 Child Count (Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/ Intersession Term)

In the table below, enter by age/grade the unduplicated statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were **served** for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the performance period only once in the age/grade category in which s/he spent the majority of his/her time while residing in the State, during the performance period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do not include

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	37
1	35
2	31
3	32
4	30
5	26
6	29
7	11
8	21
9	24
10	14
11	7
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	297
Comments: We did not offer a migrant funded summer school during the 15-16 school year. Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.1.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

In the space below, explain any increases or decreases from last year in the number of students reported for Category 2 greater than 10 percent.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: We did not offer a migrant funded summer school during the 15-16 school year.
Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.1.2.2 Birth through Two Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, enter the unduplicated statewide number of eligible migrant children from age birth through 2 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods that occurred within the performance period of September 1, 2016 through August 31, 2017. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once.

Do not include:

- Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children Served by the MEP During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	0
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.1.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

2.3.1.3.1 Student Information System

In the space below, respond to the following questions: What system did the State use to compile and generate the Category 1 child count for this performance period? Please check the box that applies.

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
NGS	<u>No</u>
MIS 2000	<u>Yes</u>
COEStar	<u>No</u>
MAPS	<u>No</u>
Other Student Information System. Please identify the system:	<u>No</u>

Student Information System	(Yes/No)
Was the Category 2 child count for this performance period generated using the same system?	<u>Yes</u>

If the State's Category 2 count was generated using a different system than the Category 1 count please identify the specific system that generates the Category 2 count.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

In the space below, please describe the procedures and processes at the State level used to ensure all eligible children, ages 3-21, are accounted for in the performance period. In particular, describe how the State includes and counts only:

- | The unduplicated count of eligible migrant children, ages 3-21. Only include children two years of age whose residency in the state has been verified after turning three.
- | Children who met the program eligibility criteria (e.g., were within 3 years of a qualifying move, and were entitled to a free public education through grade 12 in the State, or preschool children below the age and grade level at which the agency provides free public education). Children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the performance period (September 1 through August 31).
- | Children who-in the case of Category 2-were served for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the summer term or during intersession periods.
- | Children once per age/grade level for each child count category.
- | Children who had an SEA approved Certificate of Eligibility (COE) and were entered in the State's migrant student database.

Category 1 Child Count:

All COEs are generated by individual school district personnel or by a recruiter from the South Dakota Department of Education and mailed or delivered to the department. The SDDOE is the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. The State Director of Migrant Education Programs reviews every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000. Information that requires clarification or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. When necessary a phone call is made to the school administrator employee, migrant parent or recruiter that verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and verified. Clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000. This data entry process occurs on an on-going basis. An MEP or school district updates information by conducting home visits or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the year. Self-eligible youth are verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is done with a phone call to the last known residence. If residence cannot be verified the youth is not included in the Category 1 Count. Current enrollment lists generated from MIS2000 are sent to the school districts at the beginning of the school year. The personnel at the school update and verify residency of the student(verified by the state) after the child turns 3 years old. If the child is not enrolled in preschool at this time, the liaison at the school will verify residency by communication with the parent. MIS2000 automatically updates students' ages on their birthday. Once a child turns three they are included in all reports pulled from MIS2000. The MIS2000 allows the SEA to withdraw a child on the last day the child was enrolled in a LEA. Upon re-enrollment in the same LEA at the start of the Fall Semester the child's migratory status would be updated as an eligible child for purposes of the Child Count. Should the child's 36 months of eligibility have expired during this time the MIS2000 would automatically generate a report of termination. Children who have received a high school degree or HSED/GED are marked in MIS2000 under the termination field with reason, date recorded, and are no longer included in the child count. The data used to document enrollment and termination dates is taken from the COE and is verified and updated annually by the authorized LEA administrator. Duplication of identified migrant students is avoided by comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student. All duplicated names are researched and eligibility re-verified. Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS2000 tracking system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts are provided with an MIS2000 printout of all students in the district identified as eligible migratory students. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Discrepancies are discussed and resolved with the LEA administrator.

