

# **STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B**

**for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY 2021**

**South Dakota**



**PART B DUE February 1, 2023**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

### Executive Summary

#### Additional information related to data collection and reporting

#### Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year

149

#### General Supervision System:

#### The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

The SEA implements a variety of activities to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met.

The SEA's general supervision includes an accountability review of LEA special education programs on a five-year cycle. The accountability review incorporates an analysis of compliance through State Performance Plan (SPP) indicators, state assessment accommodation verification, dispute resolution follow-up, and fiscal reviews.

#### Accountability Reviews

The SEA's accountability review cycle distributes LEAs and educational agencies over a five-year cycle. Each LEA accountability review includes a review of child count data in comparison to state level reporting, an Indicator 13 review, one-on-one teacher file reviews, verification of state certification of special education staff, and a representative file review across disability categories and age levels. If relevant to the LEA, an accountability review may also include a review of private school eligibility, service plans, program purchases, extraordinary cost fund program (ECF) file reviews, and other relevant areas.

LEAs may also receive an on-site or off-site focused review. Focused reviews are generally related to disproportionality, board recommended review for ECF recipients, and follow up corrective action received from a state complaint or due process complaint with findings of noncompliance. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Coaches review specific areas related to the findings and to verify continued correction.

If noncompliance has been identified, a finding in the form of a corrective action plan (CAP) is issued by the SEA. The CAP includes the noncompliance issue, citation of the statute or regulation, and/or data supporting the conclusion. The LEA will correct all areas of noncompliance as soon as possible, but no later than one year from the written notification. The LEA will demonstrate correction by submitting supporting documentation for the correction of each individual case identified (Prong 1) as well as documentation of correction of the regulatory requirements (Prong 2) as required by the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum. Part of the corrective action may include targeted technical assistance overseen by the SEA.

The SEA is implementing a RDA 3-tiered process utilizing a risk rubric based primarily on SPP performance indicator data. The risk rubric identifies LEAs in need of support to improve academic and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. All LEAs (level 1, 2, and 3) are required to conduct a self-assessment compliance review (internal review) for one file per case manager. LEAs analyze the strengths and needs from file reviews and identify internally what professional development or other staff supports are needed. Each LEA then submits to the SEA the identified area of weakness. The SEA utilizes that information to determine state level professional development and technical assistance needs. LEAs identified in level 2 or 3 are also required to participate in a data retreat, complete internal reviews with support, develop an action plan, and receive coaching. Level 2 and 3 are required to implement the action plans to improve outcomes in SPP indicators. The RDA District Manual is located at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/D-RDA-manual.pdf>.

#### Fiscal Monitoring

Fiscal monitoring includes the review and approval of the application LEAs submit to the Department of Education (DOE) to apply for IDEA 611 and 619 funds. The SEA reviews each application to make certain it meets program requirements using a multi-faceted approach. SEA regional representatives complete an initial review to verify expenditures are allowable and ensure LEAs are budgeting. The approved application is sent to the SEA administrator for review and approval, then sent to the Grants Management (GM) office. GM reviews to certify the budget and program costs are aligned and allowable and that the LEA has met Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements. GM conducts a final review before sign-off by the GM Director and the SEA Division Director.

When the DOE conducts a fiscal review of the IDEA 611 and 619 funds, the LEA submits its accounting records. GM compares accounting records with reimbursement requests and the grant application for the IDEA Part B 611 and 619, coordinated early intervening services (CEIS), and private schools proportionate share. The following are reviewed:

1. The DOE ensures, if the LEA utilized voluntary CEIS funds up to 15%, that funds are used to provide services to non-identified students (not on an Individualized Education Plan, IEP) through fiscal review and special education accountability review. This process is also used for Comprehensive CEIS (CCEIS) requirements. The LEA separately tracks and accounts for IDEA funds used for CCEIS and CEIS in the accounting software. LEAs must submit a separate budget for these funds which are reviewed in the same manner as 611 & 619 funds.

2. MOE is reviewed and a determination is made as to whether the LEA is in compliance or if MOE needs to be addressed. MOE is reviewed using two different comparisons each fiscal year. The first comparison examines local, or state and local, special education budgeted expenditures to actual local, or state and local, special education expenditures from the most recent prior fiscal year for which information is available. This comparison is completed in the IDEA application, to determine if the LEA is eligible to receive the IDEA entitlement grant. The second comparison examines two fiscal years actual local, or state and local, special education expenditures to determine if the LEA is in compliance with IDEA MOE requirements. This compliance

test occurs after the fiscal year has ended. If an LEA does not pass at least one of these four MOE tests, the LEA must provide documentation to the DOE explaining how one of the allowable exceptions prevented the LEA from expending the necessary amount of local or state funds to maintain effort. If the LEA is unable to establish an allowable exception, noncompliance will be issued and the LEA will be required to pay the amount it fell below the MOE requirement to the DOE.

3. If the LEA has a private school, the DOE verifies the LEA expended the required proportionate share designated and budgeted in the application for IDEA funds. If the LEA purchased equipment, the DOE verifies the appropriateness of the expenditure and that the LEA maintained control over all IDEA funds, property, equipment, and supplies at the private school. If the LEA used private school personnel to provide equitable services, the SEA verifies that services were performed outside of the regular duty hours and under the supervision of the public agency. The DOE verifies the LEA identifies the private school expenses in their financial software and tracks it separately.

The DOE does a fiscal cross-cutting to ensure the LEA is supplementing and not supplanting federal funds. The DOE checks whether or not the LEA generated any program income and compares time and effort documentation against the general ledger. If the LEA purchased equipment with federal funds, the DOE requests the property records to ensure that the equipment is reasonable and necessary to implement the IEP. During on-site accountability review, the SEA confirms the item(s) purchased have been appropriately labeled and inventoried according to program requirements and whether or not adequate controls are in place to ensure safeguarding and maintaining equipment (including a physical inventory reconciled at least every other year). The DOE verifies procurement is in place, and if necessary, collects documentation supporting vendor selection. If there are third-party contractors, the DOE checks to see whether or not they are approved and monitored by the LEA.

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

##### **The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

The SEA provides technical assistance to LEAs utilizing a variety of methods to reach as many constituents as possible in the manner that best meets their needs.

Technical assistance (TA) documents are developed and maintained to help clarify policies and procedures to assist LEAs with implementing the IDEA and state requirements. The documents are posted on the SEA webpage at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped> and shared with constituents at conferences and during trainings, and notices of availability are sent on the special education listserv. Monthly special education webinars are provided, recorded, and made available for a limited time. Webinar topics include upcoming data collections, TA on needed areas identified through monitoring or complaints, and updates on policies. The SEA keeps open lines of communication with LEAs through topical listservs and assigned region representatives. This guarantees that all constituents are able to access prompt, high-quality technical support.

In order to provide topical and in-depth assistance, the SEA utilizes a portion of the state level IDEA allocation for contracted specialists. The areas these contractors directly support LEAs includes (but is not limited to):

1. RDA Coaches. These individuals are contracted through educational cooperatives to conduct accountability reviews. They also conduct regional training around IEP procedures ages 3 through 21 and high school transition for teachers, present at teacher preparation programs, and conduct training related to CAPs. RDA coaches support the implementation of the RDA.
2. Transition Services Liaison Project (TSLP). This program is a collaborative partnership between the DOE and the Department of Human Services (Division of Rehabilitation Services). TSLP staff are regionally located and focus on supporting high school transition. They make one-on-one connections with high school special education teachers and personnel. They provide technical assistance in writing compliant IEPs, locate resources for evidence-based practices, and link adult agencies with LEA personnel, students and families.
3. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Coordinators. These individuals work directly with LEAs to implement a continuous improvement framework in which data-based problem-solving and decision-making are practiced across all levels of the educational system for supporting students. The coordinators are trained in Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) processes.
4. Educational cooperatives, South Dakota School for the Deaf, and the Center for Disabilities. These organizations provide specialized training and technical assistance in areas of regional and statewide need as identified through monitoring and LEA input.
5. The Navigator Program. This program is contracted through South Dakota Parent Connection (SDPC), the State's OSEP funded parent training and information center (PTI). Each Navigator Program consultant serves as an objective and neutral party while assisting parents and school personnel. Navigators also assist in locating and utilizing information, improving communication, building (or re-building) partnerships, and making progress towards mutual agreements. SDPC develops and presents to parents and LEAs on a variety of topics based on the types of cases they are taking on and issues the SEA identifies through accountability reviews and the dispute resolution process <https://www.sdparent.org/about/navigator-program>. The SEA also analyzes the areas of concern identified in Navigator Program to determine if technical assistance and professional development are needed.

#### **Professional Development System:**

##### **The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

Professional development is provided in a variety of ways due to South Dakota's (SD) large area and rural nature. SD has 77,111 square miles and 149 LEAs. The LEAs are differentiated by the total student population with 29 that have an enrollment of 200 or less, 80 have an enrollment between 201 and 600, and 40 have an enrollment of over 600. Trainings are offered in a variety of formats including state level, regionally, and virtually which allows LEA staff to access appropriate professional development. The SEA professional development revolves around data collection, the IEP process, behavior, response to intervention, instructional coaching, early childhood and other pertinent areas. Professional development areas are identified through monitoring, LEA input, and input from the stakeholder groups (including the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities (SDAPCD) and SDPC).

