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 2011-12

SOUTH DAKOTA

PART I DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2013

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) 2011-12 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 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance Goal 3:** By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance Goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

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 2011-12 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **Thursday, December 20, 2012**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **Friday, February 15, 2013**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2011-12, 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 2011-12 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 2011-12 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/).

	OMB Number: 1810-0614
	Expiration Date: 11/30/2013

<table>
<tr><td>

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended in 2001

</td></tr>
</table>

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting:
  __X__Part I, 2011-12   ___Part II, 2011-12

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: Shannon Malone

Telephone: 605-773-6509

Fax: 605-773-3782

e-mail: shannon.malone@state.sd.us

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):
Shannon Malone

_____   __Thursday, February 28, 2013, 3:12:51 PM__
   Signature   Date

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2011-12

PART I DUE DECEMBER 20, 2012
5PM EST

1.1 STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

STANDARDS OF ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

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

1.1.1 Academic Content Standards

Indicate below whether your state has made or is planning to make revisions to or change the State's academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's content standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the revisions or changes.

	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.		
State has revised or changed	State has revised or changed its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science or is planning to make revisions to or change its academic content standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.		
Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Academic Content Standards	2010	2010	2013-2014

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

South Dakota adopted Common Core standards for English Language Arts and math in fall of 2010. Districts must implement all standards by school year 2014-2015. Districts are encouraged develop an implementation plan and start teaching the standards before the 2014-2015 school year.

South Dakota is a lead state for the development of the Next Generation Science Standards(NGSS). Currently the Deptarment plans to propose the NGSS to the State Board of Education for adoption in Spring of 2014.

1.1.1.1 Academic Achievement Standards in Mathematics, Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic achievement standards were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include changes to academic achievement standards based on any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA.

State has revised or changed	No revisions or changes to academic content standards in mathematics,reading/language arts or science made or planned.
	State has changed its academic achievement standards or is planning to change its academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below either the school year in which these changes were or will be implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.			
Academic Achievement Standards for	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	NA	NA	NA

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below. The response is limited to 1,000 characters
South Dakota does not have alternative assessment based on modified achievement standards or alternate achievement standards starting in 2014-15.

1.1.2 Assessments in Mathematics and Reading/Language Arts and Science

Indicate below whether your state has changed or is planning to change the State's academic assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science since the State's academic assessments were most recently approved through ED's peer review process for State assessment systems. If yes, indicate specifically in what school year your State implemented or will implement the changes.

As applicable, include any assessments (e.g., alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards, alternate assessments based on modified achievement standards, native language assessments, or others) implemented to meet the assessment requirements under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA.*

	No changes to assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science made or planned.
State has revised or changed	State has changed or is planning to change its assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts or science. Indicate below the year these changes were implemented or GÇ£Not ApplicableGÇ¥ to indicate that changes were not made or will not be made in the subject area.

Acceptable responses are a school year (e.g., 2011-12) or Not Applicable.

Academic Assessments	Mathematics	Reading/Language Arts	Science
Regular Assessments in Grades 3-8	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Regular Assessments in High School	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards (if applicable)	2014-15	2014-15	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Modified Achievement Standards (if applicable)	NA	NA	NA
Alternate Assessments Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	NA	NA	NA

If the responses above do not fully describe revisions or changes to your State's academic achievement standards, describe the revisions or changes below.

The response is limited to 1,000 characters

South Dakota does not have alternative assessment based on modified achievement standards or alternate achievement standards starting in 2014-15.

1.1.3 Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities

1.1.3.1 Percentages of Funds Used for Standards and Assessment Development and Other Purposes

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12, estimate what percentage of the funds your State used for the following (round to the nearest ten percent).

Purpose	Percentage (rounded to the nearest ten percent)
To pay the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b)	70.00
To administer assessments required by section 1111(b) or to carry out other activities described in section 6111 and other activities related to ensuring that the State's schools and local educational agencies are held accountable for the results	30.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.1.3.2 Uses of Funds for Purposes Other than Standards and Assessment Development

For funds your State had available under *ESEA* section 6111 (Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities) during SY 2011-12 that were used for purposes other than the costs of the development of the State assessments and standards required by section 1111(b), for what purposes did your State use the funds? (Enter "yes" for all that apply and "no" for all that do not apply).

Purpose	Used for Purpose (yes/no)
Administering assessments required by section 1111(b)	Yes
Developing challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards and aligned assessments in academic subjects for which standards and assessments are not required by section 1111 (b)	No
Developing or improving assessments of English language proficiency necessary to comply with section 1111(b)(7)	No
Ensuring the continued validity and reliability of State assessments, and/or refining State assessments to ensure their continued alignment with the State's academic content standards and to improve the alignment of curricula and instructional materials	Yes
Developing multiple measures to increase the reliability and validity of State assessment systems	No
Strengthening the capacity of local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to increase educational achievement, including carrying out professional development activities aligned with State student academic achievement standards and assessments	No
Expanding the range of accommodations available to students with limited English proficiency and students with disabilities (*IDEA*) to improve the rates of inclusion of such students, including professional development activities aligned with State academic achievement standards and assessments	Yes
Improving the dissemination of information on student achievement and school performance to parents and the community, including the development of information and reporting systems designed to identify best educational practices based on scientifically based research or to assist in linking records of student achievement, length of enrollment, and graduation over time	Yes
Other	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.2 PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.2.1 Participation of all Students in Mathematics Assessment

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

The student group "children with disabilities (IDEA)" includes children who participated in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (IDEA). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" includes recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United Sates for fewer than 12 months. Do <u>not</u> include former LEP students.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	65,783	65,591	99.71
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,387	7,339	99.35
Asian	1,021	1,017	99.61
Black or African American	1,612	1,609	99.81
Hispanic or Latino	2,399	2,384	99.37
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	68	67	98.53
White	51,271	51,154	99.77
Two or more races	964	960	99.59
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,353	8,322	99.63
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,167	2,160	99.68
Economically disadvantaged students	26,235	26,124	99.58
Migratory students	304	304	100.00
Male	33,353	33,242	99.67
Female	31,369	31,288	99.74

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students is 64,735. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. The difference between the number of students participating and the number of students assigned a proficiency level occurs when these two separate files are ran. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

1.2.2 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Mathematics Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating during the State's testing window in mathematics assessments required under Section 1111(b)(3) of *ESEA* (regardless of whether the children were present for a full academic year) by the type of assessment. The percentage of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* who participated in the mathematics assessment for each assessment option will be calculated automatically. The total number of children with disabilities *(IDEA)* participating will also be calculated automatically.

The data provided below should include mathematics participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act(IDEA)*. Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. Do not include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,727	32.77
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,753	57.11
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	842	10.12
Total	8,322	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

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

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

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	65,760	65,536	99.66
American Indian or Alaska Native	7,387	7,346	99.44
Asian	981	959	97.76
Black or African American	1,602	1,594	99.50
Hispanic or Latino	2,394	2,367	98.87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	68	67	98.53
White	51,270	51,149	99.76
Two or more races	964	960	99.59
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	8,353	8,323	99.64
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	2,111	2,070	98.06
Economically disadvantaged students	26,183	26,048	99.48
Migratory students	282	276	97.87
Male	33,322	33,202	99.64
Female	31,344	31,240	99.67
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students is 64,735. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. The difference between the number of students participating and the number of students assigned a proficiency level occurs when these two separate files are ran. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.			

1.2.3.1   Recently Arrived LEP Students Taking ELP Assessments in Lieu of Reading/Language Arts Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of recently arrived LEP students (as defined in 34 C.F.R. Part 200.6(b)(4)) included in the participation counts in 1.2.3 and 1.3.2.1 who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment, as permitted under 34 C.F.R. Part 200.20.

Recently arrived LEP students who took an assessment of English language proficiency in lieu of the State's reading/language arts assessment	56

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

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

The data provided should include reading/language arts participation data from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)*. Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
Note: For this question only, report on students with disabilities (IDEA) who are also LEP students in the U.S. less than 12 months who took the ELP in lieu of the statewide reading/language arts assessment.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	2,793	33.56
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	4,688	56.33
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	842	10.12
LEP < 12 months, took ELP	0	0.00
Total	8,323	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

1.2.5 Participation of All Students in the Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.1 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

Student Group	# Students Enrolled	# Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
All students	26,980	26,832	99.45
American Indian or Alaska Native	2,745	2,713	98.83
Asian	431	426	98.84
Black or African American	701	697	99.43
Hispanic or Latino	920	912	99.13
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	30	29	96.67
White	21,819	21,724	99.56
Two or more races	334	331	99.10
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	3,005	2,973	98.94
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	769	765	99.48
Economically disadvantaged students	10,014	9,929	99.15
Migratory students	113	113	100.00
Male	13,819	13,727	99.33
Female	13,161	13,105	99.57
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

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

1.2.6 Participation of Students with Disabilities in Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.2.2 and collects data on the State's science assessment.

The data provided should include science participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).* Do <u>not</u> include former students with disabilities (*IDEA*). Do <u>not</u> include students only covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Type of Assessment	# Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating	Percentage of Children with Disabilities (*IDEA*) Participating, Who Took the Specified Assessment
Regular Assessment without Accommodations	923	31.05
Regular Assessment with Accommodations	1,712	57.58
Alternate Assessment Based on Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Modified Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Based on Alternate Achievement Standards	338	11.37
Total	2,973	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota does not have alternate assessments based on grade-level or modified achievement standards.		