Category 2 data are collected when project reports submitted as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP completes the MEP Evaluation Report and summer intersession participation is recorded in the evaluation report. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked. Summer intersession is provided to those migrant students enrolled and residing in an MEP during the recent school year (August 15 through June 1) or to eligible migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students.

-children who were between age 3 through 21;

-children who met the program eligibility criteria.

All migrant data is entered into the MIS2000 data collection system by an SEA data entry operator. The system provides a report building feature that allows the data entry person to design the reports needed to verify Category 1 Count. The SD Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the system. No MEP has the ability to encode data or generate reports. SEA data entry personnel build a report to determine the exact criteria for counting only eligible migrant students during the count period of 9-1 through 8-31 of each count year. The report generates information on children 3-21 years of age who made a qualifying move between the count dates (QAD) and who remain eligible. Only eligible children making a qualifying move during the count year are counted with this process. The SEA data entry specialist verifies the qualifying activity of the parent based on the coded list of qualifying agricultural activities.

-children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period

The report building feature of the MIS 2000 generates a "current enrollment report" of the eligible students based on the qualifying arrival date between 9-1 and 8-31 of the count year. A student who made a qualifying move with their parent(s) between school districts or states would be an eligible student and counted once if that move was between 9-1 and 8-31 of the count year. A student who moved out of the district or state of residence would not be an eligible migrant child/youth after the

end date of the count year in which the child/youth moved. Eligibility would be reestablished if the child moved back to the state or district and a new COE completed.

-children who-in the case of Category 2-received a MEP-funded service during the summer or intersession

The Category 2 count is obtained by cross-checking data reported during the MEPs completion of an annual program evaluation report with data from summer intersession project reports with the name and SIMS numbers of each migrant child participating in the summer program. The SEA collects a unique SIMS identification number on the COE of each identified migrant student in the state and compares data from the evaluation report and the project report to verify that only eligible migrant students are served during the summer intersession and counted as Category 2 children.

-children once per age/grade level for each child count category

Category 1: Data entry personnel build a report to search for duplicate students by determining the exact criteria for counting only eligible migrant students during the count period of 9-1 through 8-31 of each year. The report generates information on children 3-21 years of age who made a qualifying move between the count date and who remain eligible. Duplicate names and birth date are generated by an MIS 2000 report asking for duplicate names and dates. If determined necessary the data entry personnel will call the school district of record to discuss duplicate students. The SEA also uses the unique SIMS number of each identified migrant student to locate any duplicate students or to verify the existence of duplicate students. We added the SIMS number, a unique student number currently assigned to all school age children in SD, to the COE during the summer of 2003.

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

How does the State ensure that the system that transmits migrant data to the Department accurately accounts for all the migrant children in every ED Facts data file (see the Office of Migrant Education's CSPR Rating Instrument for the criteria needed to address this question)?

Once the family enrolls in the school, the LEAs fill out a COE and send it to the State level. Once it is approved or denied the school district is notified by a letter. The information is then entered into the MIS2000 database by the State Director. We also use current enrollment lists to update the students each

year. The State Director works with the LEAs to ensure that children at home are accounted for. The students in summer school are marked in MIS2000 at the end of the summer session.

Use of MSIX to Verify Data Quality	(Yes/No)
Does the State use data in the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) to verify the quality of migrant data?	<u>No</u>

If MSIX is utilized, please explain how.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

2.3.1.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following questions :

Quality Control Processes	Yes/No
Is student eligibility based on a personal interview (face-to-face or phone call) with a parent, guardian, or other responsible adult, or youth-as-worker?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA and/or regional offices train recruiters at least annually on eligibility requirements, including the basic eligibility definition, economic necessity, temporary vs. seasonal, processing, etc.?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have a formal process, beyond the recruiter's determination, for reviewing and ensuring the accuracy of written eligibility information [e.g., COEs are reviewed and initialed by the recruiter's supervisor and/or other reviewer(s)]?	<u>Yes</u>
Are incomplete or otherwise questionable COEs returned to the recruiter for correction, further explanation, documentation, and/or verification?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA provide recruiters with written eligibility guidance (e.g., a handbook)?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA review student attendance records at summer/intersession projects to verify that the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students served in the summer/intersession is reconciled with the Category 2 Count ?	<u>Yes</u>
Does the SEA have both a local and state-level process for resolving eligibility questions?	<u>Yes</u>
Are written procedures provided to regular school year and summer/intersession personnel on how to collect and report pupil enrollment and withdrawal data?	<u>Yes</u>
Are records/data entry personnel provided training on how to review regular school year and summer/inter-session site records, input data, and run reports used for child count purposes?	<u>Yes</u>