IEP process workshops are held every fall across SD. In the fall of 2021, the SEA offered several opportunities for basic, advanced, transition and early childhood IEP workshops virtually and in-person. IEP basic targets new special education staff and covers the IEP process from referral, evaluation, eligibility to IEP development. Approximately 139 LEA staff statewide attended the basic workshop. The advanced IEP workshop focused on skill-based assessments and prior written notice content. Approximately 300 LEA staff statewide attended the advanced training. The transition IEP workshop covers high school transition and IEP processes. The transition workshop had approximately 137 LEA staff attend. The early childhood workshop focuses on Part C to Part B transition, preschool outcomes, and least restrictive environments. There were approximately 76 LEA staff that attended the early childhood workshop.

The SEA distributes special education program information such as professional development opportunities, federal updates, and data collection reminders through the DOE email listserv, webpage, and the monthly DOE TEACH newsletter. A monthly special education webinar is held every third Tuesday of the month and is recorded and available for a limited time upon request. The PowerPoint and handouts are available at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/directors.aspx>. The webinars inform special education directors and other interested parties about information and changes at the federal and state level, initiatives, data collection, and other DOE information.

The SEA partners with Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to offer webinar training on specialized topics. Topics include legal updates, behavior, bullying, restraint and seclusion and discipline. A new special education director webinar series is conducted every two-years targeting five areas of general supervision including the SPP/APR, budget and fiscal, dispute resolution, accountability, and child count. All TAESE webinar recordings and handouts mentioned above are posted at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/webinars.aspx>.

Training occurs regionally around the state and virtually throughout the school year. Training spans a variety of topics, including (but not limited to) discipline, struggling readers (dyslexia), early childhood, writing effective behavior plans, writing standards-based IEPs, facilitation of IEP meetings, transition training, parental engagement and connecting with youth, and instructional strategies.

The SEA sponsors speakers at conferences of partnering organizations focused on meeting the needs of students with disabilities. These include the Youth Leadership Forum (YLF), the Early Childhood conference, and SD Speech and Language Pathologist Association Joint Training. The SEA hosts two major conferences each year, Special Education Conference and Summer Conference. One targets special education professionals and the other targets all educators with a focus on making learning accessible for all students.

Entities such as the Center for Disabilities provide frequent and timely feedback and technical assistance through virtual meetings, in-person and other avenues to parents and LEAs. Other professional development offered included training on meeting the needs of students with Autism and other challenging behaviors, administration of the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS), Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, supporting mental health, Young Adult Social Skills training, infant and early childhood mental health, and training for general education teachers on supporting students with disabilities.

The SEA partnered with the SD School for the Deaf to develop training and modules for teachers statewide to improve their understanding of students who are deaf and hard of hearing and to make instruction accessible based on the student's mode of communication.

By utilizing a diverse range of technical assistance entities, delivery methods and platforms, the SEA assures access to timely and high-quality professional development for all stakeholders statewide.

#### **Broad Stakeholder Input:**

#### **The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The SEA values broad stakeholder representation. Stakeholder involvement is sought through utilizing existing stakeholder groups both within SDDOE and other government agency groups, as well as outside entities. Stakeholders are invited to serve on various stakeholder groups through SEP targeted emails, announcements on the special education webinar, individual district invitations, tribal education invitations, Head Start Collaboration Office, Part C, SDAPCD member invitations, and by reaching out to DRSD and SDPC to increase parent and individuals with disabilities involvement. Stakeholder groups include representation from various SDDOE departments, general education and special education administrators, superintendents and building principals, general and special education teachers, related services personnel, SDPC staff, professors, parents, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members, DOE staff from multiple divisions, and contractors. To establish a representative sample that reflects diversity across SD, the SEA includes stakeholders from varying demographics, geographic areas and LEA enrollment sizes. Targeted recruitment efforts included working directly with LEAs to identify stakeholders in communities with more diverse populations, however those that responded and attended were limited. Although the stakeholder participants were mainly white or Native American, they did represent students of varying race and ethnicities. The stakeholders either work directly with students providing services or provide supports to students and families of varying race/ethnicities. Students the stakeholders served, included Native American, Caucasian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The stakeholder participants also represented students from all 14 disability categories.

In addition to opportunities to share input formally in-person, stakeholders were provided an opportunities to review recommendations and proposals and provide input through email, chat in webinar presentations, and through an online survey.

Annually in the spring, after the SPP/APR is submitted, the current FFY data submission is presented to the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Board. The targets are presented, and the participants provide input whether the targets should remain the same or consider changing, as well as feedback on improvement strategies for secondary transition.

The SEA met with a large stakeholder group in September 2022 to review FFY 2020 data, historical data, trends and gather stakeholder feedback. Invitations were sent to a variety of potential participants that included parents, LEA administrators, LEA general education and special education staff, related service providers, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members, SDPC staff, Disability Rights South Dakota (DRSD) staff (OSEP funded protection and advocacy agency), DOE staff from multiple divisions and contractors. The SEA attempted to recruit those with diverse race and ethnic backgrounds, however, those that responded and attended were limited. Although the stakeholder participants were mainly white and Native American, they did represent students of varying race and ethnicities. The stakeholders either work directly with students providing services or provide supports to students and families. Students the stakeholders served, included Native American, Caucasian, African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The stakeholder participants also represented students from all 14 disability categories.

The SEA staff used the feedback and recommended strategies from the large stakeholder group to present to additional stakeholder groups. On January 5th, 2023 SEA staff presented to SDAPCD the preliminary data results of the SPP and solicited feedback. The SEA sent a follow-up email to panel members with a link to provide additional feedback. The SDAPCD is made up of parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, administrators, DRSD, vocational rehabilitation, higher education, juvenile justice, private schools, McKinney Vento, and other state agencies. This meeting was also broadcast live through public broadcasting and recordings are made available at <https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=16> under the "Archived Meetings" tab. The general practice of the SEA is to solicit participation from a broad group representing a variety of race and ethnic backgrounds and various locations throughout the state by advertising through listservs, current advisory panel member recommendations, DRSD, and SDPC. January 17th, 2023 SEA staff presented the preliminary data during the monthly special education webinar that consists of teacher, administrators, and other entities or individuals. A link was provided to all participants to provide feedback.

Indicator 17 SSIP progress was reviewed with stakeholders during the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Advisory Committee meeting on

October 13, 2022. SPDG Advisory Committee members included educators, administrators, family organizations, higher education representatives, and staff from several divisions of DOE. While the focus of the meeting was to review data and progress of districts implementing the SPDG, data from all programs that provide literacy support to pilot LEAs was reviewed.

Indicator 17 data was also reviewed during the MTSS Stakeholder meeting held on November 17, 2022. MTSS stakeholders included educators, administrators, MTSS coordinators, parents, and school board members from LEAs participating in the state MTSS initiative. The stakeholders represented school staff who serve students from multiple race/ethnicities and multiple disability categories. Stakeholders reviewed data and progress of the MTSS initiative and also participated in a facilitated feedback process for each component of the MTSS initiative. MTSS stakeholders also provided feedback on the updated Theory of Action and implementation activities related to each Theory of Action component.

Stakeholder input is obtained directly from LEAs on specific indicators through the RDA process. LEAs identified in level 2 and 3 are required to participate in a data retreat on specific indicators at the LEA and the SEA level. The data retreat teams include staff who are parents of children with disabilities, administrators, and teachers. The analysis focuses on instruction, curriculum, environment, and learner needs along with the IEP role in improving indicator data. After analysis of the data, LEAs identify improvement strategies to support root cause areas. When the LEA identifies areas to be improved after data analysis, an action plan with those improvement strategies is developed along with how to measure progress. The SEA reviews the LEA's data analysis and action plan to determine supports needed by the LEA to improve SPP areas that the SEA can support.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

NO

#### **Number of Parent Members:**

14

#### **Parent Members Engagement:**

#### **Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Parents from the SDAPCD, SDPC, DRSD, and other parents of students with disabilities were invited to formal stakeholder meetings to engage in reviewing and analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress. Invitations were sent through a variety of means to multiple outlets that work with parents that included underrepresented populations, however there was a limited response. The SEA sent stakeholder invitations via social media, listservs, the DOE Secretary weekly emails, advocacy groups, developmental disabilities council, SDPC, and the SD Tribal Education Department and encouraged school districts to disseminate requests for stakeholders and make direct nominations.

SEP educates all stakeholders, including parents, on the indicators at each stakeholder meeting and by presenting throughout the year on data collection and results on individual indicators. The information provided includes: what is being measured and how it is calculated; current results; historical data; how, when and where the data is collected; how the indicators impact each other as well as how student outcomes are impacted. Stakeholders also receive information on what can be done to improve data quality and improvement activities that have been completed to address areas of need. SEP also provides guiding questions to assist stakeholders with completing an in-depth dive into the data to help them identify areas of need and to recommend improvement activities.