1.3 STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

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

Note: States are not required to report these data by the seven (7) racial/ethnic groups; instead, they are required to report these data by the major racial and ethnic groups that are identified in their Accountability Workbooks. The charts below display racial/ethnic data that has been mapped back from the major racial and ethnic groups identified in their workbooks, to the 7 racial/ethnic groups to allow for the examination of data across states.

1.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics

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

The student group "children with disabilities (*IDEA*)" includes children who participated, and for whom a proficiency level was assigned in the regular assessments with or without accommodations and alternate assessments. Do not include former students with disabilities *(IDEA)*. The student group "limited English proficient (LEP) students" does include recently arrived students who have attended schools in the United States for fewer than 12 months. Do <u>not</u> include former LEP students.

1.3.1.1 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,773	7,422	75.94
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,217	561	46.10
Asian	142	90	63.38
Black or African American	263	133	50.57
Hispanic or Latino	411	264	64.23
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	14	5	35.71
White	7,305	6,106	83.59
Two or more races	193	144	74.61
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,606	871	54.23
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	396	139	35.10
Economically disadvantaged students	4,307	2,746	63.76
Migratory students	46	16	34.78
Male	4,901	3,703	75.56
Female	4,644	3,600	77.52

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in third graders is 9,545. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

For the LEP students districts are identifying them correctly so that is the reason for the decrease in LEP students.

1.3.2.1 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,765	7,537	77.18
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,219	627	51.44
Asian	135	91	67.41
Black or African American	257	164	63.81
Hispanic or Latino	410	276	67.32
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	14	7	50.00
White	7,304	6,113	83.69
Two or more races	193	148	76.68
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,606	839	52.24
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	383	138	36.03
Economically disadvantaged students	4,295	2,886	67.19
Migratory students	44	13	29.55
Male	4,892	3,656	74.73
Female	4,640	3,770	81.25

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in third graders is 9,532. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for

the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

For the LEP students are districts are identifying them correctly so that is the reason for the decrease in LEP students.

1.3.3.1 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 3

Grade 3	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested in grade 3 in South Dakota.			

1.3.1.2 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,537	7,399	77.58
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,213	587	48.39
Asian	152	95	62.50
Black or African American	211	124	58.77
Hispanic or Latino	365	235	64.38
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	7	100.00
White	7,249	6,146	84.78
Two or more races	162	117	72.22
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,477	756	51.18
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	368	102	27.72
Economically disadvantaged students	4,092	2,644	64.61
Migratory students	50	15	30.00
Male	4,820	3,757	77.95
Female	4,539	3,554	78.30

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in fourth grade is 9,359. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Asian and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.2.2 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,524	7,264	76.27
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,213	585	48.23
Asian	137	93	67.88
Black or African American	209	114	54.55
Hispanic or Latino	361	232	64.27
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	7	7	100.00
White	7,247	6,023	83.11
Two or more races	162	121	74.69
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,477	719	48.68
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	346	84	24.28
Economically disadvantaged students	4,074	2,602	63.87
Migratory students	42	12	28.57
Male	4,810	3,596	74.76
Female	4,526	3,579	79.08

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in fourth grade is 9,336. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Asian and Two or more race students over the past

year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.3.2 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 4

Grade 4	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested in grade 4 in South Dakota.			

1.3.1.3 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,431	7,054	74.80
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,161	558	48.06
Asian	128	91	71.09
Black or African American	254	140	55.12
Hispanic or Latino	338	213	63.02
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	6	60.00
White	7,175	5,846	81.48
Two or more races	149	109	73.15
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,286	560	43.55
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	346	73	21.10
Economically disadvantaged students	3,972	2,499	62.92
Migratory students	38	9	23.68
Male	4,742	3,550	74.86
Female	4,473	3,413	76.30

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in fifth grade is 9,215. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.2.3 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,416	6,980	74.13
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,162	582	50.09
Asian	119	83	69.75
Black or African American	250	138	55.20
Hispanic or Latino	334	219	65.57
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	7	70.00
White	7,176	5,741	80.00
Two or more races	149	110	73.83
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,286	575	44.71
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	331	74	22.36
Economically disadvantaged students	3,958	2,495	63.04
Migratory students	36	9	25.00
Male	4,741	3,405	71.82
Female	4,459	3,475	77.93

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in fifth grade is 9,200. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year.

South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.3.3 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 5

Grade 5	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,212	6,990	75.88
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,160	547	47.16
Asian	127	84	66.14
Black or African American	254	130	51.18
Hispanic or Latino	338	210	62.13
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	10	7	70.00
White	7,174	5,911	82.39
Two or more races	149	101	67.79
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,285	593	46.15
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	346	80	23.12
Economically disadvantaged students	3,970	2,476	62.37
Migratory students	38	6	15.79
Male	4,739	3,675	77.55
Female	4,473	3,315	74.11

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.1.4 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,594	7,362	76.74
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,112	529	47.57
Asian	144	85	59.03
Black or African American	235	131	55.74
Hispanic or Latino	361	225	62.33
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	9	75.00
White	7,439	6,228	83.72
Two or more races	137	96	70.07
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,197	473	39.52
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	331	81	24.47
Economically disadvantaged students	4,031	2,570	63.76
Migratory students	53	11	20.75
Male	4,900	3,751	76.55
Female	4,540	3,552	78.24

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in sixth grade is 9,440. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

1.3.2.4 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,592	7,379	76.93
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,114	530	47.58
Asian	137	81	59.12
Black or African American	235	140	59.57
Hispanic or Latino	361	245	67.87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	12	9	75.00
White	7,437	6,194	83.29
Two or more races	137	101	73.72
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,198	526	43.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	323	75	23.22
Economically disadvantaged students	4,026	2,609	64.80
Migratory students	47	8	17.02
Male	4,896	3,671	74.98
Female	4,537	3,629	79.99

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in sixth grade is 9,433. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

1.3.3.4 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 6

Grade 6	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested in grade six in South Dakota.			

1.3.1.5 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,460	7,037	74.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,079	466	43.19
Asian	150	95	63.33
Black or African American	202	106	52.48
Hispanic or Latino	335	188	56.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5	2	40.00
White	7,432	6,052	81.43
Two or more races	136	87	63.97
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,063	365	34.34
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	299	73	24.41
Economically disadvantaged students	3,755	2,281	60.75
Migratory students	42	7	16.67
Male	4,884	3,578	73.26
Female	4,455	3,418	76.72

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in seventh grade is 9,339. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

LEP is different due to the increase in LEP students.

1.3.2.5 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,452	6,747	71.38
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,079	471	43.65
Asian	139	83	59.71
Black or African American	200	101	50.50
Hispanic or Latino	333	195	58.56
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	5	1	20.00
White	7,433	5,766	77.57
Two or more races	136	90	66.18
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,064	364	34.21
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	283	51	18.02
Economically disadvantaged students	3,741	2,148	57.42
Migratory students	36	3	8.33
Male	4,877	3,385	69.41
Female	4,448	3,322	74.69

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in seventh grade is 9,325. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be

included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

LEP is different due to the increase in LEP students.

1.3.3.5 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 7

Grade 7	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students			
American Indian or Alaska Native			
Asian			
Black or African American			
Hispanic or Latino			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander			
White			
Two or more races			
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)			
Limited English proficient (LEP) students			
Economically disadvantaged students			
Migratory students			
Male			
Female			
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Science is not tested in grade seventh in South Dakota.			

1.3.1.6 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,264	7,085	76.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	986	434	44.02
Asian	157	97	61.78
Black or African American	236	141	59.75
Hispanic or Latino	326	218	66.87
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	10	66.67
White	7,318	6,055	82.74
Two or more races	110	84	76.36
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,018	335	32.91
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	261	68	26.05
Economically disadvantaged students	3,547	2,238	63.10
Migratory students	33	9	27.27
Male	4,659	3,440	73.84
Female	4,489	3,599	80.17

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in eighth grade is 9,148. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.2.6 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,261	6,805	73.48
American Indian or Alaska Native	987	464	47.01
Asian	149	83	55.70
Black or African American	235	136	57.87
Hispanic or Latino	320	218	68.12
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	9	60.00
White	7,319	5,768	78.81
Two or more races	110	86	78.18
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,018	329	32.32
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	246	50	20.33
Economically disadvantaged students	3,534	2,123	60.07
Migratory students	29	3	10.34
Male	4,650	3,236	69.59
Female	4,485	3,528	78.66

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in eighth grade is 9,135. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year.

South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

LEP is different due to the increase in LEP students.

1.3.3.6 Student Academic Achievement in Science - Grade 8

Grade 8	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	9,143	6,411	70.12
American Indian or Alaska Native	981	389	39.65
Asian	157	84	53.50
Black or African American	236	125	52.97
Hispanic or Latino	326	205	62.88
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	15	8	53.33
White	7,318	5,526	75.51
Two or more races	110	74	67.27
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	1,014	251	24.75
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	261	47	18.01
Economically disadvantaged students	3,543	1,983	55.97
Migratory students	33	3	9.09
Male	4,657	3,255	69.89
Female	4,486	3,156	70.35

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.1.7 Student Academic Achievement in Mathematics - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,525	5,915	69.38
American Indian or Alaska Native	571	210	36.78
Asian	144	71	49.31
Black or African American	208	86	41.35
Hispanic or Latino	248	114	45.97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4	4	100.00
White	7,236	5,370	74.21
Two or more races	73	44	60.27
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	675	149	22.07
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	159	14	8.81
Economically disadvantaged students	2,420	1,264	52.23
Migratory students	42	3	7.14
Male	4,336	3,036	70.02
Female	4,148	2,863	69.02

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in high school is 8,484. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Hispanic or Latino and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.2.7 Student Academic Achievement in Reading/Language Arts - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,521	5,998	70.39
American Indian or Alaska Native	572	268	46.85
Asian	143	62	43.36
Black or African American	208	87	41.83
Hispanic or Latino	248	135	54.44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4	3	75.00
White	7,233	5,380	74.38
Two or more races	73	47	64.38
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	674	177	26.26
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158	6	3.80
Economically disadvantaged students	2,420	1,347	55.66
Migratory students	42	0	0.00
Male	4,336	2,984	68.82
Female	4,145	2,998	72.33

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The correct total of all students in high school is 8,481. Students with disabilities are sometimes counted in both FAY and Non-FAY counts in subtotal 1. This happens because sometimes a student who is disabled may be FAY for all subgroups but did not meet the IEP FAY criteria in SD to be included as FAY for the disabled subgroups so they are then Non-FAY for the with disabilities subgroup. Please see ticket # 183866 with PSC.