In the space below, describe the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA during the performance period to test the accuracy of the State's MEP eligibility determinations.

Results	#
The number of eligibility determinations sampled.	60
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed.	35
The number of eligibility determinations sampled for which a re-interview was completed and the child was found eligible.	35

Describe any reasons for non-response in the re-interviewing process.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Procedures For Independent Prospective Re-Interviews	
What was the most recent year that the MEP conducted independent prospective re-interviews (i.e., interviewers were neither SEA or LEA staff members responsible for administering or operating the MEP, nor any other persons who worked on the initial eligibility determinations being tested)? If independent prospective re-interviews were not administered in any of the three performance periods, please provide an explanation in the "Comment" row at the end of this table.	SY 2016-17
Procedures	Yes/No
Was the sampling of eligible children random?	<u>Yes</u>
Was the sampling statewide?	<u>Yes</u>

Comment:

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

ERTC conducted the re-interview.
Data is accurate as reported.

FAQ on independent prospective re-interviews:

- a. *What are independent prospective re-interviews?* Independent prospective re-interviews allow confirmation of your State's eligibility determinations and the accuracy of the numbers of migrant children in your State reports. Independent prospective interviews should be conducted at least once every three years by an independent interviewer, performed on the current year's identified migrant children.

If the sampling was stratified by group/area please describe the procedures. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Please describe the sampling replacement by the State. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Obtaining Data From Families	
Check the applicable box to indicate how the re-interviews were conducted	
Face-to-face re-interviews	<u>Face-to-face re-interviews</u>
Phone Interviews	
Both	

Obtaining Data From Families	Yes/No
Was there a protocol for verifying all information used in making the original eligibility determination?	Yes
Were re-interviewers independent from the original interviewers?	Yes

If you did conduct independent re-interviews in this reporting period, describe how you ensured that the process was independent. Only enter a response if your State completed independent prospective re-interviews in SY 2016-17 .

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The interview protocol was developed based on recommendations by OME staff. The protocol was required to be used by the audit interviewers with each family to complete the process. The audit interviewers also had copies of each student's original COE from 2015-16 to use as a comparison following the completion of the interview. The interview protocol was designed to include a review of the interview content and COE by the project coordinator from ERTC as well as the state migrant director. The interviewers, the project coordinator, and the state migrant director must all agree on any issues related to recruiting and each student's eligibility and sign off on the interview protocol. If the student is found to be ineligible, reasons must be provided and included on each form.

The audit interviewers were the ERTC team of the following individuals: Mr. Richard Rangel and Mr. Michael Rangel. The interviews were conducted in English and Spanish and translation in Karen and Napli by Dil Bhujel in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and Ethan Moo in Huron, South Dakota.

The team was assisted by program coordinators, Jennifer Sweeney in Sioux Falls, South Dakota; Dawn Marshall in Huron, South Dakota; and Heather Fischer in Watertown, South Dakota.

In the space below, refer to the results of **any** re-interview processes used by the SEA, and if any of the migrant children were found ineligible, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The audit of the Child Eligibility was completed by Educational Research and Training Corporation. It is important to note that of the random sample of the 16 migrant families with 35 migrant students in the sample, all were eligible to receive services. This would calculate the State's defect rate at zero percent. This is indicative of the high degree of accuracy of the South Dakota migrant recruiters and infers that migrant students and families in the State of South Dakota are eligible for services they are receiving

In the space below, please respond to the following question:

Does the state collect all the required data elements and data sections on the National Certificate of Eligibility (COE)?	Yes
---	-----

2.3.2 Eligible Migrant Children

2.3.2.1 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	72
1	61
2	43
3	54
4	39
5	35
6	34
7	25
8	37
9	55
10	30
11	24
12	8
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	525

Comments: We have about 100 more eligible migrant students this year. I have provided more training on this and the consistency of staff identifying the children's needs has improved. We have been enrolling more students that have had no formal education before coming to SD. We have started a statewide consortium to reach out to more districts and provide more services.
Data is accurate as reported.