Partner entities provide additional training to help parents build their capacity to provide input and engage in stakeholder processes. SDPC offers online workshops on "Serving on Groups that Make Decisions" and DRSD offers training in "Partners in Policymaking."

#### **Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

#### **The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

SEA staff met to identify potential stakeholders for each indicator. A list of potential stakeholders was developed to include participants with a variety of race and ethnic backgrounds both as a participant and representing the student population the stakeholder works with, stakeholders with varying expertise in the 14 disability categories, parents as well as agencies who work with parents, advocates, positions based on the indicator (i.e. transition – college representative and a parent of a student with disabilities graduating), administrators from LEAs and cooperatives, teachers, Part C program representative, representatives from different regions of the state which included reservations, and related service professionals.

The SEA also encouraged LEAs to share out stakeholder opportunities with parents through the monthly special education webinars. The SEA staff directly contacted LEAs with diverse student populations, and parent to extend personal invitations to join stakeholder groups.

#### **Soliciting Public Input:**

#### **The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Stakeholders had the opportunity to learn about the reported data, targets, and baseline data through in-person meetings and virtual meetings. During and after presentations participants were encouraged to ask questions and provide feedback both live and offline.

The SPP/APR FFY 2020 webinar has been made available and shared out with stakeholders since February 2022. In June 2022, SEA staff began identifying potential stakeholders and groups to assist with providing stakeholder feedback for FFY 2021. The SEA began notifying and recruiting stakeholders in August 2022 to attend the large stakeholder data drill down in September 2022. Notifications went out via the special education listserv, targeted district email, SD Tribal Education, individual parent invites between August 2022 and September 2022, and through the SDAPCD. During the January monthly special education webinar FFY 2021 data was presented and a feedback link was provided for participants to comment on current data, targets, and improvement strategies.

#### **Making Results Available to the Public:**

#### **The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The SEA posts the SPP/APR at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> by June 1st. In May 2022, announcements via DOE listservs, monthly special education webinar, and public notices went out alerting stakeholders that the SPP/APR would be posted. The SEA presented FFY 2021 preliminary dispute resolution results to the SDAPCD in September 2022. The SEA presented all preliminary SPP/APR data in January 2023. In February of each year, the SEA presents the SPP/APR data that was submitted to OSEP on the monthly special education webinar.

#### **Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

Following the submission of the SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Education, the SEA disseminated the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, and LEA public information in the following ways:

1. Posted the final version of the SPP/APR, and LEA public reports on the SEA website at <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx>. The SEA publicly reports at the LEA level public reports on the required indicators as soon as practical, but no later than 120 days following the SEA's submission of its SPP/APR each year.
2. The SEA utilizes the IDEA Data Center Interactive Public Reporting Engine to display the 618 public data reports. The link to the final 618 public data tables can be found on the SEA website at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/StatePublicReports.aspx>.
3. Published Public Notices via state press release that targets approximately 250 individual recipients or entities statewide that can further distribute information to include newspapers, television stations, and radio stations to notify the public of the website <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> where the SPP/APR and LEA public reports can be accessed. Hard copies of the reports are made available upon request.

The SEA disseminated the information by:

1. Alerting constituency groups via existing listservs, email and workshops.
2. The SEA staff present current SPP/APR preliminary data and results to the SDAPCD in January of each year.
3. The SEA staff present the data and results submitted to OSEP February 1st during the monthly special education webinar in February.
4. SDPC shares via newsletter and weekly updates with parents' directions on how to access the publication of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR on the SEA website.
5. Providing electronic copies to all SDAPCD members.
6. Providing access to alternative formats of this document (e.g., Braille, large print, hard copy, or digital) on request. Alternative forms can be requested at: South Dakota Department of Education Attn: Special Education Programs 800 Governor's Drive Pierre, SD 57501-2294.

### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **Intro - OSEP Response**

### **Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Graduation

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in ED Facts file specification FS009.

### Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	67.99%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	67.99%
Data	60.42%	60.18%	62.98%	72.14%	75.40%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	67.99%	68.45%	68.91%	71.84%	73.67%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 1 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Due to this indicator being a lag year (SY2020-2021), the FFY 2020 stakeholders had identified that there would be a decline in indicator results due to COVID19. When reviewing the trends, stakeholders continued to observe COVID19 impact on the data reported in FFY 2021.

Indicator 1 had a change in measurement for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package, which impacted results. During the stakeholder’s examination of data, the following suggestions for data analysis and target strategies were made: examine data at the SEA and the LEA level to identify who is graduating in 4 years verse 5+, continue training on graduation requirements, develop materials and training on accommodations and supports to keep students in general education, especially at the middle and high school level.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	508
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	62
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	262

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
508	832	75.40%	67.99%	61.06%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The SEA had a decrease of 102 students graduating with a regular high school diploma from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021. When examining the data and understanding the school year impacts, even though the total of students exiting from the FFY 2020 (2019-2020 school year) to FFY 2021 (2020-2021 school year) only increased by 23 students, the impact of COVID19 was evident. This is the school year after COVID19 began. Even though most of LEAs were face-to-face operational, it was difficult to locate students who had unknowingly moved, and no records were requested to transfer, students would not engage in virtual courses, additional absences due to COVID19 protocols or unexplained absences. These issues contributed to an additional 115 students dropping out for the FFY 2021 reporting period which impacted the number who graduated.

COVID19 continued impact for this indicator:

1. The impact of COVID19 - LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses, and providing consistent services in a safe environment. Beginning in the fall of 2020 and continuing through the present, COVID19 has caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses . The DOE has undertaken a campaign to raise awareness of the issue and impact of absenteeism to improve attendance rate.
2. Students may have to re-take or take recovery courses due to failing courses that were moved to virtual instruction due to the aforementioned ongoing effects of COVID19 on LEAs; not all students learn well in a virtual learning environment.
3. Concerns were expressed regarding some LEAs remaining open while others were virtual.
4. Concern over consistency between LEAs as to how students are counted as attending school and completing coursework during COVID19 recovery years.

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

SD has one diploma with the ability to add an advanced, advanced career, or an advanced honors endorsement. The minimum requirements for receiving a diploma are established by SDCL 13-33-19 and ARSD 24:43:11:02.

24:43:11:02. General requirements for high school graduation. The units of credit required for high school graduation must include the following:

- (1) Four units or more of language arts that must include the following:
  - (a) One unit of writing;
  - (b) One-half unit of speech or debate; and
  - (c) One unit of literature that must include one-half unit of American literature;
- (2) Three units or more of social studies that must include the following:
  - (a) One unit of U.S. history; and
  - (b) One-half unit of U.S. government;
- (3) Three units or more of mathematics that must include one unit of algebra I;
- (4) Three units or more of science that must include one unit of biology;
- (5) One unit or more in any combination of the following:
  - (a) Approved career and technical education courses;
  - (b) A capstone experience; and
  - (c) World languages;
- (6) One-half unit of personal finance or economics;



- (7) One unit of fine arts;
- (8) One-half unit of physical education;
- (9) One-half unit of health or health integration; and
- (10) Five and one-half units of electives.

A state-approved advanced computer science course may be substituted for one unit of science, but may not be substituted for biology.

Within the coursework outlined above, a student may earn one or more advanced endorsement, but is not required to do so. A student may earn one or more of the following advanced endorsements: advanced, advanced career, and advanced honors. Substitutions for laboratory science, using a state-approved computer science course, do not apply to the advanced and advanced honors endorsements.

Students may be granted up to one credit in fine arts for participation in extracurricular activities. A maximum of one-fourth credit may be granted for each extracurricular activity each school year. In order to grant credit, a LEA must document the alignment of the activity with fine arts content standards as approved by the SD Board of Education.

Academic core content credit may be earned by completing an approved career and technical education course. Approval to offer credit must be obtained through an application process with the DOE. The application must include:

- (1) Course syllabus;
- (2) Standards based curriculum;
- (3) Teacher certification;
- (4) Assessment of standards by methods including end-of-course exams, authentic assessment, project-based learning or rubrics.

The IEP team has the authority to modify the specific credits required for graduation. The IEP team must take into consideration the student's postsecondary goals along with the nature of the student's disability, which prevents the student from accessing the same curriculum with accommodations and supports. If a student has modified requirements they are not considered to have met the regular graduation requirements and their eligibility for FAPE is not ended.

Graduation information may be found on the DOE website at <https://doe.sd.gov/gradrequirements/>

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

### **1 - OSEP Response**

### **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Drop Out

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

#### Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2019	19.35%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	2.80%	2.50%	2.40%	2.40%	19.35%
Data	3.09%	3.30%	3.01%	2.55%	18.17%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	19.35%	18.38%	17.40%	14.60%	10.70%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 2 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Due to this indicator being a lag year (actual 2020-2021), the FFY 2020 stakeholders had identified that there would be a decline in indicator results due to COVID19. When reviewing the trends, stakeholders continued to observe COVID19 impact on the data reported in FFY 2021.