The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Hispanic or Latino and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.3.3.7 Student Academic Achievement in Science - High School

High School	# Students Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring at or Above Proficient	Percentage of Students Scoring at or Above Proficient
All students	8,477	5,635	66.47
American Indian or Alaska Native	572	217	37.94
Asian	142	60	42.25
Black or African American	207	72	34.78
Hispanic or Latino	248	114	45.97
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	4	4	100.00
White	7,232	5,129	70.92
Two or more races	72	39	54.17
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	674	112	16.62
Limited English proficient (LEP) students	158	5	3.16
Economically disadvantaged students	2,416	1,218	50.41
Migratory students	42	1	2.38
Male	4,331	2,964	68.44
Female	4,146	2,671	64.42

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The data is correct. South Dakota has had an increase in the number of Hispanic or Latino and Two or more race students over the past year. South Dakota has limited diversity and populations can change dramatically from one year to the next. Small student groups may show greater fluctuations in student performance because of low student numbers. Two or more races has increased in part to additional training provided to districts and parents being aware of this choice on enrollment forms.

1.4   SCHOOL AND DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

This section collects data on the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status of schools and districts.

1.4.1 All Schools and Districts Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State, including charters, and the total number of those schools and districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Entity	Total #	Total # that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
Schools	704		
Districts	171		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The increase in the number of districts is due to Co-ops being included in the total number of districts in school year 2011-2012. This is because we are a Flex Waiver State and the way the data is loading is different than last year. South Dakota is a Flex Waiver State. Therefore, we are released from submitting DG 32 in File Specification C103. Please note the columns for total number making AYP and Percentage making AYP will be blank.			

1.4.2 Title I School Accountability

In the table below, provide the total number of public Title I schools by type and the total number of those schools that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12 . Include only public Title I schools. Do <u>not</u> include Title I programs operated by local educational agencies in private schools. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

Title I School	# Title I Schools	# Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Title I Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12
All Title I schools	340		
Schoolwide (SWP) Title I schools	214		
Targeted assistance (TAS) Title I schools	126		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota is a Flex Waiver State. Therefore, we are released from submitting DG 32 in File Specification C103. Please note the columns for # Title Schools that Made AYP in SY 2011-12 and Percentage will be blank.			

1.4.3 Accountability of Districts That Received Title I Funds

In the table below, provide the total number of districts that received Title I funds and the total number of those districts that made AYP based on data for SY 2011-12. The percentage that made AYP will be calculated automatically.

# Districts That Received Title I Funds in SY 2011-12	# Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12	Percentage of Districts That Received Title I Funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12
152		
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota is a Flex Waiver State. Therefore, we are released from submitting DG 32 in File Specification C103. Please note the columns for # Districts that received Title I funds and Made AYP in SY 2011-12 and Percentage will be blank.		

1.4.4.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for schools in corrective action, provide the number of schools for which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Title I Schools in Corrective Action in Which the Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Required implementation of a new research-based curriculum or instructional program	6
Extension of the school year or school day	
Replacement of staff members relevant to the school's low performance	
Significant decrease in management authority at the school level	
Replacement of the principal	
Restructuring the internal organization of the school	3
Appointment of an outside expert to advise the school	2
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.4.4.4 Restructuring – Year 2

In the table below, for schools in restructuring – year 2 (implementation year), provide the number of schools for which the listed restructuring actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Restructuring Action	# of Title I Schools in Restructuring in Which Restructuring Action Is Being Implemented
Replacement of all or most of the school staff (which may include the principal)	
Reopening the school as a public charter school	
Entering into a contract with a private entity to operate the school	
Takeover the school by the State	
Other major restructuring of the school governance	4
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

In the space below, list specifically the "other major restructuring of the school governance" action(s) that were implemented.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Schools formed a governance board to help guide the school with decision making. Others added full day kindergarten as well as developing a summer school program for students needed more help and providing technical assistance to the principal with decision making based on data.

1.4.5.2 Actions Taken for Districts That Received Title I Funds and Were Identified for Improvement

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state provides technical assistance to the districts in improvement through the School Support Team (SST) and SD DOE employees. SD DOE is also supported in its work by its national comprehensive center, Mid-Central Regional Education Lab (McREL). Each district is assigned an SST. The SST contacts the assigned district to check on development and implementation of the improvement plan; assists with data analysis participate in and/or facilitate a district-level program audit; recommends approval of the improvement plan; and monitors and supports the implementation of the improvement plan. Educational Service Agencies in the state provide fee-based technical assistance to districts as requested by the district; provide fee-based professional development in curriculum areas; coordinate activities with SST members; and assist with development of formative assessments using the Achievement Series (fee-based).

One district is continuing their second two-year corrective action plan. The increased actions imposed on this district were:
a)A technical advisor was appointed by the department to ensure alignment of district decisions with improving student achievement. The technical advisor works with the school district and consultant, but is responsible to the State Department of Education. This technical advisor served the school district for a two-year period: 2009-10 and 2010-11 and then was kept on for the 2011-12 school year. The Department of Education determines the amount of time the technical advisor is required to be on-site within the district and the amount of time to be devoted to the project.

b)A consultant approved by the department assists the district improvement initiatives. The consultant works with the technical advisor and the local school district, but is responsible to the State Department of Education. The consultant serves the district for a two-year period: 2009-10 and 2010-11 and then was kept on for the 2011-12 school year. The Department of Education determines the amount of time the consultant will be required to be on-site within the district and the amount of time to be devoted to the project.

c)District Title I expenditures are approved by the technical advisor, the superintendent, the business manager, and the district's Title I Director.

d)District Title I funds are deferred to support the work of both the technical advisor and consultant within the district.

e)The district annually receives, and incurs the cost for both a fiscal and program audit.

f)A Memorandum of Understanding was developed between the Department, the District, the Technical Advisor, and the Consultant outlining the responsibilities of each entity.

g)The department, with the assistance of the technical advisor and consultant, develops measurable goals for the corrective action plan.

Districts will participate in the common core training to help with the implementation of a new curriculum based on the common core standards. The remaining districts in corrective action are continuing their corrective action plans with assistance from their assigned SST and DOE employees.

1.4.5.3 Corrective Action

In the table below, for districts in corrective action, provide the number of districts in corrective action in which the listed corrective actions under *ESEA* were implemented in SY 2011-12 (based on SY 2010-11 assessments under Section 1111 of *ESEA*).

Corrective Action	# of Districts receiving Title I funds in Corrective Action in Which Corrective Action was Implemented in SY 2011-12
Implemented a new curriculum based on State standards	0
Authorized students to transfer from district schools to higher performing schools in a neighboring district	0
Deferred programmatic funds or reduced administrative funds	0
Replaced district personnel who are relevant to the failure to make AYP	0
Removed one or more schools from the jurisdiction of the district	0
Appointed a receiver or trustee to administer the affairs of the district	0
Restructured the district	0
Abolished the district (list the number of districts abolished between the end of SY 2010-11 and beginning of SY 2011-12 as a corrective action)	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. No districts implemented any of these corrective actions for the 2011-12 school year.	

1.4.7 Appeal of AYP and Identification Determinations

In the table below, provide the number of districts and schools that appealed their AYP designations based on SY 2011-12 data and the results of those appeals.

	# Appealed Their AYP Designations	# Appeals Resulted in a Change in the AYP Designation
Districts	0	0
Schools	0	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota is a Flex Waiver State. Since AYP was not determined no AYP appeals were received or granted.		

Date (MM/DD/YY) that processing appeals based on SY 2011-12 data was complete	

1.4.8 Sections 1003(a) and (g) School Improvement Funds

In the section below, "schools in improvement" means Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA* for SY 2011-12.

1.4.8.5.1 Section 1003(a) State Reservations

In the space provided, enter the percentage of the FY 2011 (SY 2011-12) Title I, Part A allocation that the SEA reserved in accordance with Section 1003(a) of *ESEA* and §200.100(a) of ED's regulations governing the reservation of funds for school improvement under Section 1003(a) of *ESEA*:   4.00 %

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.4.8.5.2 Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) Allocations to LEAs and Schools

For SY 2011-12 there is no need to upload a spreadsheet to answer this question in the CSPR.

1.4.8.5.2 will be answered automatically using data submitted to EDFacts in Data Group 694, School improvement funds allocation table, from File Specification N/X132. You may review data submitted to EDFacts using the report named "Section 1003(a) and 1003(g)Allocations to LEAs and Schools - CSPR 1.4.8.5.2 (EDEN012)" from the EDFacts Reporting System.