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.2.2 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP) During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	8
K	76
1	63
2	44
3	56
4	42
5	38
6	35
7	28
8	36
9	60
10	31
11	25
12	10
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	552

Comments: We have about 100 more eligible migrant students this year.
Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.2.3 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who are also children with disabilities (*IDEA*) under Part B or Part C of the *IDEA*. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA) During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	2
1	5
2	2
3	2
4	2
5	5
6	2
7	1
8	4
9	2
10	1
11	1
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	30

Comments: Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.2.4 Qualifying Arrival Date (QAD)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date (QAD) occurred within 12 months from the last day of the performance period, August 31, 2017 (i.e., QAD during the performance period). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	45
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	30
K	32
1	21
2	17
3	24
4	14
5	13
6	18
7	11
8	17
9	32
10	9
11	3
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	289

Comments: Our migrant numbers have increased this year. The Demkota beef plant in Aberdeen has remained open. Dakota Provisions turkey plant in Huron is expanding, and the dairies are expanding in the Northeast corner of the state due to the opening of the Babybel cheese factory in Brookings. Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.2.5 Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children whose qualifying arrival date occurred during the performance period's regular school year (i.e., QAD during the 2016-17 regular school year). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Qualifying Arrival Date During the Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	35
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	26
K	26
1	16
2	14
3	18
4	9
5	11
6	13
7	7
8	14
9	27
10	2
11	2
12	2
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	1
Total	223

Comments: We have had an increase of migrant students move into South Dakota this year. Our migrant numbers have increased this year. The Demkota beef plant in Aberdeen has remained open. Dakota Provisions turkey plant in Huron is expanding, and the dairies are expanding in the Northeast corner of the state due to the opening of the Babybel cheese factory in Brookings.
Data is accurate as reported.

FAQ on Regular School Year:

How is "regular school year" defined? For schools that operate on a traditional calendar, the regular school year is the period from the beginning of school in the State in the fall to the end in the spring, generally from September to June. For schools that operate on a year-round schedule without a traditional long summer break, the regular school term is the aggregate of all those periods throughout the year when the school (or part of the school) is in session providing the annual amount of instruction analogous to the traditional school-year regular term.

2.3.2.6 Referrals — During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who, during the performance period, received an educational or educationally related service funded by a non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who received a referral only or who received both a referral and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who received a referral from the MEP, but did not receive services from the non-MEP program/organization to which they were referred. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referrals During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	69
K	17
1	11
2	19
3	12
4	16
5	11
6	10
7	3
8	13
9	24
10	13
11	11
12	7
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	238
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.2.8 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of **eligible** migrant students.

2.3.2.8.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropouts During the Performance Period
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	1
12	0
Ungraded	
Total	1

Comments: Data is accurate as reported.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropouts" defined? The term used for students, who, (1) were enrolled in a school for at least one day during the 2016-17 performance period, (2) were not enrolled at the beginning of the current (2017-18) performance period, (3) who have not graduated from high school or completed a State- or district-approved educational program, and (4) who do not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: (a) transfer to another school district, private school or State- or district-approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs), (b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness or (c) death. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2016-17 performance period should not be reported in this item.

2.3.2.8.2 HSED (High School Equivalency Diploma)

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant students who obtained a High School Equivalency Diploma (HSED) by passing a high school equivalency test that your state accepts (e.g., GED, HiSET, TASC).

Obtained HSED	#
Obtained a HSED in your State During the Performance Period	0

Comments: Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.3 Services for Eligible Migrant Children

The following questions collect data about MEP services provided to eligible migrant children during the performance period.