Indicator 2 had a change in measurement for the FFY 2020-2025 SPP/APR package, which impacted results. During the stakeholder's examination of data, the following suggestions for data analysis and target strategies were made: examine data at the SEA and the LEA level to identify who is dropping out verses moved not known to continue, analyze attendance rates and identify students to target for intervention, and identify interventions and strategies to keep students engaged at the LEA level.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	508
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b)	

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c)	
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d)	62
SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/25/2022	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e)	262

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out	Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
262	832	18.17%	19.35%	31.49%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

When examining the data and understanding the school year impacts, even though the total of students exiting from the FFY 2020 (2019-2020 school year) to FFY 2021 (2020-2021 school year) only increased by 23 students, the impact of COVID19 was still evident.

This is the school year after COVID19 began. Even though most of LEAs were face-to-face operational, the following issues contributed to an additional 115 students identified as dropouts for the FFY 2021 reporting period:

COVID19 continued impact for this indicator.

1. The impact of COVID19 - LEAs need time to recover from COVID19 closures, continued illnesses, and providing consistent services in a safe environment. COVID19 caused an increase in substitute teachers, turnover in staff, and absences due to student and family illnesses.
2. Student's attendance issues resulting in the LEAs recording students as dropouts following state regulations. The DOE has undertaken a campaign to raise awareness of the issue and impact of absenteeism to improve attendance rate.
3. Some LEAs face difficulty locating and re-enrolling students. Some students moved and did not enroll in another district or no education records were requested by another education entity.
4. Students may have signed up for virtual learning but did not log on to classes or complete requirements resulting in being dropped from enrollment.

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

- 1) Was enrolled in school at some time during the school year;
- 2) Was not enrolled on the last day of school;
- 3) Has not graduated from high school or completed a state approved program;
- 4) Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: Transfer to another accredited education program, Temporary absence due to suspension or illness, Excused from public school attendance (SDCL 13-27-3), or Death;
- 5) A student who has moved and is not known to continue in another LEA.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

### Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

#### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

#### Measurement

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	95.52%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	92.13%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	93.28%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	95.20%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	91.50%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	92.97%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	95.52%	95.79%	96.10%	96.74%	98.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	95.20%	97.50%	97.60%	97.80%	98.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The SEA followed the FFY 2020 OSEP required action to revise targets for FFY 2020, FFY 2021, FFY 2022, FFY 2023, and FFY 2024 for Reading Grade 8, Reading Grade HS, Math Grade 8, and Math Grade HS, to align with ESEA requirements of at least 95.00% participation. These revised targets were shared with the stakeholder groups. Despite FFY 2020 SPP/APR concerns that participation would be negatively affected by attendance rates and the challenges of providing secure testing environments to students participating in virtual learning during COVID19, all FFY 2021 participation rate targets were met.

Stakeholders discussed potential barriers to participation could be student frustration with the assessment causing parents to refuse their children’s participation. LEAs should make sure that accommodations are available and appropriate to reduce student frustration and to increase accessibility. Both general education and special education teachers’ understanding of accommodations needs to be increased/supported. This could include professional development and physical materials, such as a one-page infographic.

Analysis of the disaggregated participation data of groups within each grade showed that the participation of group c (children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations) has low numbers. The low number in group c is due to a low number of students who need designated accommodations on the state assessments. The need for designated accommodations is low due to the state assessment platforms including a wide range of accessibility tools and supports built-in for all students, including embedded calculator, highlighter, line reader, spell check, and text-to-speech.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,942	1,443	958
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,724	1,216	748
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	109	114	73
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	96	85	91

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs*	1,943	1,443	956
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	1,589	1,083	763
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	247	246	55
d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	96	85	91

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,929	1,942	95.52%	95.52%	99.33%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,415	1,443	92.13%	95.00%	98.06%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	912	958	93.28%	95.00%	95.20%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	Number of Children with IEPs	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	1,932	1,943	95.20%	95.20%	99.43%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	1,414	1,443	91.50%	95.00%	97.99%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	909	956	92.97%	95.00%	95.08%	Met target	No Slippage

**Regulatory Information**

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

To access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

- 1) Go to <https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>.
- 2) Scroll to the bottom of the screen. To explore State results, click on the “State” icon. To explore School or District results, click on the “Schools” or “Districts” icon, or type the school or district name in the “Find Your School” search box.
- 3) Click on “Student Performance”.
- 4) Scroll down to the “Performance by Student Population” section.
- 5) Click the green “View Details” button and select “Students With Disabilities.”
- 6) Below the “Interactive Analysis” title, click on “Table”.
- 7) The data can be filtered and explored by proficiency, participation, grade level, subject, regular or alternate assessment, and with or without accommodations. To view full results, scroll to the bottom of the table and drag the slide bar to the right.
- 8) To export data, go to the upper right corner of the Student Performance Table. Hover cursor over the three dots and select a document type.
- 9) To view data from previous years, go to the upper right corner of the screen. Click the red “Options” menu and select “Prior Year Report Cards.”

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To increase the participation rate of students with disabilities in the state-wide assessments, the SEA continues to train teachers on the appropriate use of accommodations on IEPs and in state assessments. Guidance and materials regarding accommodations are provided to test coordinators and administrators. The SEA provides in-person and virtual training to test coordinators and administrators on how to administer the state assessment. LEAs are encouraged to have students participate in interim tests throughout the school year to boost student familiarity/participation on the state assessment.

**3A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

With the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must revise its targets for FFY 2020 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2021 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2022 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2023 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; and FFY 2024 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS to align with ESEA requirements, solicit stakeholder input on the State’s targets, and report the revised targets.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

In this FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the SEA revised targets for FFY 2020, FFY 2021, FFY 2022, FFY 2023, and FFY 2024 for Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS, to align with ESEA requirements of at least 95.00% participation. The revised targets were reported and stakeholder input was solicited.

**3A - OSEP Response**

The State revised its targets for FFY 2020 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2021 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2022 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; FFY 2023 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS; and FFY 2024 Reading Grades 8 and HS, and Math Grades 8 and HS, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**3A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

### Data Source

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

### Measurement

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	18.51%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	10.53%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	15.95%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	20.58%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	6.71%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	3.48%

### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	18.51%	19.14%	19.76%	21.01%	23.51%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	10.53%	10.91%	11.28%	12.03%	13.53%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	15.95%	16.33%	16.70%	17.45%	18.95%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	20.58%	21.22%	21.86%	23.15%	25.58%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	6.71%	7.09%	7.46%	8.21%	9.71%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	3.48%	3.86%	4.23%	4.98%	6.48%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current targets should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3B will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholder discussion about proficiency and slippage in Grade 8 Math centered around two topics explained in the following two paragraphs: least restrictive environment (placement) and the assessment platform.

First, stakeholders discussed that proficiency might improve if more students are moved from resource room placement to general education placement. If students are not reaching proficiency in the resource room placement, then either resource room instruction needs to drastically change, or students should be put back into the regular education placement to ensure they have access to the full scope of instruction based on grade level math standards. Stakeholders expressed that instead of IEPs listing reasons why students should be pulled into the resource room placement, IEPs should

instead list ways/supports that can be put in place for students to be successful in the regular education placement. General education teachers need additional training in providing accommodations to help students with disabilities to be included in regular education placement.

Second, stakeholders discussed that interim assessments should be used year-round to familiarize students with all the digital tools and buttons on the digital platform, and that teachers should be using the platform tools as instructional tools throughout the school year. Stakeholders questioned if the movement to online assessment is actually assessing students' academic knowledge, or just assessing students' computer skills, therefore producing overall low proficiency scores.

Analysis of the disaggregated proficiency data of groups within each grade showed that the proficiency of group c (children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations) has low numbers. This correlates to the low participation number for group c due to the low need for designated accommodations on the state assessment.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,833	1,330	821
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	389	137	135
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	4	7

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment	1,836	1,329	818
b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	391	83	33
c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	3	1

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**



Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	398	1,833	18.51%	18.51%	21.71%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	141	1,330	10.53%	10.53%	10.60%	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	142	821	15.95%	15.95%	17.30%	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	395	1,836	20.58%	20.58%	21.51%	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	86	1,329	6.71%	6.71%	6.47%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	34	818	3.48%	3.48%	4.16%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

FFY 2021 data showed 0.24% slippage in Grade 8 Math, with a decrease from 6.71% proficiency rate in FFY 2020 to 6.47% proficiency rate in FFY 2021.

Two reasons for slippage in Grade 8 Math may be student placement (least restrictive environment) and the online assessment platform. First, students placed in the resource room may miss out on general education instruction and content. One way to address this is by providing additional training and support on the use of accommodations and collaboration with general education teachers to ensure students have access to the grade level content that is on the state assessments. Second, students' possible lack of familiarity with the online assessment platform may hinder their proficiency during the state assessment. To address this the SEA will promote the use of interim assessments to familiarize students with the digital tools and system functionality prior to the state assessment may increase overall proficiency.