1.4.8.5.3 Use of Section 1003(g)(8) Funds for Evaluation and Technical Assistance

Section 1003(g)(8) of *ESEA* allows States to reserve up to five percent of Section 1003(g) funds for administration and to meet the evaluation and technical assistance requirements for this program. In the space below, identify and describe the specific Section 1003(g) evaluation and technical assistance activities that your State conducted during SY 2011-12.

This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The SD DOE's reserve of 1003(g) funds are used for technical assistance for Title I schools by supporting the contracts for the state's School Support Team. Funds for evaluation of the program are used to develop monitoring and evaluation documents as well as to provide for the monitoring of the grants which may include onsite monitoring.

1.4.8.6 Actions Taken for Title I Schools Identified for Improvement Supported by Funds Other than Those of Section 1003(a) and 1003(g).

In the space below, describe actions (if any) taken by your State in SY 2011-12 that were supported by **funds other than Section 1003(a) and 1003(g) funds** to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

No other funds are available to assist with school improvement efforts.

1.4.9 Public School Choice and Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on public school choice and supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.1 Public School Choice

This section collects data on public school choice. FAQs related to the public school choice provisions are at the end of this section.

1.4.9.1.2 Public School Choice – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for public school choice, the number of eligible students who applied to transfer, and the number who transferred under the provisions for public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*. The number of students who were eligible for public school choice should include:

1. All students currently enrolled in a school Title I identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116, and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

The number of students who applied to transfer should include:

1. All students who applied to transfer in the current school year but did not or were unable to transfer.
2. All students who transferred in the current school year under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116; and
3. All students who previously transferred under the public school choice provisions of Section 1116 and are continuing to transfer for the current school year under Section 1116.

For any of the respective student counts, States should indicate in the Comment section if the count does not include any of the categories of students discussed above.

	# Students
Eligible for public school choice	14,254
Applied to transfer	77
Transferred to another school under the Title I public school choice provisions	77
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The Public School Choice program continued to expand as more schools went in to improvement. This resulted in higher numbers of eligible students and those who transfered.	

1.4.9.1.3 Funds Spent on Public School Choice

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

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on transportation for public school choice	$ 17,430

1.4.9.1.4 Availability of Public School Choice Options

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

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

	# LEAs
LEAs Unable to Provide Public School Choice	14

FAQs about public school choice:

a. How should States report data on Title I public school choice for those LEAs that have open enrollment and other choice programs? For those LEAs that implement open enrollment or other school choice programs in addition to public school choice under Section 1116 of *ESEA*, the State may consider a student as having applied to transfer if the student meets the following:

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

  In addition, the State may consider costs for transporting a student meeting the above conditions towards the funds spent by an LEA on transportation for public school choice if the student is using district transportation services to attend the non-identified school.

b. How should States report on public school choice for those LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice? In the count of LEAS that are not able to offer public school choice (for any of the reasons specified in 1.4.9.1.4), States should include those LEAs that are unable to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels. For instance, if an LEA is able to provide public school choice to eligible students at the elementary level but not at the secondary level, the State should include the LEA in the count. States should also include LEAs that are not able to provide public school choice at all (i.e., at any grade level). States should provide the reason(s) why public school choice was not possible in these LEAs at the grade level(s) in the Comment section. In addition, States may also include in the Comment section a separate count just of LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at any grade level.

  For LEAs that are not able to offer public school choice at one or more grade levels, States should count as eligible for public school choice (in 1.4.9.1.2) all students who attend identified Title I schools regardless of whether the LEA is able to offer the students public school choice.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The dollars spent on transportation are lower than the previous year's as one LEA did not track transportation costs for public school choice separately from all other district transportation, chosing instead to spend the entire 20% set-aside on the SES program.

3 Adapted from OESE/OII policy letter of August 2004. The policy letter may be found on the Department's Web page at
http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/stateletters/choice/choice081804.html.

1.4.9.2 Supplemental Educational Services

This section collects data on supplemental educational services.

1.4.9.2.2 Supplemental Educational Services – Students

In the table below, provide the number of students who were eligible for, who applied for, and who received supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	# Students
Eligible for supplemental educational services	10,051
Applied for supplemental educational services	3,154
Received supplemental educational services	2,699
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The SES program continued to grow as more and more parents requested the services for their eligible students.	

1.4.9.2.3 Funds Spent on Supplemental Educational Services

In the table below, provide the total dollar amount spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services under Section 1116 of *ESEA*.

	Amount
Dollars spent by LEAs on supplemental educational services	$ 3,645,775
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. During the 11-12 school year, more students signed up and actually participated in the SES program than every before. As a result, more funds were spent.	

1.5 TEACHER QUALITY

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

1.5.1 Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for the grade levels listed, the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified, and the number taught by teachers who are not highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified and the percentage taught by teachers who are not highly qualified will be calculated automatically. Below the table are FAQs about these data.

	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are NOT Highly Qualified
All classes	26,451	26,270	99.32	181	0.68
All elementary classes	13,374	13,304	99.48	70	0.52
All secondary classes	13,077	12,966	99.15	111	0.85

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

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

If the answer above is no, please explain below. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Does the State count elementary classes so that a full-day self-contained classroom equals one class, or does the State use a departmentalized approach where a classroom is counted multiple times, once for each subject taught?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The response depends on how the school is structured. Typically KG-4 is self contained and 5-8 is departmentalized. Some elementary schools employ self-contained teachers and those assignments are counted once. The elementary school with departmentalized settings are counted once per each assignment.

FAQs about highly qualified teachers and core academic subjects:

a. *What are the core academic subjects?* English, reading/language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography [Title IX, Section 9101(11)]. While the statute includes the arts in the core academic subjects, it does not specify which of the arts are core academic subjects; therefore, States must make this determination.

b. *How is a teacher defined?* An individual who provides instruction in the core academic areas to kindergarten, grades 1 through 12, or ungraded classes, or individuals who teach in an environment other than a classroom setting (and who maintain daily student attendance records) [from NCES, CCD, 2001-02]

c. *How is a class defined?* A class is a setting in which organized instruction of core academic course content is provided to one or more students (including cross-age groupings) for a given period of time. (A course may be offered to more than one class.) Instruction, provided by one or more teachers or other staff members, may be delivered in person or via a different medium. Classes that share space should be considered as separate classes if they function as separate units for more than 50% of the time [from NCES Non-fiscal Data Handbook for Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, 2003].

d. *Should 6th-, 7th-, and 8th-grade classes be reported in the elementary or the secondary category?* States are responsible for determining whether the content taught at the middle school level meets the competency requirements for elementary or secondary instruction. Report classes in grade 6 through 8 consistent with how teachers have been classified to determine their highly qualified status, regardless of whether their schools are configured as elementary or middle schools.

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

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

g. *What is the reporting period?* The reporting period is the school year. The count of classes must include all semesters, quarters, or terms of the school year. For example, if core academic classes are held in summer sessions, those classes should be included in the count of core academic classes. A state determines into which school year classes fall.

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

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

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

	Percentage
Elementary School Classes	
Elementary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or (if eligible) have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	79.00
Elementary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who did not pass a subject-knowledge test or have not demonstrated subject-matter competency through HOUSSE	0.00
Elementary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	4.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	17.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those who do not meet both full-state certification and competency.

	Percentage
Secondary School Classes	
Secondary school classes taught by certified general education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter knowledge in those subjects (e.g., out-of-field teachers)	63.00
Secondary school classes taught by certified special education teachers who have not demonstrated subject-matter competency in those subjects	22.00
Secondary school classes taught by teachers who are not fully certified (and are not in an approved alternative route program)	1.00
Other (please explain in comment box below)	14.00
Total	100.00

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Other includes those who do not meet both full-state certification and competency.

1.5.3 Poverty Quartiles and Metrics Used

In the table below, provide the number of core academic classes for each of the school types listed and the number of those core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified. The percentage of core academic classes taught by teachers who are highly qualified will be calculated automatically. The percentages used for high- and low-poverty schools and the poverty metric used to determine those percentages are reported in the second table. Below the tables are FAQs about these data.

NOTE: No source of classroom-level poverty data exists, so States may look at school-level data when figuring poverty quartiles. Because not all schools have traditional grade configurations, and because a school may not be counted as both an elementary and as a secondary school, States may include as elementary schools all schools that serve children in grades K through 5 (including K through 8 or K through 12 schools).

This means that for the purpose of establishing poverty quartiles, some classes in schools where both elementary and secondary classes are taught would be counted as classes in an elementary school rather than as classes in a secondary school in 1.5.3. This also means that such a 12th grade class would be in a different category in 1.5.3 than it would be in 1.5.1.

School Type	Number of Core Academic Classes (Total)	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Teachers Who Are Highly Qualified
Elementary Schools			
High Poverty Elementary Schools	2,274	2,264	99.56
Low-poverty Elementary Schools	3,261	3,250	99.66
Secondary Schools			
High Poverty secondary Schools	1,908	1,885	98.79
Low-Poverty secondary Schools	3,948	3,925	99.42

1.5.3.1 Poverty Quartile Breaks

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

	High-Poverty Schools (more than what %)	Low-Poverty Schools (less than what %)
Elementary schools	57.80	23.50
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced	
Secondary schools	41.60	21.70
Poverty metric used	Free and Reduced	

FAQs on poverty quartiles and metrics used to determine poverty

a. *What is a "high-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "high-poverty" schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

b. *What is a "low-poverty school"?* Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines "low-poverty" schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.

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

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

1.6 TITLE III AND LANGUAGE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1.6.1 Language Instruction Educational Programs

In the table below, place a check next to each type of language instruction educational programs implemented in the State, as defined in Section 3301(8), as required by Sections 3121(a)(1), 3123(b)(1), and 3123(b)(2).