Eligible migrant children who are served include:

- | Migrant children who were eligible for and received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- | Children who continued to receive MEP-funded services during the term their eligibility ended.
- | Migrant children who are not included in your State's Category I or Category II child counts because they did not reside in your State for at least one day during the performance period (e.g., interstate collaboration), but who were eligible in another State and received instructional services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds in your State. If you report such children, please provide an explanatory comment in the comment box for each relevant CSPR question.

Do not include:

- | Children who were served through a Title I **Schoolwide Program** (SWP) where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- | Children who received only referred services (non-MEP funded).
- | Children who were served for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs.
- | Children who were in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section (1304(e)(2-3))).

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets/annual measurable objectives. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Regular School Year
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	16
1	24
2	12
3	15
4	5
5	13
6	7
7	7
8	11
9	4
10	2
11	2
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	119

Comments: We are providing services to more kids this year through the statewide migrant consortium. Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.4.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP- funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Summer/Intersession Term
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	36
1	34
2	29
3	29
4	27
5	23
6	24
7	11
8	18
9	23
10	12
11	6
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	272

Comments: We did not provide migrant funded summer school throughout South Dakota in 15-16.
Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.5 MEP Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the performance period. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	47
K	44
1	48
2	37
3	45
4	34
5	37
6	31
7	16
8	34
9	28
10	18
11	9
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	430

Comments: We have more students to serve this year. We were able to provide more Migrant funded services this year due to the statewide migrant consortium. We also provided summer school with migrant funding.
Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.5.1 Priority for Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1
K	43
1	47
2	34
3	41
4	31
5	30
6	26
7	15
8	29
9	27
10	16
11	8
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	348
Comments: We are serving about 100 more migrant students this year. We have also been able to identify and serve more students, as training and teacher consistency has gotten better. Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.5.2 Continuation of Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the performance period under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2–3). Do **not** include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services During the Performance Period
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	0
1	0
2	0
3	0
4	0
5	0
6	0
7	0
8	0
9	0
10	0
11	0
12	0
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	0
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.5.3 Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the performance period. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Instructional Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2	2
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	46
K	39
1	38
2	33
3	35
4	34
5	28
6	29
7	14
8	29
9	24
10	14
11	7
12	
Ungraded	
Out-of-school	
Total	372

Comments: During the 2015-2016 school year the Huron migrant program funded 2 teachers to work with the K-1 students. They also hired 5 paraprofessionals to work with the K-8 students. The paraprofessionals were not funded with migrant funds this past school year. Also, we provided migrant funded summer school this year.
Data is accurate as reported.

2.3.5.3.1 Type of Instructional Service – During the Performance Period

In the table below, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children reported in the table above who received MEP-funded reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the performance period. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction During the Performance Period	Mathematics Instruction During the Performance Period	High School Credit Accrual During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2			////////////////////////////////////
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)			////////////////////////////////////
K	39	39	////////////////////////////////////
1	38	38	////////////////////////////////////
2	31	31	////////////////////////////////////
3	32	32	////////////////////////////////////
4	31	31	////////////////////////////////////
5	26	26	////////////////////////////////////
6	29	29	////////////////////////////////////
7	12	12	////////////////////////////////////
8	22	22	
9	24	24	
10	14	14	
11	7	7	
12			
Ungraded			
Out-of-school			
Total	305	305	

Comments: During the 2015-2016 school year the Huron migrant program funded 2 teachers to work with the K-1 students. They also hired 5 paraprofessionals to work with the K-8 students. The paraprofessionals were not funded with migrant funds this past school year. Also, we provided migrant funded summer school this year.
Data is accurate as reported.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher. Beginning with SY 2016-17, high school credit accrual may include the age/grade categories of Grade 8 through Grade 12.

2.3.5.3.2 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Services – During the Performance Period

In the table below, in the column titled **Support Services**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the performance period. In the column titled **Breakout of Counseling Services During the Performance Period**, provide the unduplicated number of **eligible** migrant children who received a counseling service during the performance period. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Support Services During the Performance Period	Breakout of Counseling Service During the Performance Period
Age Birth through 2		
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)		
K		
1		
2	1	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
Ungraded		
Out-of-school		
Total	1	

Comments: MEP funds were not used to pay for these services. Huron received a cut in funding. They used other resources to assist with this. This allowed them to use the funding for teachers and paraprofessionals.
Data is accurate as reported.