## Regulatory Information

The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]

## Public Reporting Information

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

To access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

- 1) Go to <https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>.
- 2) Scroll to the bottom of the screen. To explore State results, click on the "State" icon. To explore School or District results, click on the "Schools" or "Districts" icon, or type the school or district name in the "Find Your School" search box.
- 3) Click on "Student Performance".
- 4) Scroll down to the "Performance by Student Population" section.
- 5) Click the green "View Details" button and select "Students With Disabilities."
- 6) Below the "Interactive Analysis" title, click on "Table".
- 7) The data can be filtered and explored by proficiency, participation, grade level, subject, regular or alternate assessment, and with or without accommodations. To view full results, scroll to the bottom of the table and drag the slide bar to the right.
- 8) To export data, go to the upper right corner of the Student Performance Table. Hover cursor over the three dots and select a document type.
- 9) To view data from previous years, go to the upper right corner of the screen. Click the red "Options" menu and select "Prior Year Report Cards."

### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To increase the proficiency rate of students with disabilities in the regular assessment, the SEA continues to train teachers on the importance of choosing the least restrictive environment/placement for students' IEPs, so students have access to the maximum amount of general education instruction as possible. The SEA provides in-person and virtual training in the spring to test coordinators and administrators on student accessibility features on the digital assessment platform. LEAs are encouraged to have students navigate the assessment platform and digital tools through interim tests throughout the school year. The SEA continues to provide SSIP supports and trainings directly to LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, including MTSS, RTI, and SPDG.

## **3B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **3B - OSEP Response**

## **3B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3C - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	38.00%
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	33.33%
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	56.32%
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	54.00%
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	39.18%
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	56.98%

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A >=	Grade 4	38.00%	38.63%	39.25%	40.50%	43.00%
Reading	B >=	Grade 8	33.33%	33.71%	34.08%	34.83%	36.33%
Reading	C >=	Grade HS	56.32%	56.70%	57.07%	57.82%	59.32%
Math	A >=	Grade 4	54.00%	54.63%	55.25%	56.50%	59.00%
Math	B >=	Grade 8	39.18%	39.56%	39.93%	40.68%	42.18%
Math	C >=	Grade HS	56.98%	57.36%	57.73%	58.48%	59.98%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current targets should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3C will be maintained for FFY 2021. The potential for a significant decrease in alternate assessment proficiency was noted in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, and FFY 2021 data showed a slippage in proficiency in multiple groups.

Stakeholders participated in discussions regarding the SEA analysis of reasons for proficiency slippage for multiple groups of students taking the alternate assessment. The three factors discussed with stakeholders were alternate assessment participation rate during COVID19, virtual learning during COVID19, and the SEA monitoring of the 1% cap. Stakeholders were in agreement with these reasons for slippage. Stakeholders expressed that student proficiency could be negatively affected when students with significant disabilities do not receive sufficient exposure and access to grade level content, and if students are not familiar with the online testing platform.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	96	85	91
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	28	27	36

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment	96	85	91
b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient	56	33	37

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	28	96	38.00%	38.00%	29.17%	Did not meet target	Slippage
B	Grade 8	27	85	33.33%	33.33%	31.76%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C	Grade HS	36	91	56.32%	56.32%	39.56%	Did not meet target	Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

Reasons for slippage for Group A in the Reading Assessment could be due to three factors explained in the following paragraphs: alternate assessment participation rate during COVID19, virtual learning during COVID19, and SEA monitoring of the 1% cap.

First, there was a large difference in the alternate assessment participation rate (total students participated in alternate assessment divided by total students eligible for alternate assessment) between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021. In FFY 2020, only 85% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment. This was likely due to students with the most severe needs not testing while homebound during COVID19, therefore causing an inflated baseline proficiency rate. In FFY 2021, 97.2% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment, therefore the proficiency rate decreased to a more accurate level. The SEA did not change targets but will continue to monitor if there is continued COVID19 impact.

Second, this subgroup of students with significant disabilities was more likely to have medical issues that caused their parents to choose virtual learning over in school learning during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Students with significant cognitive disabilities require repeated instruction/practice of skills, which likely was harder to effectively access during COVID19/virtual learning. This lack of face-to-face instruction may have contributed to a regression in academic skills and a decrease in proficiency rates for FFY 2021.

Third, a decrease in alternate assessment proficiency could result from the SEA's diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. LEAs have been more mindful of which students meet the criteria for the alternate assessment. When students consistently score proficient on the alternate assessment, LEAs re-consider the appropriateness of the alternate assessment for those students. Removing those higher scoring students from the alternate assessment brings down the overall alternate assessment proficiency rate.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable**

Reasons for slippage for Group B in the Reading Assessment could be due to three factors explained in the following paragraphs: alternate assessment participation rate during COVID19, virtual learning during COVID19, and SEA monitoring of the 1% cap.

First, there was a large difference in the alternate assessment participation rate (total students participated in alternate assessment divided by total students eligible for alternate assessment) between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021. In FFY 2020, only 85% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment. This was likely due to students with the most severe needs not testing while homebound during COVID19, therefore causing an inflated baseline proficiency rate. In FFY 2021, 97.2% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment, therefore the proficiency rate decreased to a more accurate level. The SEA did not change targets but will continue to monitor if there is continued COVID19 impact.

Second, this subgroup of students with significant disabilities was more likely to have medical issues that caused their parents to choose virtual learning over in school learning during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Students with significant cognitive disabilities require repeated instruction/practice of skills, which likely was harder to effectively access during COVID19/virtual learning. This lack of face-to-face instruction may have contributed to a regression in academic skills and a decrease in proficiency rates for FFY 2021.

Third, a decrease in alternate assessment proficiency could result from the SEA's diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. LEAs have been more mindful of which students meet the criteria for the alternate assessment. When students consistently score proficient on the alternate assessment, LEAs re-consider the appropriateness of the alternate assessment for those students. Removing those higher scoring students from the alternate assessment brings down the overall alternate assessment proficiency rate.

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

Reasons for slippage for Group C in the Reading Assessment could be due to three factors explained in the following paragraphs: alternate assessment participation rate during COVID19, virtual learning during COVID19, and SEA monitoring of the 1% cap.

First, there was a large difference in the alternate assessment participation rate (total students participated in alternate assessment divided by total students eligible for alternate assessment) between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021. In FFY 2020, only 85% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment. This was likely due to students with the most severe needs not testing while homebound during COVID19, therefore causing an inflated baseline proficiency rate. In FFY 2021, 97.2% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment, therefore the proficiency rate decreased to a more accurate level. The SEA did not change targets but will continue to monitor if there is continued COVID19 impact.

Second, this subgroup of students with significant disabilities was more likely to have medical issues that caused their parents to choose virtual learning over in school learning during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Students with significant cognitive disabilities require repeated instruction/practice of skills, which likely was harder to effectively access during COVID19/virtual learning. This lack of face-to-face instruction may have contributed to a regression in academic skills and a decrease in proficiency rates for FFY 2021.

Third, a decrease in alternate assessment proficiency could result from the SEA's diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. LEAs have been more mindful of which students meet the criteria for the alternate assessment. When students consistently score proficient on the alternate assessment, LEAs re-consider the appropriateness of the alternate assessment for those students. Removing those higher scoring students from the alternate assessment brings down the overall alternate assessment proficiency rate.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	56	96	54.00%	54.00%	58.33%	Met target	No Slippage

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards	Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B	Grade 8	33	85	39.18%	39.18%	38.82%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	37	91	56.98%	56.98%	40.66%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable**

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable**

Reasons for slippage for Group C in the Math Assessment could be due to three factors explained in the following paragraphs: alternate assessment participation rate during COVID19, virtual learning during COVID19, and SEA monitoring of the 1% cap.

First, there was a large difference in the alternate assessment participation rate (total students participated in alternate assessment divided by total students eligible for alternate assessment) between FFY 2020 and FFY 2021. In FFY 2020, only 85% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment. This was likely due to students with the most severe needs not testing while homebound during COVID19, therefore causing an inflated baseline proficiency rate. In FFY 2021, 97.2% of students eligible for alternate assessment participated in the alternate assessment, therefore the proficiency rate decreased to a more accurate level. The SEA did not change targets but will continue to monitor if there is continued COVID19 impact.

Second, this subgroup of students with significant disabilities was more likely to have medical issues that caused their parents to choose virtual learning over in school learning during FFY 2019 and FFY 2020. Students with significant cognitive disabilities require repeated instruction/practice of skills, which likely was harder to effectively access during COVID19/virtual learning. This lack of face-to-face instruction may have contributed to a regression in academic skills and a decrease in proficiency rates for FFY 2021.

Third, a decrease in alternate assessment proficiency could result from the SEA's diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. LEAs have been more mindful of which students meet the criteria for the alternate assessment. When students consistently score proficient on the alternate assessment, LEAs re-consider the appropriateness of the alternate assessment for those students. Removing those higher scoring students from the alternate assessment brings down the overall alternate assessment proficiency rate.