Table 1.6.1 Definitions:

1. **Types of Programs =** Types of programs described in the subgrantee's local plan (as submitted to the State or as implemented) that is closest to the descriptions in http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/rcd/BE021775/Glossary_of_Terms.pdf.
2. **Other Language =** Name of the language of instruction, other than English, used in the programs.

Check Types of Programs	Type of Program	Other Language
No	Dual language	
No	Two-way immersion	
No	Transitional bilingual programs	
No	Developmental bilingual	
Yes	Heritage language	Lakota
Yes	Sheltered English instruction	
Yes	Structured English immersion	
No	Specially designed academic instruction delivered in English (SDAIE)	
Yes	Content-based ESL	
Yes	Pull-out ESL	
Yes	Other (explain in comment box below)	

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

SIOP is used in two of our LEAs.

1.6.2 Student Demographic Data

1.6.2.1 Number of ALL LEP Students in the State

In the table below, provide the underlined number of ALL LEP students in the State who meet the LEP definition under Section 9101(25).

- Include newly enrolled (recent arrivals to the U.S.) and continually enrolled LEP students, whether or not they receive services in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- Do not include Former LEP students (as defined in Section 200.20(f)(2) of the Title I regulation) and monitored Former LEP students (as defined under Section 3121(a)(4) of Title III) in the ALL LEP student count in this table.

Number of ALL LEP students in the State	5,307
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

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

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

	#
LEP students who received services in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12 for this reporting year.	4,046
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.2.3 Most Commonly Spoken Languages in the State

In the table below, provide the five most commonly spoken languages, other than English, in the State (for all LEP students, not just LEP students who received Title III Services). The top five languages should be determined by the highest number of students speaking each of the languages listed.

Language	# LEP Students
Spanish; Castilian	1,165
Siouan languages	774
German	722
Thai	239
Nepali	179

Report additional languages with significant numbers of LEP students in the comment box below.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.3 Student Performance Data

This section collects data on LEP students' English language proficiency, as required by Sections 1111(h)(4)(D) and 3121 (a)(2).

1.6.3.1.1 All LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, please provide the number of ALL LEP students tested and not tested on annual State English language proficiency (ELP) assessment (as defined in 1.6.2.1).

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	4,641
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	31
Total	4,672
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The number of LEP students enrolled is a count that includes all LEP students throughout the year. The number of students tested/not tested is a count of only those LEP students that are enrolled during the testing window. The difference can be explained by the frequent transfer of students from public schools to non public schools.	

1.6.3.1.2 ALL LEP Student English Language Proficiency Results

	#
Number attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	516
Percent attained proficiency on State annual ELP assessment	11.12
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.2.1 Title III LEP Students Tested on the State Annual English Language Proficiency Assessment

In the table below, provide the number of Title III LEP students tested on annual State English language proficiency assessment.

	#
Number tested on State annual ELP assessment	3,615
Number not tested on State annual ELP assessment	27
Total	3,642
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The count of LEP students is based on our Fall Enrollment Count. The count of LEP students tested is only those students that are enrolled during the ELP testing window.	
In the table below, provide the number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time and whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1. Report this number ONLY if the State did not include these students in establishing AMAO 1/ making progress target and did not include them in the calculations for AMAO 1/ making progress (# and % making progress).	

	#
Number of Title III students who took the State annual ELP assessment for the first time whose progress cannot be determined and whose results were not included in the calculation for AMAO 1.	658

1.6.3.2.2 Title III LEP English Language Proficiency Results

This section collects information on Title III LEP students' development of English and attainment of English proficiency.

Table 1.6.3.2.2 Definitions:

1. **Annual Measureable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) =** State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining proficiency.
2. **Making Progress =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the definition of "Making Progress" as defined by the State and submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
3. **Attained Proficiency =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency submitted to ED in the Consolidated State Application (CSA), or as amended.
4. **Results =** Number and percent of Title III LEP students that met the State definition of "Making Progress" and the number and percent that met the State definition of "Attainment" of English language proficiency.

In the table below, provide the State targets for the number and percent of students making progress and attaining English proficiency for this reporting period. Additionally, provide the results from the annual State English language proficiency assessment for Title III-served LEP students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program in grades K through 12. If your State uses cohorts, provide us with the range of targets, (i.e., indicate the lowest target among the cohorts, e.g., 10% and the highest target among a cohort, e.g., 70%).

	Results		Targets	
	#	%	#	%
Making progress	1,453	49.14	1,988	55.00
Attained proficiency	383	10.59	217	6.00
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.				

1.6.3.5 Native Language Assessments

This section collects data on LEP students assessed in their native language (Section 1111(b)(6)) to be used for AYP determinations.

1.6.3.5.1 LEP Students Assessed in Native Language

In the table below, check "Yes" if the specified assessment is used for AYP purposes.

State offers the State reading/language arts content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State mathematics content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
State offers the State science content tests in the students' native language(s).	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.3.5.2 Native Language of Mathematics Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for mathematics.

Language(s)
English
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.3 Native Language of Reading/Language Arts Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for reading/language arts.

Language(s)
English
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.5.4 Native Language of Science Tests Given

In the table below, report the language(s) in which native language assessments are given for *ESEA* accountability determinations for science.

Language(s)
English
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

1.6.3.6 Title III Served Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) Students

This section collects data on the performance of former LEP students as required by Sections 3121(a)(4) and 3123(b)(8).

1.6.3.6.1 Title III Served MFLEP Students by Year Monitored

In the table below, report the underlined count of monitored former LEP students during the two consecutive years of monitoring, which includes both MFLEP students in AYP grades and in non-AYP grades.

Monitored Former LEP (MFLEP) students include:

- Students who have transitioned out of a language instruction educational program.
- Students who are no longer receiving LEP services and who are being monitored for academic content achievement for 2 years after the transition.

Table 1.6.3.6.1 Definitions:

1. **# Year One =** Number of former LEP students in their first year of being monitored.
2. **# Year Two =** Number of former LEP students in their second year of being monitored.
3. **Total =** Number of monitored former LEP students in year one and year two. This is automatically calculated.

# Year One	# Year Two	Total
220	170	390
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.6.3.6.2 MFLEP Students Results for Mathematics

In the table below, report the number of MFLEP students who took the annual mathematics assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.2 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in mathematics in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the number tested.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual mathematics assessment. This will be automatically calculated.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
291	185	63.57	106
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.3 MFLEP Students Results for Reading/Language Arts

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual reading/language arts assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are monitored former LEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.3 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in reading/language arts in all AYP grades.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual reading/language arts assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
291	203	69.76	88
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.3.6.4 MFLEP Students Results for Science

In the table below, report results for MFLEP students who took the annual science assessment. Please provide data only for those students who transitioned out of language instruction educational programs and who no longer received services under Title III in this reporting year. These students include both students who are MFLEP students in their first year of monitoring, and those in their second year of monitoring.

Table 1.6.3.6.4 Definitions:

1. **# Tested =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who were tested in science.
2. **# At or Above Proficient =** State-aggregated number of MFLEP students who scored at or above proficient on the State annual science assessment.
3. **% Results =** Automatically calculated based on number who scored at or above proficient divided by the total number tested. This will be automatically calculated.
4. **# Below proficient =** State-aggregated number MFLEP students who did not score proficient on the State annual science assessment.

# Tested	# At or Above Proficient	% Results	# Below Proficient
162	97	59.88	65
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.			

1.6.4 Title III Subgrantees

This section collects data on the performance of Title III subgrantees.

1.6.4.1 Title III Subgrantee Performance

In the table below, report the number of Title III subgrantees meeting the criteria described in the table. Do <u>not</u> leave items blank. If there are zero subgrantees who met the condition described, put a zero in the number (#) column. Do <u>not</u> double count subgrantees by category.

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

	#
# - Total number of subgrantees for the year	6
# - Number of subgrantees that met all three Title III AMAOs	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 1	3
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 2	5
# - Number of subgrantees who met AMAO 3	3
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet any Title III AMAOs	1
# - Number of subgrantees that did not meet Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years (SYs 2010-11 and 2011-12)	0
# - Number of subgrantees implementing an improvement plan in SY 2011-12 for not meeting Title III AMAOs for two consecutive years	0
# - Number of subgrantees that have not met Title III AMAOs for four consecutive years (SYs 2008-09, 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12)	2

Provide information on how the State counted consortia members in the total number of subgrantees and in each of the numbers in table 1.6.4.1.

The response is limited to 4,000 characters.

Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. Each consortia counts as one subgrantee.

1.6.4.2 State Accountability

In the table below, indicate whether the State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs.

Note: Meeting all three Title III AMAOs means meeting <u>each</u> State-set target for <u>each</u> objective: Making Progress, Attaining Proficiency, and Making AYP for the LEP subgroup. This section collects data that will be used to determine State AYP, as required under Section 6161.

State met <u>all</u> three Title III AMAOs	No
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.4.3 Termination of Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs

This section collects data on the termination of Title III programs or activities as required by Section 3123(b)(7).

Were any Title III language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities terminated for failure to reach program goals?	No
If yes, provide the number of language instruction educational programs <u>or</u> activities for immigrant children and youth terminated.	
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.6.5 Education Programs and Activities for Immigrant Students

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

Note: All immigrant students are not LEP students.