FAQs on Support Services:

- a. *What are support services?* These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.
- b. *What are counseling services?* Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.

2.3.6 School Data - During the Regular School Year

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.6.1 Schools and Enrollment - During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled **eligible** migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	59
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	534
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.6.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs (SWP) – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of **eligible** migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the regular school year, the number of children may include duplicates.

Schools	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.	

2.3.7 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.7.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the MEP funds from the State and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children **served** in the projects. Since children may receive services in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Served in the Projects
Regular school year - school day only	3	674
Regular school year - school day/extended day	0	0
Summer/intersession only	0	0
Year round	0	0
Comments: Data is accurate as reported.		

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project?* A project is any entity that receives MEP funds and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications or contracts. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites. Each project should be counted once, regardless of the number of sites in which it provides services.
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects?* Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.
- e. *What are Year Round projects?* Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- | Report data for the program year of July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.
- | Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- | Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- | Use the definitions listed below:
 - | **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - | **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - | **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - | **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - | **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - | **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	
Juvenile detention	0	
Juvenile corrections	0	
Adult corrections	0	
Other	0	
Total	0	////////////////////

Comments: No programs during 2016-2017 and no data. The SD Department of Corrections (SA) declined Title I funding for the school year 2016-2017. The Department of Corrections(SA) closed the only juvenile Subpart 1 facility in early 2016 and no longer operates a juvenile program. At the same time, they closed their Title I program at the Women's Prison; the only adult facility receiving Title I funds. USDE was notified and funding reverted.

FAQ on Programs and Facilities - Subpart 1:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	0
Juvenile corrections	0
Adult corrections	0
Other	0
Total	0

Comments:

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*) and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served					
Total Long Term Students Served					

Student Subgroups	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)					
LEP Students					

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native					
Asian					
Black or African American					
Hispanic or Latino					
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander					
White					
Two or more races					
Total					

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male					
Female					
Total					

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
Total					

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments:

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.1.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the State agency program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the State agency program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student, only after exit)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit										
Outcomes (once per student)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED										
Obtained high school diploma										
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Adult Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits										
Enrolled in a GED program										
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education										
Enrolled in job training courses/programs										
Obtained employment										

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments:

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in reading pre-and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Total					
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams					
Comments:					

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. The total number of programs/ facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	2	109
Neglected programs	0	
Juvenile detention	4	50
Juvenile corrections	13	106
Other	0	
Total	19	////////////////////
Comments:		

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported - Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	2
Neglected programs	0
Juvenile detention	4
Juvenile corrections	13
Other	0
Total	19
Comments:	

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by disability (*IDEA*), and limited English proficiency (LEP), by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	829		330	658	
Total Long Term Students Served	517		27	298	

Student Subgroups	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Students with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	94		37	259	
LEP Students	12		7	5	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	192		213	265	
Asian	11		1	3	
Black or African American	77		19	54	
Hispanic or Latino	59		8	32	
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	3		2	4	
White	455		77	272	
Two or more races	32		10	28	
Total	829		330	658	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	452		239	460	
Female	377		91	198	
Total	829		330	658	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10			3	3	
11	1		1	5	
12	5		16	18	
13	8		33	42	
14	9		43	66	
15	50		68	108	
16	152		54	134	
17	234		73	145	
18	233		39	103	
19	95			18	
20	32			12	
21	10			4	
Total	829		330	658	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

--

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017.

2.4.2.3.2 Academic and Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 90 Calendar Days After Exit

In the tables below, for each program type, provide the number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes.

The first table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only after exit. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who enrolled, or planned to enroll, in their local district school within 90 calendar days after exiting. A student may be reported only once, per program type.