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

To access report information to fulfill requirements in CFR 300.160(f):

- 1) Go to <https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>.
- 2) Scroll to the bottom of the screen. To explore State results, click on the "State" icon. To explore School or District results, click on the "Schools" or "Districts" icon, or type the school or district name in the "Find Your School" search box.
- 3) Click on "Student Performance".
- 4) Scroll down to the "Performance by Student Population" section.
- 5) Click the green "View Details" button and select "Students With Disabilities."
- 6) Below the "Interactive Analysis" title, click on "Table".
- 7) The data can be filtered and explored by proficiency, participation, grade level, subject, regular or alternate assessment, and with or without accommodations. To view full results, scroll to the bottom of the table and drag the slide bar to the right.
- 8) To export data, go to the upper right corner of the Student Performance Table. Hover cursor over the three dots and select a document type.
- 9) To view data from previous years, go to the upper right corner of the screen. Click the red "Options" menu and select "Prior Year Report Cards."

District 1% Justifications for LEAs having over 1% participation in the Alternate Assessment are publicly available. To access directions on how to request the Justifications:

- 1) Go to <https://doe.sd.gov/assessment/alternate.aspx>.
- 2) Expand "1% Participation Justification."
- 3) Select "District 1% Participation Justification."

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To increase the proficiency rate of students with significant disabilities on the alternate assessment, the SEA provides educators with instructional resources for students with significant disabilities, found at <https://doe.sd.gov/assessment/alternate.aspx>. The SEA provides in-person and virtual training to test coordinators and administrators on how to administer the alternate assessment. The SEA continues providing SSIP supports and

trainings directly to LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, including MTSS, RTI, and SPDG. Training will be developed and provided on how to utilize the Core Content Connectors (alternate achievement standards) for students' IEP goals and instruction.

**3C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3C - OSEP Response**

**3C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

- A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.
- D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

#### Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

#### Instructions

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

### 3D - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data:

Subject	Group	Group Name	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
Reading	A	Grade 4	2020	29.79
Reading	B	Grade 8	2020	41.45
Reading	C	Grade HS	2020	49.97
Math	A	Grade 4	2020	26.51
Math	B	Grade 8	2020	32.88
Math	C	Grade HS	2020	35.80

#### Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Reading	A <=	Grade 4	29.79	29.54	29.29	28.79	27.79
Reading	B <=	Grade 8	41.45	41.14	40.83	40.20	38.95
Reading	C <=	Grade HS	49.97	49.66	49.35	48.72	47.47
Math	A <=	Grade 4	26.51	26.26	26.01	25.51	24.51
Math	B <=	Grade 8	32.88	32.57	32.26	31.63	30.38
Math	C <=	Grade HS	35.80	35.49	35.18	34.55	33.30

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current targets should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3D will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Despite FFY 2020 SPP concerns that the gap in proficiency might increase due to the increasing rigor of the statewide assessment and due to COVID19 impacts, all FFY 2021 gap targets were met.



Stakeholders discussed that if the proficiency rate for students with disabilities or students without disabilities increases or decreases while the other stays consistent, the gap in proficiency will see a significant impact.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,150	10,623	9,065
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,833	1,330	821
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	5,004	5,230	5,725
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	6	10
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	389	137	135
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	9	4	7

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

Group	Grade 4	Grade 8	Grade HS
a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	10,175	10,653	9,068
b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment	1,836	1,329	818
c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4,847	3,983	3,408
d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	4	1
e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	391	83	33
f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	4	3	1

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.71%	49.39%	29.79	29.79	27.68	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	10.60%	49.29%	41.45	41.45	38.69	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	17.30%	63.27%	49.97	49.97	45.97	Met target	No Slippage

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

Group	Group Name	Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Grade 4	21.51%	47.68%	26.51	26.51	26.16	Met target	No Slippage
B	Grade 8	6.47%	37.43%	32.88	32.88	30.96	Met target	No Slippage
C	Grade HS	4.16%	37.59%	35.80	35.80	33.44	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

To decrease the gap in proficiency between students with disabilities and students without disabilities on the regular assessment, the SEA will continue to provide RDA coaching to LEAs identified as needing support. The purpose of RDA is to establish a meaningful and continuous process focused on improving LEA special education programs, academic results, and functional outcomes for students with disabilities. The SEA continues providing SSIP supports and trainings directly to LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, including MTSS, RTI, and SPDG.

**3D - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3D - OSEP Response**

**3D - Required Actions**

## Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target <=	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%	0.00%	0.00%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target <=	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 4 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

148

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State

**State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology**

The SEA defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. This methodology has been utilized since the FFY 2005 State Performance Plan, at that time the cell size was set to 10 to align with the SEA minimum cell size of 10 which is utilized across all data reporting and calculations for ESSA, Special Education and other federal and state reporting requirements. Stakeholders have provided input on the methodology on many occasions, most recently with the submission of the new target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 package. The SEA selected to compare the rates of suspensions and expulsion among LEAs in the state for analyzing suspension data because the DOE does not collect data on suspensions of students without disabilities in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

The SEA compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. To complete this calculation and identify LEAs with significant discrepancy the SEA uses the following calculation:

1. Identify any district that meets the minimum cell size of 10. This reflects the numerator of the suspension rate, i.e., there must be at least 10 students with disabilities who have been suspended/expelled for more than 10 days for a rate to be considered for significant discrepancy.
2. Once the districts that meet the minimum cell size are determined, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to determine which districts exceed the threshold of 5.00%.

In the entire state of SD, only 98 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2021 (based on 2020-21 data). In 2020-21, SD had 149 districts; of these, 134 districts (89.93%) had a 0% suspension rate of SWD for greater than 10 days. Thus, a large majority of districts do not have students' suspensions of greater than 10 days. The breakdown of the remaining district rates of suspensions for SWD is as follows:

- 1 suspension greater than 10 days – 6 districts (4.03%)
- 2 suspensions greater than 10 days – 3 districts (2.01%)
- 3-5 suspensions greater than 10 days – 5 districts (3.36%)
- 6-9 suspensions greater than 10 days – 0
- 10 days or more – 1 (0.67%)

When calculating the LEAs for significant discrepancy, the SEA will use the following formula:  

$$((\# \text{ of SWDs suspended/expelled in the LEA } > 10 \text{ days}) / (\text{Total } \# \text{ of SWDs in the LEA } -)) * 100$$

Although the SEA utilizes a minimum cell size that excludes a majority of the districts, through internal and district accountability reviews, the SEA has determined that there is not a significant rate or systemic issue of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days as represented by the majority of districts, 89.93%, having no suspensions greater than 10 days. Due to the demographics and size of LEAs across SD and the number of SWD suspended in any given district is minimal, not finding any district with a significant discrepancy is reasonable and representative of the state population. The SEA annually provides technical assistance on utilizing positive behavioral interventions and supports along with de-escalation to support LEAs in reducing the overall suspensions of students.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.647(b)(1)(iv)(A) a minimum n of no greater than 10 is considered reasonable, this also aligns with the cell size the SEA consistently uses across other state and federal reporting requirements. The calculation methodology utilized aligns with Chapter 4, Exhibit 8 outlined in the IDEA Data Center Guide "Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide".

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

15 LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than ten days. Of the 15 LEAs, one met the minimum cell size of 10 students for removals, no LEAs suspended over 5% of their special education students for greater than 10 days and therefore no LEAs were required to have a review of policies, procedures, and practices.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4A - OSEP Response**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State reported, "The SEA defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator." OSEP is unable to determine whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table. Specifically, it is unclear how the State's chosen threshold of a 5% suspension and expulsion rate bar relates to the State-level, State mean or some other measure of the distribution of suspension and expulsion rates among LEAs in the State. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

**4A - Required Actions**

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2021. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2022 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

## Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

- A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and
- B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

#### Data Source

State discipline data, including State's analysis of State's Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

#### Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or
- The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2016	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

148

Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	1	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

#### State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The SEA defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. This methodology has been utilized since the FFY 2005 State Performance Plan, at that time the cell size was set to 10 to align with the SEA minimum cell size of 10 which is utilized across all data reporting and calculations for ESSA, Special Education and other federal and state reporting requirements. Stakeholders have provided input on the methodology on many occasions, most recently with the submission of the new target setting for the FFY 2020-2025 package. The SEA selected to compare the rates of suspensions and expulsion among LEAs in the state for analyzing suspension data because the DOE does not collect data on suspensions of students without disabilities in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

The SEA compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State. To complete this calculation and identify LEAs with significant discrepancy, the SEA uses the following calculation:

1. Identify any district that meets the minimum cell size of 10. This reflects the numerator of the suspension rate, i.e., there must be at least 10 students with disabilities who have been suspended/expelled for more than 10 days for a rate to be considered for significant discrepancy.
2. Once the districts that meet the minimum cell size are determined, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to determine which districts exceed the threshold of 5.00%.
3. The SEA follows this same process for each and every racial/ethnic group. Every district has a suspension rate calculated for each of the seven race/ethnicity categories. Some districts do not have any students with disabilities suspended or expelled of a given race/ethnicity, but South Dakota calculates it for every racial/ethnic category that is present at a given district. The suspension/expulsion-rate bar that South Dakota uses for each racial/ethnic group is the same suspension/expulsion-rate bar that was used for 4A (i.e., the 5.00%); in other words, South Dakota applies the same suspension/expulsion-rate bar to each and every racial/ethnic group. A district has significant discrepancy when its suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any racial/ethnic group is 5.00% or higher and met the cell size.