1.6.5.1 Immigrant Students

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

Table 1.6.5.1 Definitions:

1. **Immigrant Students Enrolled =** Number of students who meet the definition of immigrant children and youth under Section 3301(6) and enrolled in the elementary or secondary schools in the State.
2. **Students in 3114(d)(1) Program =** Number of immigrant students who participated in programs for immigrant children and youth funded under Section 3114(d)(1), using the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. This number should not include immigrant students who only receive services in Title III language instructional educational programs under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a).
3. **3114(d)(1)Subgrants =** Number of subgrants made in the State under Section 3114(d)(1), with the funds reserved for immigrant education programs/activities. Do <u>not</u> include Title III Language Instruction Educational Program (LIEP) subgrants made under Sections 3114(a) and 3115(a) that serve immigrant students enrolled in them.

# Immigrant Students Enrolled	# Students in 3114(d)(1) Program	# of 3114(d)(1) Subgrants
1,664	10	1

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.6 Teacher Information and Professional Development

This section collects data on teachers in Title III language instruction educational programs as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

1.6.6.1 Teacher Information

This section collects information about teachers as required under Section 3123 (b)(5).

In the table below, report the number of teachers who are working in the Title III language instruction educational programs as defined under Section 3301(8) and reported in 1.6.1 (Types of language instruction educational programs) even if they are not paid with Title III funds.

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

	#
Number of all certified/licensed teachers currently working in Title III language instruction educational programs.	86
Estimate number of **additional** certified/licensed teachers that will be needed for Title III language instruction educational programs in the next 5 years*.	150

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

1.6.6.2 Professional Development Activities of Subgrantees Related to the Teaching and Learning of LEP Students

In the tables below, provide information about the subgrantee professional development activities that meet the requirements of Section 3115(c)(2).

Table 1.6.6.2 Definitions:

1. **Professional Development Topics =** Subgrantee professional development topics required under Title III.
2. **#Subgrantees =** Number of subgrantees who conducted each type of professional development activity. A subgrantee may conduct more than one professional development activity. (Use the same method of counting subgrantees, including consortia, as in 1.6.1 and 1.6.4.)
3. **Total Number of Participants =** Number of teachers, administrators and other personnel who participated in each type of the professional development activities reported.
4. **Total =** Number of all participants in professional development (PD) activities.

Type of Professional Development Activity	# Subgrantees	
Instructional strategies for LEP students	7	
Understanding and implementation of assessment of LEP students	7	
Understanding and implementation of ELP standards and academic content standards for LEP students	7	
Alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards	7	
Subject matter knowledge for teachers	7	
Other (Explain in comment box)	7	
Participant Information	**# Subgrantees**	**# Participants**
PD provided to content classroom teachers	7	120
PD provided to LEP classroom teachers	7	45
PD provided to principals	7	10
PD provided to administrators/other than principals	7	10
PD provided to other school personnel/non-administrative	7	5
PD provided to community based organization personnel	7	5
Total	42	195

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

1.6.7 State Subgrant Activities

This section collects data on State grant activities.

1.6.7.1 State Subgrant Process

In the table below, report the time between when the State receives the Title III allocation from ED, normally on July 1 of each year for the upcoming school year, and the time when the State distributes these funds to subgrantees for the intended school year. Dates must be submitted using the MM/DD/YY format.

Table 1.6.7.1 Definitions:

1. **Date State Received Allocation =** Annual date the State receives the Title III allocation from US Department of Education (ED).
2. **Date Funds Available to Subgrantees =** Annual date that Title III funds are available to approved subgrantees.
3. **# of Days/$$ Distribution =** Average number of days for States receiving Title III funds to make subgrants to subgrantees beginning from July 1 of each year, except under conditions where funds are being withheld.

Example: State received SY 2011-12 funds July 1, 2011, and then made these funds available to subgrantees on August 1, 2011, for SY 2011-12 programs. Then the "# of days/$$ Distribution" is 30 days.

Date State Received Allocation	Date Funds Available to Subgrantees	# of Days/$$ Distribution
07/01/12	07/30/12	30
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The State received the 2011-12 allocation on 07/01/2011. The LEAs were able to draw down funds on 07/01/2011 as well as long as they had an approved application.		

1.6.7.2 Steps To Shorten the Distribution of Title III Funds to Subgrantees

In the comment box below, describe how your State can shorten the process of distributing Title III funds to subgrantees.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The state will work with Title III Coordinators prior to the submission to indicate focus areas of each district and ways districts can utilize Title III Funding to the fullest.

1.7 PERSISTENTLY DANGEROUS SCHOOLS

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

	#
Persistently Dangerous Schools	0
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9 EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTHS PROGRAM

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

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

	#	# LEAs Reporting Data
LEAs without subgrants	149	149
LEAs with subgrants	2	2
Total	151	151
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.1 All LEAs (with and without McKinney-Vento subgrants)

The following questions collect data on homeless children and youths in the State.

1.9.1.1 Homeless Children And Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The totals will be automatically calculated:

Age/Grade	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths <u>Enrolled</u> in Public School in LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	27	68
K	116	177
1	105	152
2	119	146
3	94	130
4	80	109
5	70	91
6	79	98
7	67	102
8	48	74
9	69	114
10	74	91
11	55	48
12	68	71
Ungraded		
Total	1,071	1,471
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. South Dakota does not recognize "ungraded" as an age/grade.		

1.9.1.2 Primary Nighttime Residence of Homeless Children and Youths

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by primary nighttime residence enrolled in public school at any time during the regular school year. The primary nighttime residence should be the student's nighttime residence when he/she was identified as homeless. The totals will be automatically calculated.

	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>Without</u> Subgrants	# of Homeless Children/Youths - LEAs <u>With</u> Subgrants
Shelters, transitional housing, awaiting foster care	232	276
Doubled-up (e.g., living with another family)	723	884
Unsheltered (e.g., cars, parks, campgrounds, temporary trailer, or abandoned buildings)	23	42
Hotels/Motels	93	269
Total	1,071	1,471
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.2 LEAs with McKinney-Vento Subgrants

The following sections collect data on LEAs with McKinney-Vento subgrants.

1.9.2.1 Homeless Children and Youths Served by McKinney-Vento Subgrants

In the table below, provide the number of homeless children and youths by grade level who were served by McKinney-Vento subgrants during the regular school year. The total will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	# Homeless Children/Youths Served by Subgrants
Age Birth Through 2	130
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	147
K	176
1	152
2	144
3	133
4	111
5	90
6	100
7	108
8	76
9	117
10	89
11	48
12	72
Ungraded	0
Total	1,693
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.2.2 Subgroups of Homeless Students Served

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

	# Homeless Students Served
Unaccompanied homeless youth	127
Migratory children/youth	15
Children with disabilities (*IDEA*)	313
Limited English Proficient (LEP) students	102
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.9.3 Academic Achievement of Homeless Students

The following questions collect data on the academic achievement of enrolled homeless children and youths.

1.9.3.1 Reading Assessment

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

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	151	87
4	150	75
5	117	64
6	135	71
7	127	62
8	80	45
High School	61	39
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.2 Mathematics Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State mathematics assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3	151	79
4	151	74
5	118	59
6	134	73
7	128	66
8	80	42
High School	61	33
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.		

1.9.3.3 Science Assessment

This section is similar to 1.9.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on the State science assessment.

Grade	# Homeless Children/Youth Who Received a Valid Score and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Homeless Children/Youth Scoring at or above Proficient
3		
4		
5	117	65
6		
7		
8	80	42
High School	60	31
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters. The 5th and 8th grades are the only grades tested.		

1.10   MIGRANT CHILD COUNTS

This section collects the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) child counts which States are required to provide and may be used to determine the annual State allocations under Title I, Part C. The child counts should reflect the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This section also collects a report on the procedures used by States to produce true, accurate, and valid child counts.

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

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

FAQs on Child Count:

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

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

1.10.1 Category 1 Child Count

In the table below, enter the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number by age/grade of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, resided in your State for one or more days during the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. This figure includes all eligible migrant children who may or may not have participated in MEP services. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do <u>not</u> include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	12-Month Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	140
K	83
1	104
2	84
3	69
4	79
5	70
6	83
7	57
8	66
9	97
10	72
11	49
12	23
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	8
Total	1,084
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.1.1 Category 1 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have added liasions to our program in Watertown. This program is a consortium of small schools along with the Watertown school. We saw a need because of the dairies in that area that have migratory families. We have been able to get out into the districts and assist them in finding the students.

We also are seeing the movement of families to the Aberdeen area. There is a beef plant that is in the process of opening in that District. We are identifying children in that district.

1.10.2 Category 2 Child Count

In the table below, enter by age/grade the <u>unduplicated</u> statewide number of **eligible** migrant children age 3 through 21 who, within 3 years of making a qualifying move, were <u>served</u> for one or more days in a MEP-funded project conducted during either the <u>summer term or during intersession periods</u> that occurred within the reporting period of September 1, 2011 through August 31, 2012. Count a child who moved from one age/grade level to another during the reporting period only once in the highest age/grade that he/she attained during the reporting period. Count a child who moved to different schools within the State and who was served in both traditional summer and year-round school intersession programs only once. The unduplicated statewide total count is calculated automatically.

Do <u>not</u> include:

- Children age birth through 2 years
- Children served by the MEP (under the continuation of services authority) after their period of eligibility has expired when other services are not available to meet their needs
- Previously eligible secondary-school children who are receiving credit accrual services (under the continuation of services authority).

Age/Grade	Summer/Intersession Count of Eligible Migrant Children Who Are Participants and Who Can Be Counted for Funding Purposes
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	21
K	43
1	53
2	47
3	42
4	45
5	38
6	40
7	38
8	0
9	17
10	19
11	9
12	2
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	414
Comments: The response is limited to 4,000 characters.	