The second table includes outcomes a student is able to achieve only one time. In this table, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained the listed outcomes either while enrolled in the LEA program/facility column ("in fac.") or in the 90 days after exit column. A student may be reported only once across the two time periods, per program type.

The third table includes outcomes a student may achieve more than once. In the "in fac." column, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes while enrolled in the LEA program/facility. In the "90 days after exit" column provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic and vocational outcomes within 90 calendar days after exiting. If a student attained an outcome once in the program/facility and once during the 90 day transition period, that student may be reported once in each column.

Outcomes (once per student), only after exit	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who Enrolled in their local district school 90 days after exit	209				164		306			
Outcomes (once per student)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned a GED	26				3		11	1		
Obtained high school diploma	210				4		29	2		
Outcomes (once per student per time period)	At-Risk Programs		Neglected Programs		Juvenile Detention		Juvenile Corrections		Other Programs	
# of Students Who	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit	In fac.	90 days after exit
Earned high school course credits	653				39	69	378	42		
Enrolled in a GED program					13	1	22	6		
Accepted and/or enrolled into post-secondary education		22					6			
Enrolled in job training courses/programs							21	4		
Obtained employment							48	4		

FAQ on facilities collecting data on student outcomes after exit:

In the text box below, please account for any missing or incomplete data after exit.

This response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: Blank cells are unknown data.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in reading pre- and post-testing. Students should be reported in only one of the four change categories. Reporting pre- and post-test data for at-risk students in the table below is optional.

Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2016, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	88		8	35	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	13		13	85	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	29		1	69	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	46		4	50	
Total	176		26	239	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students with negative grade level change from the pre- to post-test exams	78		4	44	
Long-term students with no change in grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	29		5	75	
Long-term students with improvement up to one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	29		5	60	
Long-term students with improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre- to post-test exams	38		12	51	
Comments:					

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2016, through June 30, 2017.

Is reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk programs required? No, reporting pre/post-test data for at-risk students is no longer required, but States have the option to continue to collect and report it within the CSPR.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	6
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	3
Parental involvement activities	1
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	1
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	1
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	2
Comments:	

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The goals and objectives for the seven schools participating in the RLIS program are being implemented and met through districts providing data driven, quality professional development for their staff. By using data gathered during a comprehensive needs assessment, districts are able to tailor professional development to the needs of the schools within their districts. In doing so, they are working to close the achievement gap of students across the state, as well as increase student achievement levels.

Professional development that utilizes current technology and increases teacher effectiveness has helped meet the goals as determined by the State of South Dakota. The seven schools receiving the RLIS funds have used those funds to add further professional development to help teachers change instructional practices in the classroom, including Mass Customized Learning, ensuring more college and career ready students.

Districts are using the RLIS funds to help teachers further certifications in high need areas and to have paraprofessionals who can help work with English Learners, along with reimbursement for college classes. Funds are also used to implement mentor programs.

Increased family and community engagement activities are also contributing to more success by South Dakota students. These activities are driven by the needs of individual communities, but they all result in increased parental participation in the students' education. Surveys show that parents are feeling more connected to their children's education, especially at the younger ages.

While the state has not met all of the goals originally set out, progress has been made in enabling schools to better meet their goals and objectives through increased teacher retention and effectiveness. Efforts to help schools build better capacity are also continuing.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)**2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds**

In the table below, indicate whether the state transferred funds under the state transferability authority.

State Transferability of Funds	Yes/No
Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2016-17?	<u>No</u>
Comments:	

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

In the table below, indicate the number of LEAs that notified the state that they transferred funds under the LEA transferability authority.

LEA Transferability of Funds	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	2
Comments:	

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the table below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from an eligible program to another eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	2	0
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0	0
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0	0
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0	0
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		2

In the table below provide the total amount of FY 2016 appropriated funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	181,485.00	0.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	0.00	0.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	0.00	0.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	0.00	0.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		181,485.00
Total	181,485.00	181,485.00
Comments:		

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.

2.11 GRADUATION RATES ⁴

This section collects graduation rates.