In the entire state of South Dakota, only 98 students with disabilities were suspended or expelled for greater than ten days in FFY 2021 (based on 2020-21 data). In 2020-21, SD had 149 districts. Of these, 134 districts (90%) had a 0% suspension rate of SWD for greater than days; 14 districts (9%) suspended between 1-5 SWD for a given racial/ethnic group; and 1 district (67%) suspended 10 or more SWD.

Although the SEA utilizes a minimum cell size that excludes a majority of the districts, through internal and district accountability reviews, the SEA has determined that there is not a significant rate or systemic issue of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days as represented by the majority of districts, 89.93%, having no suspensions greater than 10 days. Due to the demographics and size of LEAs across South Dakota and the number of

SWD suspended in any given district is minimal, not finding any district with significant discrepancy is reasonable and representative of the state population. The SEA annually provides technical assistance on utilizing positive behavioral interventions and supports along with de-escalation to support LEAs in reducing the overall suspensions of students.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In accordance with 34 CFR 300.647(b)(1)(iv)(A) a minimum n of no greater than 10 is considered reasonable, this also aligns with the cell size the SEA consistently uses across other state and federal reporting requirements. The calculation methodology utilized aligns with Chapter 5, Exhibit 10 outlined in the IDEA Data Center Guide "Measuring Significant Discrepancy: An Indicator B4 Technical Assistance Guide".

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

For the one LEA that was identified as having a significant discrepancy, the SEA reviewed the LEAs policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA. The SEA also interviewed LEA staff and selected files from different school levels to determine if implementation of the policies, procedures and practices related to improve behavior and reducing suspension/expulsion were being implemented by the district. The SEA also requires the LEAs to review, and as necessary, revise their policies, procedures, and practices if noncompliance was identified, however noncompliance was not identified as a result of the review.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**4B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4B - OSEP Response**

The State reported, "The SEA defines significant discrepancy as more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator." Specifically, it is unclear how the State's chosen threshold of a 5% suspension and expulsion rate bar relates to the State-level, State mean or some other measure of the distribution of suspension and expulsion rates among LEAs in the State. Therefore, OSEP is unable to determine whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required in 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

**4B- Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must provide data for this indicator for FFY 2022 using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.



## Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

- A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;
- B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and
- C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6. Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.00%	75.96%
A	75.96%	Data	70.40%	71.01%	72.08%	73.91%	75.96%
B	2020	Target <=	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	5.57%
B	5.57%	Data	5.40%	5.46%	5.57%	5.38%	5.57%
C	2020	Target <=	3.49%	3.39%	3.29%	3.29%	1.67%
C	1.67%	Data	2.07%	1.94%	1.99%	1.99%	1.67%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	75.96%	76.68%	77.18%	77.68%	78.68%
Target B <=	5.57%	5.57%	5.57%	5.50%	5.50%
Target C <=	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	1.67%	1.65%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 5 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholders discussed the goal is for all students to be educated in regular education classroom to the maximum extent possible. In order to achieve the goal, stakeholders provided suggested strategies: Develop IEP examples to include IEP documentation focused on why the student will be in the general education setting instead of focusing on why the student is removed and the IEP team utilizing data and interventions to support students in classroom. The SEA will develop in-service training for both general education and special education staff that focuses on differentiated instruction, effective teaching methods for all students, accommodations and supports, and de-escalation techniques.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	20,454
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,446
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,151
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools	119
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities	126
SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/06/2022	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	36

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	15,446	20,454	75.96%	75.96%	75.52%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,151	20,454	5.57%	5.57%	5.63%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	281	20,454	1.67%	1.67%	1.37%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**



## Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

- A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
- B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.
- C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%). Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

### Historical Data – 6A, 6B

Part	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	Target >=	21.45%	21.55%	21.65%	21.65%	21.76%
A	Data	24.02%	24.24%	23.33%	23.79%	21.76%
B	Target <=	16.26%	16.16%	16.16%	16.16%	18.15%
B	Data	13.72%	14.45%	14.85%	13.62%	18.15%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined the target for Indicator 6 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholders discussed how preschools are funded locally by the LEAs, therefore, not all LEAs have a public preschool available to 3, 4, and 5-year-old students. Stakeholders suggested the SEA provide training to LEAs on how to utilize the settings available within the LEA boundaries to help minimize the number of students receiving services outside the general education classroom. The SEA can also provide training to LEAs on the importance of collaboration between general education teachers and special education teachers/service providers to incorporate students' supports and accommodations within the preschool setting to academically and developmentally benefit the students on IEPs. Collaboration between all IEP team members would help regular education preschool teachers embed the goals in the daily routines of the classrooms lessening the need for services to be provided in other locations.

### Targets

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	2020	21.76%
B	2020	18.15%
C	2020	1.27%

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	22.00%	22.75%	23.50%	24.25%	25.00%
Target B <=	17.93%	17.60%	17.17%	16.74%	16.00%

Inclusive Targets – 6C

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target C <=	1.27%	1.26%	1.24%	1.22%	1.20%

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

07/06/2022

Description	3	4	5	3 through 5 - Total
Total number of children with IEPs	518	924	409	1,851
a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	118	186	91	395
b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	114	158	68	340
b2. Number of children attending separate school	4	10	1	15
b3. Number of children attending residential facility	1	0	0	1
c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home	6	7	3	16

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	395	1,851	21.76%	22.00%	21.34%	Did not meet target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	356	1,851	18.15%	17.93%	19.23%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C. Home	16	1,851	1.27%	1.27%	0.86%	Met target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group B aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility did not meet the target and had slippage. If 24 fewer students had been served in 6B, the target would have been met. In FFY 2020, 362 students were served in 6B, so there are fewer students in 6B in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020; however, the 356 students being served in FFY 2021 is a larger percentage (19.23%) of the total number of students (1,851) served in FFY 2021 than compared to FFY 2020 (n=1,884).

In determining the reason a higher percentage of students were served in 6B in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020, the SEA disaggregated the data by disability. In FFY 2021 there were 30 students with multiple disabilities reported in 6B compared to 15 students with multiple disabilities served in 6B in FFY 2020. These additional 15 students with multiple disabilities, who required a more restrictive environment, explains a large portion of the increase in the 6B rate. Of these 15 additional students, 11 were new to Part B 619 services in FFY 2021 and four had previously been served in the home.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

#### Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A1	2018	Target >=	79.15%	79.25%	79.35%	79.35%	67.11%
A1	67.11%	Data	71.65%	70.00%	67.11%	67.74%	70.02%

A2	2018	Target >=	84.15%	84.25%	84.35%	84.35%	71.79%
A2	71.79%	Data	81.95%	80.64%	71.79%	73.43%	72.37%
B1	2018	Target >=	67.50%	68.50%	69.50%	69.50%	56.71%
B1	56.71%	Data	67.97%	62.41%	56.71%	57.74%	56.10%
B2	2018	Target >=	55.96%	56.96%	57.96%	57.96%	51.89%
B2	51.89%	Data	59.39%	56.87%	51.89%	47.74%	50.17%
C1	2018	Target >=	70.10%	71.10%	71.60%	71.60%	58.35%
C1	58.35%	Data	68.97%	61.49%	58.35%	60.06%	60.78%
C2	2018	Target >=	72.10%	72.60%	73.60%	73.60%	66.13%
C2	66.13%	Data	72.80%	71.14%	66.13%	66.72%	63.58%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1 >=	67.11%	67.35%	67.58%	68.06%	69.00%
Target A2 >=	71.79%	72.07%	72.34%	72.90%	74.00%
Target B1 >=	56.71%	57.12%	57.53%	58.36%	60.00%
Target B2 >=	51.89%	52.15%	52.42%	52.95%	54.00%
Target C1 >=	58.35%	58.81%	59.26%	60.17%	62.00%
Target C2 >=	66.13%	66.36%	66.60%	67.07%	68.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 7 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholders hypothesized about changing when students receive the exit BDI assessment. Reasons included:

Students are assessed with the BDI when they exit the Part B (619) program early or prior to turning 6. Stakeholders discussed if exiting prior to kindergarten would better measure the student's progress instead of measuring the kindergarten program. With the early childhood special education programs experiencing a teacher shortage, exiting prior to kindergarten will create additional burdens on the staff to exit all students within a two-month window prior to dismissing school for the summer break. Students who entered the program later and received 6 months of services may not show as many gains as they would if they were in the Part B (619) program longer or until age 6.

Professional development strategies that could improve preschool outcomes:

Questions arose around entry and exit Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-2 and BDI-3) assessments given with fidelity and how can fidelity be measured. The SEA advised stakeholders that targeted training is being provided throughout the year and on monthly special education webinars.

