

The department has been working with US ED since January regarding graduation rate and the accountability workbook to be applied this summer to data from the current school year. The approved workbook will be posted on the department's website at <http://doe.sd.gov/nclb/state.asp> once it is finalized.

There are two changes regarding this year's AYP calculation that you need to be aware of:

1) South Dakota's **graduation rate goal is 85 percent** (rather than 80 percent), effective immediately. That means a school and district grade span that includes grade 12 will be expected to meet or exceed the state's graduation rate of 85 percent or improve its graduation rate over the previous year by a minimum of at least two percentage points in order to make AYP for the "other academic indicator." This decision came to us directly from the U.S. Department of Education as a result of new Title I regulations.

We will continue with the same method of calculating graduation rate that we have used for the last several years. It is our intention to move to the new Title I four-year cohort graduation calculation beginning with the 2010-11 school year.

2) Pending approval from the U.S. Department of Education, South Dakota **will increase its minimum N size from 10 to 25** for all student groups **when making accountability determinations**. The change would bring us more in line with surrounding states such as Nebraska, Iowa,

Montana, Minnesota and Wyoming, which have similar N size requirements for accountability. Under this scenario, AYP for schools with an "all student group" of less than 25 students will be determined on an annual basis by the department's small school audit process. The **N size for public reporting will remain at 10**.

To explain this further: The first tab of the online Report Card -- which is titled "FAY Math/Reading Scores" -- will remain unchanged. This tab reports the proficiency levels gained in reading and math for all student groups with 10 or more students. The third tab -- which is the "Status tab" -- is where the minimum N size of 25 **for accountability** comes into play. The minimum N size is used in the behind-the-scenes calculations such as confidence interval, two-year averaging and safe harbor to determine the pass or fail of AYP. The chart indicating "Yes" or "No" displays the box in green if the student group meets the minimum N size of 25. Anything less than 25 will be displayed in a yellow cell.

Title I Parent Involvement

Section 1118, of No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires each district and school with a Title I program to have a parent involvement policy that is jointly developed, agreed upon, and distributed to parents of participating children. The policies must be on file in the district, but need not be approved by the school board. The parent involvement policy must be provided to all parents of students served in a Title I program. The parent involvement policies must be reviewed annually.

A parent compact must be provided to every parent in a schoolwide program building and to Title I parents in targeted assistance program schools. The law does not require a parent signature for the compact. However, effort should be made to encourage parents to sign the compact. Schools are encouraged to create compacts that are useful to them and reflect the beliefs of the school and community, while using the parent involvement guidance to ensure the required components are included in the compact.

An annual Title I parent meeting must be held at a convenient time for parents. Each year, Title I programs are required to host a meeting for parents to explain what the Title I program is and how parents can become involved in the Title I program.

The parent involvement guidance can be found at the following department of education link

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/titleiparta/parentinvguid.doc>

Each schoolwide program must **evaluate annually** the outcomes and the plan's implementation to determine whether the academic achievement of all students, and particularly of low achieving students, improved, whether the goals and objectives contained in the plan were met. The evaluation must determine whether the SW program was effective in increasing student achievement. The schoolwide annual evaluation must include an analysis of data. Based on the results of the evaluation, the school must revise the plan if necessary.

The SW review team should present the results of the evaluation to staff in the school, parents, and other community members. The intended audience for the annual review is all stakeholders, internal and external to the school. The stakeholders have interest in knowing whether or not goals have been met. The evaluation will provide a road map for the future of the schoolwide program. The evaluation is completed when the school uses the results of the evaluation to more effectively implement its schoolwide program and improve student achievement.

A more detailed explanation of the review process can be found in the SW non-regulatory guidance at the following link.

<http://doe.sd.gov.oess.title.1Abasic/sec1114.asp>

About one half of the districts have logged into the egrant system and begun working on their applications for federal ESEA funds for 2010-2011. Districts are encouraged to begin that process as soon as possible so that DOE staff can begin the review process. Program representative assignments can be found on the following webpage <http://doe.sd.gov/ofm/grants/LEApp/index.asp> which contains all pertinent information about the egrant.

Please note that the district's business official must submit estimated carry-over amounts to DOE in order for those figures to be loaded into the egrant. This process may take a little while, so please get this task done as soon as possible to allow the district to proceed in completing its egrant. The district will not be able to submit the application until the carry over funds have been accounted for in the system.

We are hopeful that districts will be able to complete and submit their applications soon so that we can get a good start on the reviews before the department makes the physical move from the Kneip to the McKay building in June. We expect some down time in application reviews during this transition.

Another step that a district could take that would help us in our application review would be to ensure that an administrator and the business official will watch for email notices about the egrant over the summer months. Responding quickly to the request for clarification or revisions to the egrant helps us to keep the process going and will ultimately result in a quicker turn around from initial submission to final approval. We appreciate your help in this process!