1.10.2.1 Category 2 Child Count Increases/Decreases

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

We have added liasions to our program in Watertown. This program is a consortium of small schools along with the Watertown school. We saw a need because of the dairies in that area that have migratory families. We have been able to get out into the districts and assist them in finding the students.

We also are seeing the movement of families to the Aberdeen area. There is a beef plant that is in the process of opening in that District. We are identifying children in that district.

With the additional staff,we have been able to increase the number of districts we provide summer school to within the Consortium.

1.10.3 Child Count Calculation and Validation Procedures

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

1.10.3.1 Student Information System

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Our state using MIS2000 to collect all data. It is the same system as last year.

1.10.3.2 Data Collection and Management Procedures

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was the child count data collected?
Each LEA designates a person as the contact for the Identification and Recruitment of migrant students. That person has been trained by Office of Educational Services and Support recruiters in the identification and recruitment of students that might be migratory. The LEA contact person is also trained in the completion of the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). Once the COE is completed using information provided by the child's parent the person interviewing the parent signs the COE and asks for a parent signature. Once that process is complete the LEA representative verifies the information on the COE signs the COE and sends it to the Office of Educational Services and Support. Information on the COE is verified by 2 different SEA staff and if found to be accurate is encoded by one SEA staff into the MIS2000 data management system for storage and eventual reporting. The SEA is the only data entry point for all data managed by the MIS2000.

What data were collected?

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

a) Names of legal parents or guardians address and phone number;
b) Name of self-eligible youth address and phone number;
c) Name of child/youth including: gender birth date grade in school ethnicity place of birth etc;
d) Verification which indicates how children's data was obtained;
e) Eligibility data which includes: last school and residence of children current school district qualifying arrival date status of children's residency qualifying activity of the children's parent or legal guardian and place of employment (if applicable) to help determine enrollment date in school the assigned Student Information Management System (SIMS) number any other work performed by
members of the household is noted and interviewer comments/verification statements;
f) Type of work performed at previous place of residence and number of months family resided at previous residence;
g) Assurance that work is temporary/seasonal assurance that FERPA rights have been explained to worker and assurance that parent engages in a migratory lifestyle;
h) Parent recruiter and LEA representative signatures and dates.

What activities were conducted to collect the data?

School district staff that are designated as the contact person for the identification and recruitment of migrant students are trained by SEA recruiters in the collection and reporting of child and family data. LEA designees conduct family interviews review school records and use family data from all available sources to complete the Certificate of Eligibility (COE). The COE is completed after a "face-toface" interview has been conducted with the parent or guardian or eligible youth. COEs are signed by the LEA migrant recruiter designee, parent, and verified by the LEA Representative. Because of the free school meals program that eligible migrant families can acquire, most school district superintendents and principals are now completing COEs when migratory parents come to school to enroll their children. Annually each LEA is also provided with I & R Training Packets that can be used for district education program inservice training. The packet contains a copy of the COE a ID & R training manual and a copy of the Draft Non-Regulatory Guidance for Title I Part C. If the data for the State's category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the category 1 count please describe each set of procedures.

Category 1 Child Count:

The data collection process is explained in the previous question. The Category I Child Count data collection process is a year-round data collection process maintained by the South Dakota Department of Education (SDDOE). The only site that has final determination of eligibility and resolves all data anomalies is SDDOE. All quality control procedures are implemented by SDDOE and all data entry is completed by SDDOE.
The Category I Child Count data is stored in a data management system called MIS2000. The MIS2000's report building function allows the State to customize reports based on the data stored in the system. The Category Child 1 count is generated by using this report building function.

Category 2 Child Count:

The Category 2 Child Count is collected by using the SY 2010-2011 MEP Program Evaluation Report (data is collected after school started Fall 2011) and the 2011 Summer MEP Project Report. The program evaluation report contains the number of eligible migrant students served in an extended year program and the types of services provided. The Summer MEP Project Report contains the names and unique identification number of all the eligible migrant students who were provided with extended year services and reports their progress in attaining proficiency in reading and math using pre and post test scores.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Child count information is updated daily or as new COEs are submitted by LEAs or ID & R recruiters and verified by SEA staff. The SEA is the sole data entry point for all COEs verified and encoded into the MIS 2000 data management system. Two staff persons at the SEA will verify all COEs and reconcile any discrepancies in data or information. Once all discrepancies are resolved the individual COE data will be
recorded into the MIS 2000 data base. After the end of the "count year" (August 31 of each year) the person who encodes all data into the MIS2000 generates a report of all identified migrant children by school district of residence. That report is sent to each LEA superintendent or the MEP project director of each school district in the state for updating and verification. If a student's parent(s) maintains residence in
the district and the student's eligibility has not expired district personnel return the list of eligible students with a request to re-enroll the eligible migrant student(s). If a student has moved out of the district during the count year, the date of the move and the eventual residence(if known) are submitted to the SEA. An authorized representative of the district must sign this report and return it to the SEA. Once that information is verified by SEA staff encoding the updated COE information the MIS 2000 is updated with the eligible migrant students residing in South Dakota's school districts during the count year. The MIS 2000 runs a report of duplicate names; those duplications are eliminated by checking both SEA and LEA data bases. The data is compiled using the MIS 2000. The Category I count is generated and reported to the federal Office of Migrant Education as requested.

If the data for the State's Category 2 count were collected and maintained differently from the Category 1 count, please describe each set of procedures.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For purposes of generating the Category 1 Child Count the State of South Dakota uses the South Dakota Department of Education Office of Educational Services and Support as the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. A Senior Secretary assigned to the migrant education program and the State Director of Migrant Education Programs both review every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000 data management system. Information on a COE that requires clarification and/or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. When necessary a phone call is made to the school district administrator employer migrant parent or recruiter who completed and
verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000 data management system. This data entry process occurs on an ongoing basis throughout the year. An MEP or local school district might update their information by conducting home visits when appropriate
or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the school year. Preschool student information is verified by the school district through home visits when appropriate by making a phone call or by visiting with the parent during school hours. Self-eligible youth are usually verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is
made to locate them. This is normally done with a phone call to the last known residence. If the State of South Dakota cannot verify a residence the child or youth is not included in the Category 1 Child Count. The MIS 2000 allows the SEA to withdraw a child from the child count on the last day the child was enrolled in an LEA. Upon re-enrollment in the same LEA at the start of the Fall Semester the child's migratory status would be updated as an eligible child for purposes of the Migrant Child Count. Should the child's 36 months of eligibility have expired during this time the MIS 2000 would automatically generate a report of termination. The data used to document enrollment and termination dates is taken from the COE and is verified and updated
annually by the authorized LEA administrator. Duplication of identified migrant students is avoided by comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student in a report of duplicates generated by the MIS 2000. All duplicated names are researched, eligibility verified and duplications resolved. Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS 2000 data management system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts are provided with an MIS 2000 printout of all students in the district who were identified as eligible migratory students during the count year. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Forms are returned to the SEA and discrepancies are discussed by phone with the LEA administrator. All discrepancies are resolved prior to final child count report. Category 2 data are collected when project reports and the annual MEP Evaluation Reports are completed by district MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names and unique identification number of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000.

In the fall of each year a funded MEP must complete the annual MEP Evaluation Report. The evaluation report contains the Participation Table for Summer Services used to report the number of children served during summer intersession. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked to verify that the count of students reported in the project report matches the count reported on the MEP Evaluation Report. Currently we are providing summer services to those eligible migrant students who were enrolled in an MEP during the current school year(August 15 through June 15) and who still
reside in the district or to migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession and verified to be eligible by the SEA. First priority migrant students must be served before other eligible migrant students can be provided with summer intersession services.

1.10.3.3 Methods Used To Count Children

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

How was each child count calculated?

Category 1 Child Count: All COEs are generated by individual school district personnel, or by a recruiter from the South Dakota Department of Education and mailed or delivered to the department. The South Dakota Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the MIS 2000. A Senior Secretary assigned to the migrant education program and the State Director of Migrant Education Programs review every COE prior to entering the data into the MIS 2000. Information that requires clarification or revision is targeted by data entry personnel or the program director. When necessary a phone call is made to the school administrator employer migrant parent or recruiter that verified the original COE to clarify issues or supply missing information. All information on the COE is checked and verified. Clarifications are made when necessary and the verified COE is entered into the MIS 2000. This data entry process occurs on an on-going basis. An MEP or school district updates information by conducting home visits or by visiting with the parents at other opportune times during the year. Self-eligible youth are verified through records maintained by their employer. If the youth is no longer employed at the identified site every effort is made to locate them. This is done with a phone call to the last known residence. If residence cannot be verified the youth is not included in the Category 1 Count. The MIS 2000 allows the SEA to withdraw a child on the last day the child was enrolled in an LEA. Upon re-enrollment in the same LEA at the start of the Fall Semester the child's migratory status would be updated as an eligible child for purposes of the Child Count. Should the child's 36 months of eligibility have expired during this time the MIS 2000 would automatically generate a report of termination. The data used to document enrollment and termination dates is taken from the COE and is verified and updated annually by the authorized LEA administrator. Duplication of identified migrant students is avoided by comparing student demographic data and the unique SIMS number of each student. All duplicated names are researched
and eligibility re-verified. Upon completion of the initial data entry into the MIS 2000 tracking system and prior to the reporting deadline school districts
are provided with an MIS 2000 printout of all students in the district identified as eligible migratory students. The district of residence checks this list for verification of eligibility. Discrepancies are discussed and resolved with the LEA administrator.