2.11.1 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rates

In the table below, provide the graduation rates calculated using the methodology that was approved as part of the State's accountability plan for the **current school year** (SY 2016-17). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Note: States are not required to report these data by the racial/ethnic groups shown in the table below; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that have been mapped from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the racial/ethnic groups shown.

Student Group	# Students in Cohort	# of Graduates	Graduation Rate
All Students	9,325	7,809	83.74
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,039	520	50.05
Asian or Pacific Islander	176	150	85.23
<i>Asian</i>	172	147	85.47
<i>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</i>	4	3	75.00
Black or African American	252	197	78.17
Hispanic or Latino	367	259	70.57
White	7,283	6,521	89.54
Two or more races	208	162	77.88
Children with disabilities (<i>IDEA</i>)	914	550	60.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	202	120	59.41
Economically disadvantaged students	2,787	1,865	66.92

FAQs on graduation rates:

What is the regulatory adjusted cohort graduation rate? For complete definitions and instructions, please refer to the non-regulatory guidance, which can be found here: <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/hsgrguidance.pdf>.

The response is limited to 500 characters.

⁴ The "Asian/Pacific Islander" row in the tables below represent either the value reported by the state to the Department of Education for the major racial and ethnic group "Asian/Pacific Islander" or an aggregation of values reported by the state for the major racial and ethnic groups "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander or Pacific Islander" (and "Filipino" in the case of California). When the values reported in the Asian/Pacific Islander row represent the U. S. Department of Education aggregation of other values reported by the state, the detail for "Asian" and "Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander" are also included in the following rows. Disaggregated reporting for the adjusted cohort graduation rate data is done according to the provisions outlined within each state's Accountability Workbooks or Accountability Workbooks Addenda. Accordingly, not every state uses major racial and ethnic groups which enable detail of Asian American/Pacific Islander (AAPI) populations.

2.12 LISTS OF SCHOOLS AND DISTRICTS

This section contains data on school statuses. States with approved *ESEA* Flexibility requests should follow the instructions in section 2.12.1. All other states should follow the instructions in section 2.12.2. These tables will be generated based on data submitted to *EDFacts* and included as part of each state's certified report; states will no longer upload their lists separately. Data will be generated into separate reports for each question listed below.

2.12.1 List of Schools for *ESEA* Flexibility States

2.12.1.2 List of Priority and Focus Schools

Instructions for States that identified priority and focus schools⁵ under *ESEA* flexibility for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: priority or focus)
- | If applicable, State-specific status in addition to priority or focus (e.g., grade, star, or level)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN031 "List of Priority and Focus Schools" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN031 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁵ The definitions of priority and focus schools are provided in the document titled, *ESEA Flexibility*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/esea/flexibility/documents/esea-flexibility.doc>

2.12.2 List of Schools for All Other States

2.12.2.1 List of Schools Identified for Improvement

Instructions for States that identified schools for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under *ESEA* section 1116 for SY 2017-18: Provide the information listed in the bullets below for those schools.

- | District Name
- | District NCES ID Code
- | School Name
- | School NCES ID Code
- | Status for SY 2017-18 (Use one of the following status designations: School Improvement – Year 1, School Improvement – Year 2, Corrective Action, Restructuring Year 1 (planning), or Restructuring Year 2 (implementing)⁶
- | Whether (yes or no) the school is a Title I school (*This information must be provided by all States.*)
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(a).
- | Whether (yes or no) the school was provided assistance through Section 1003(g).

The data for this question are reported through *EDFacts* files and compiled in the EDEN033 "List of Schools Identified for Improvement" report in the *EDFacts* Reporting System (ERS). The *EDFacts* files and data groups used in this report are listed in the CSPR Crosswalk. The CSPR Data Key contains more detailed information on how the data are populated into the report.

Before certifying Part II of the CSPR, a state user must run the EDEN033 report in ERS and verify that the state's data are correct. The final, certified data from this report will be made publicly available alongside the state's certified CSPR PDF.

Comments:

⁶ The school improvement statuses are defined in *LEA and School Improvement Non-Regulatory Guidance*. This document may be accessed on the Department's Web page at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/schoolimprovementguid.doc>.