Category 2 data are collected when project reports submitted as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP completes the MEP Evaluation Report and summer intersession 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 MIS 2000 data collection system by an SEA data entry operator. The system provides a report building feature that allows the data entry person to design the reports needed to verify Category 1 Count. The SD Department of Education is the sole data entry point for the system. No MEP has the ability to encode data or generate reports. SEA data entry personnel build a report to
determine the exact criteria for counting only eligible migrant students during the count period of 9-1 through 8-31 of each count year. The report generates information on children 3-21 years of age who made a qualifying move between the count dates (QAD) and who remain eligible. Only eligible children making a qualifying move during the count year are counted with this process. The SEA data entry specialist verifies the qualifying activity of the parent based on the coded list of qualifying agricultural activities.
-children who were resident in your State for at least 1 day during the eligibility period

The report building feature of the MIS 2000 generates a "current enrollment report" of the eligible students based on thequalifying 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(qualifying arrival date) and who remain eligible. Duplicate names and birth date are
generated by an MIS 2000 report asking for duplicate names and dates. If determined necessary the data entry personnel will call the school district of record to discuss duplicate students. The SEA also uses the unique SIMS number of each identified migrant student to locate any duplicate students or to verify the existence of duplicate students. We added the SIMS number, a unique student number currently assigned to all school age children in South Dakota, to the COE during the summer of 2003.

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

- Category 1 count:

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

- Category 2 Count:

Category 2 data are collected when project reports completed as part of the summer intersession application process are completed by MEPs offering summer services. This report contains the names of all migrant students who received MEP funded summer services. The names of participating students are verified using the eligibility information contained in the MIS 2000. In the fall of each year a funded MEP must complete the MEP Evaluation Report. It contains a Participation Table for Summer Services. The information contained in each of the two reports is cross-checked to verify that the count of students reported in the project report matches the count reported on the MEP Evaluation Report. Currently we are providing summer services to those eligible migrant students who were enrolled in an MEP during the recent school year (August 15 through June 15) and who still reside in the district or to migrant students enrolling in a funded MEP during the summer intersession and verified to be eligible by the SEA.

1.10.3.4 Quality Control Processes

In the space below, respond to the following question: What steps are taken to ensure your State properly determines and verifies the eligibility of each child included in the child counts for the reporting period of September 1 through August 31 before that child's data are included in the student information system(s)?

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The MIS 2000 includes only those children and youth between the ages of 3 and 21 years that have not graduated from high school. The tracking system automatically verifies that a student has made a qualifying move within the last 36 month time period. (federal regulations state that a migrant child/family needs to move in 12 months or less in order to maintain their migrant lifestyle. The migrant child/family still qualify up to 36 months but if they move after being in their prior qualifying job more than 12 months then at their new location for employment they will not qualify per the regulations.) Verification of parent/guardian qualifying activity takes place at the recruitment location (usually the school district) and again during data entry at the SEA. At this time the SEA reviews the eligibility documents. An MIS 2000 report is generated that searches the data base for duplicate names and birth dates. The COE beginning in 2003 includes the unique SIMS number of every identified migrant child enrolled in South Dakota's schools. Use of this unique number insures that an identified migrant child is counted only once for Category 1 and 2 Child Counts. The State of South Dakota is the only data entry point for the MIS 2000. At the time data is entered by the Department of Education data entry person all information contained in the COE is scrutinized for accuracy by both the state director and data entry personnel. If the director or data entry person suspects that data is inaccurate or incomplete, a phone call is made to the LEA district administrator, employer, parent, or recruiter to re-verify the COEs data. All
discrepancies are rectified before the student(s) listed on the COE can be encoded as eligible migratory students in the MIS 2000 data base. Training for the recruiters happens each Fall before they go into School Districts. The recruiters meet with the State Director and send in reports of the findings in each districts. If there is a concern in a district the State Director will visit the district. The recruiters and State Director have open communication and evaluate and reivse as necessary. The State Director has a meeting to go through the new regulations. They then go into Districts to train them.

Category 2 Child Count data is generated during the collection of data for the Migrant Program Evaluation Report each fall. Children receiving summer services in a funded MEP would be counted as Category 2 children. In order to verify that children served in the summer MEP are eligible children the SEA uses the child's unique SIMS number to make sure that served children are identified migrant children with a valid COE. This information is included in the summer program project report and is compared to data reported in the MEP evaluation report completed each fall. If a child, previously identified as migratory but not encoded as eligible, turns 3 years of age prior to 8-
31 of each count year, the MIS 2000 system automatically updates the child's status when a child count report is generated for a district. The district MEP staff then verifies that the child is still eligible for services and a resident of the district by checking district enrollment and attendance records. For a child turning 3 years of age prior to 8-31 of each year who was not already reported as a migratory child an
updated COE is generated and submitted to the SEA for verification and data entry. We work with the same staff and students throughout the summer so procedures remain the same for the Migrant summer schools.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

The re-interview process for 2011-2012 began after the count is verified and during the summer of 2012. In order to verify the unduplicated child count, the procedure chosen by the South Dakota Migrant Education Program selects 10% of all families whose QAD falls between September 1 and August 31 of the count year for a re-interview procedure. These are "new" families who recently moved into South Dakota and were not residing in South Dakota during the previous count year. For count year 2011-2012 the re-interview process was completed in the Fall of 2012. The person conducting the reinterview process is an employee of the State of South Dakota and did not participate in the original interviewing process. She has received training at numerous OME Conferences and has conducted these re-interviews in the past. A QAD report generated by MIS 2000 indicated that 404 new families had been verified as eligible migrant families during the count year of September 1 2011 through August 31 2012. We generated a re-interview process for 40 randomly selected families. The South Dakota Migrant Education Project used the South Dakota Bureau of Information and Technology (BIT) as the source for a set of 40 randomly selected numbers between 1 and 404. The BIT used a computer generated RAND function to select the 40 numbers. Listed alphabetically by last name, the 40 numbers selected the families that would receive a reinterview from the state office. The re-interview process was conducted under the direct supervision of the State Director of Migrant Education. All families were contacted personally, when available, by staff from the state office. Alternate methods

of contact were used when the families had moved to other locations out-of-state. Those contacts consisted of school district administrators or employers in the
receiving school district. Results of the re-interview process indicated that 35 families had been appropriately identified as migratory and are still eligible. 5 families are no longer eligible. In the guidance it says an average of 50. We are a small program. The State of South Dakota has hired Education Research Training Corporation to do its reinterviewing process for this school year. They will use a sample size of 60 children.

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

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

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

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

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

All children determined to be eligible migratory students during the previous school year have been re-verified as eligible migratory children residing in the school district of residence. This verification is certified by an LEA Representative (school superintendent school principal or MEP director) following September 1 of each school year. The MIS 2000 also contains built-in edit checks to help determine which students
qualify for the Category 1 Child Count. Duplicate names and missing data are located by the edit checks and data entry staff are alerted to the problem. The Category 2 Child Count submitted by MEPs are unduplicated counts provided by the MEPs implementing summer services. Only children and youth already served by a regular-term MEP program or determined to be eligible during summer intersession are served by a summer program. Student eligibility is verified when an MEP participating in the summer program reports the names and SIMS numbers of the participating students. Children not documented as an eligible migrant student are not served with MEP funds. The names and unique identification numbers of each student reported in the Category II count is cross-checked with 3 reports. The Summer Project Report, the annual MEP Evaluation Report and the MIS 2000 data base. Annual migrant program evaluation reports and project reports completed by the MEP document only those students who have received summer intersession services. Guidance provided to MEP sites includes information on the provision of summer programs and completion of child count data. Included in the guidance and instructions for completion of the MEP Evaluation Report is the process each MEP uses for category 1 and 2 child count reporting. Guidance provided indicates that children not yet graduated within a 36 month QAD or children who are at least 3 years of age can be counted as participating students. The count period established for the summer program was June 1 through August 31 2010. When the MIS 2000 system identifies multiple entries for a student with a similar name or similarly spelled name data entry fields are checked using the following procedure:
a. student's name is checked for exact spelling using original COE;
b. student's SIMS number is checked;
c. student's birth date is checked;
d. student's grade level is checked;
e. names of the student's parents or guardians are checked;
f. names of siblings if available are checked;
g. If unresolved the school district of residence is contacted to verify additional student information

In the space below, describe those corrective actions or improvements that will be made by the SEA to improve the

accuracy of its MEP eligibility determinations in light of the prospective re-interviewing results.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

At this time the quality control procedures implemented in 2006 have been producing positive results and the changes to the identification and recruitment process have produced positive results. One big change that has come to light is the new federal migrant regulations. As of August 28,2008 the new federal regulation changed the way we identify qualifying migrant families. The biggest change in the regulations would be that in order to demonstrate a migratory lifestyle,the new federal regulations state that a migrant child/family needs to move in 12 months or less in order to maintain their migrant lifestyle. The migrant child/family still qualifies up to 36 months but if they move after being in their prior qualifying job more than 12 months then at their new location for employment they will not qualify per the regulations. We need to follow up sooner on the families that come with the intent of finding work.

In the space below, discuss any concerns about the accuracy of the reported child counts or the underlying eligibility determinations on which the counts are based.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

In 2011-2012 we decided to use the identification and recruitment process as a technical assistance and in-service training program. We teach key personnel in every school district how to appropriately recruit and identify migrant families, how to conduct interviews, and how to document information on the required COE. Using our internal quality control process all COE information is then verified by state office
personnel prior to final determination of eligibility and the school food service personnel are notified that the family is eligible for free meals within 2 weeks of transmittal of the original COE to the state office. The result has been quicker identification of migrant families, better school/parent involvement, and a working quality control process that meets the needs of all involved. However, it is sometimes difficult to identify children of Migrant parents because of the information required on the COE.