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

#### Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

1,005

#### Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	165	16.42%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	122	12.14%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	200	19.90%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	518	51.54%



Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	322	487	70.02%	67.11%	66.12%	Did not meet target	Slippage
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	718	1,005	72.37%	71.79%	71.44%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	3	0.30%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	315	31.34%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	212	21.09%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	211	21.00%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	264	26.27%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	423	741	56.10%	56.71%	57.09%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	475	1,005	50.17%	51.89%	47.26%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	4	0.40%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	222	22.09%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	117	11.64%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	176	17.51%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Children
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	486	48.36%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i>	293	519	60.78%	58.35%	56.45%	Did not meet target	Slippage
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i>	662	1,005	63.58%	66.13%	65.87%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
<b>A1</b>	<p>Slippage in A1 can be attributed to severity of disability, increase of students with higher needs, COVID19 impacting education, and students excluded from the data set due to noncomparable assessments. If nine more students had been reported in categories c-d the target would have been met and slippage would not have occurred.</p> <p>There were 9 students with multiple disabilities exiting the Part B (619) program in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020. These students exited in category b. The increase of students with multiple disabilities may contribute to the slippage because the students may not have made enough gains to be functioning within age expectation when they turned 6 or exited the program due to the severity of the disabilities. There were approximately 50 more students reported with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) when exiting the Part B (619) program in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020.</p> <p>COVID19 impact: Students who had entered the Part B (619) program the year schools were closed due to the COVID19, have shown the least gains. Slippage due to COVID19 may have occurred for the following reasons:</p> <p>When FFY 2021 BDI-2 and BDI-3 data was pulled in August 2022, for FFY 2021 child outcomes, most of those students exiting the Part B (619) program had been impacted by COVID19 for two years.</p> <p>LEAs reported parents' reluctance to send their student to school if someone in the family was sick or there were reported cases of COVID19 in the school, causing an interruption in the growth trajectory.</p> <p>Exclusion of students due to noncomparable data: A small number of students were administered the BDI-3 at exit when the BDI-2 had been used for entry. Due to the difference in norming between the two versions, the SEA excluded 9 students from the data sets.</p>
<b>B2</b>	<p>Slippage in B-2 can be attributed to severity of disability, increase of students with higher needs, COVID19 impacting education, and students excluded from the data set due to noncomparable assessments. This category showed the greatest amount of slippage. If 47 more students had been reported in category d or category e the target would have been met and slippage would not have occurred.</p> <p>There were three students identified in category a (did not improve functioning) who have severe disabilities that require substantial supports. There were 9 more students with multiple disabilities exiting the Part B (619) program in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020. These students exited in category b. The increase of students with multiple disabilities may contribute to the slippage because the students may not have made enough gains to be functioning within age expectation when they turned 6 or exited program due to the severity of the disabilities.</p> <p>COVID19 impact: Students who had entered the Part B (619) program the year schools were closed due to COVID19, have shown the least gains. Slippage due to COVID19 may have occurred for the following reasons:</p> <p>When FFY 2021 BDI-2 and BDI-3 data was pulled in August 2022, for FFY 2021 child outcomes, most of those students exiting the Part B (619) program had been impacted by COVID19 for two years.</p> <p>Exclusion of students due to noncomparable data: A small number of students were administered the BDI-3 at exit when the BDI-2 had been used for entry. Due to the difference in norming between the two versions, the SEA excluded 9 students from the data sets.</p>
<b>C1</b>	<p>Slippage can be contributed to severity of disability, increase of students with higher needs, COVID19 impacting education, and students excluded from the data set due to noncomparable assessments. If 10 more students had been reported in category c or d the target</p>

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
	<p>would have been met and slippage would not have occurred.</p> <p>There were four students identified in category a (did not improve functioning) who have severe disabilities that require substantial supports). There were 9 more students with multiple disabilities exiting the Part B (619) program in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020. These students exited in category b. The increase of students with multiple disabilities may contribute to the slippage because the students may not have made enough gains to substantially increase their rate of growth when they turned 6 years of age or exited the program due to the severity of their disabilities. As stated above, there were approximately 50 more students reported with ASD when exiting the Part B (619) program in FFY 2021 than FFY 2020. The increase in students with ASD from FFY 2020 to FFY 2021 and the supports required for these students may contribute to the slippage.</p> <p>COVID19 impact: Students who had entered the Part B (619) program the year schools were closed due to COVID19, have shown the least gains. Slippage due to COVID19 may have occurred for the following reasons:</p> <p>When FFY 2021 BDI-2 and BDI-3 data was pulled in August 2022, for FFY 2021 child outcomes, most of those students exiting the Part B (619) program had been impacted by COVID19 for two years.</p> <p>LEAs reported parents' reluctance to send their student to school if someone in the family was sick or there were reported cases of COVID19 in the school, causing an interruption in the growth trajectory.</p> <p>Exclusion of students due to noncomparable data: A small number of students were administered the BDI-3 at exit when the BDI-2 had been used for entry. Due to the difference in norming between the two versions, the SEA excluded 9 students from the data sets.</p>

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."**

The SEA defined "comparable to same-aged peers" as any student who received a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on the BDI-2 or BDI-3 scoring chart. This corresponds to the 10th percentile rank on the BDI-2 and BDI-3 for a given outcome area.

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

The BDI-2 and the BDI-3 is used to gather data for this indicator. When a student exits the Part C program and transitions to the Part B (619) program, the student is assessed in the areas of cognitive, motor, communication, social-emotional, and adaptive development. If the student was assessed with the BDI-2 when entering the Part B (619) program, the student was assessed with the BDI-2 when exiting the Part B (619) program or prior to turning 6 years of age. Starting July 1, 2021, the BDI-3 has been used for all new students entering the Part B (619) program. The exit data for Part C becomes the baseline data for students who become eligible for Part B (619) at the time of transition. To establish a baseline, students who enter the Part B (619) system at or after age three, will be re-assessed using the BDI-2 or BDI-3, depending upon the assessment tool used upon entry, in the areas of the development listed previously. Upon exiting the Part B (619) program (student exits early or prior to turning 6), a student is assessed in the same five areas of development using the BDI-2 or BDI-3. The baseline entry scores will be compared to the exit scores in the five assessed areas of development to determine progress in the three indicator outcome areas.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

As stated above, the BDI-3 has been implemented since July 1, 2021, for all new assessments. There were 67 students reported in FFY 2021 who entered the Part B (619) program with entry scores from the BDI-3 and have exited the Part B (619) program with BDI-3 exit scores.

There were 9 students within 8 different LEAs who entered the Part B (619) program with entry scores from the BDI-2 and exit scores from the BDI-3. The BDI-2 entry scores should not be compared to the BDI-3 exit scores for childhood outcomes because the assessments were normed differently. The data for these students could not be included in the FFY 2021 data.

Another contributing factor toward slippage is the publisher's noted differences between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 assessment tools regarding the demographic characteristics of the standardization samples as well as the test blueprint, test content, and items scoring criteria. The BDI-2 and BDI-3 standardization sample are composed of different examinees, tested approximately 15 years apart. The BDI-3 standardization sample reflects recent US census estimates, 2020 US population projections and the continued shift of populations toward other racial and ethnic groups. The BDI-3 includes a greater balance of items oriented toward younger students and expansion of domains to reflect current literature. Revisions to the BDI-3 add greater objectivity and precisions to the assessment tool.

The SEA expects FFY 2022 Indicator 7 data to represent an equal number of students with entry and exit BDI-2 scores compared to entry and exit BDI-3 scores.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

## 7 - Required Actions

## Indicator 8: Parent involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of parents from whom response is requested is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** include in the State's analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

### 8 - Indicator Data

Question	Yes / No
Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?	NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 8 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholders discussed that FFY 2021 data showed that more attention needs to be given to transition conversations during IEP meetings. It was also discussed that providing an opportunity for parents to complete the surveys privately in-person improves the response rate. For LEAs with response rates less than 10%, stakeholders suggested that LEAs should use their enrollment numbers to calculate the number of surveys to complete for a 10% or higher response rate.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2012	77.30%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%	81.00%
Data	84.74%	88.41%	87.77%	87.74%	86.20%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
-----	------	------	------	------	------

Target >=	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	83.00%	85.00%
--------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
4,961	5,684	86.20%	81.00%	87.28%	Met target	No Slippage

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

The SD Parent Survey was designed for all parents of students with disabilities ages 3-21. Parents of preschool children and parents of school age children were given the exact same parent survey instruction letter and parent survey questions. The survey was distributed to both groups via the same procedures, including distribution by LEAs in-person, via mail, QR code, an online link, and in a variety of languages. The data analysis methodology was the same for both groups. Therefore, the combined data from school age and preschool surveys is valid and reliable.

When comparing the response rate of the two groups, parents of preschool children had a 29% response rate, whereas parents of school age children had an average response rate of 24.46% (grade K-12 average). The lower response rate for parents of school age children is due to a decreased response rate of 21% for grades 9 and 12. When comparing the parent involvement score of the two groups, 92% of parents of preschool children met the parent involvement score, whereas 86.38% (grade K-12 average) of parents of school age children met the parent involvement score. The lower parent involvement score for parents of school age children is due to a decreased parent involvement score of 81% for grades 8 and 10.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

22,305

**Percentage of respondent parents**

25.48%

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	25.53%	25.48%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The FFY 2021 response rate is 25.48%, only 0.05% lower than the 25.53% response rate in FFY 2020. The survey was available online at all times and information was communicated by LEAs to families via text, e-mail, phone calls, and in-person.

The SEA has implemented various strategies to increase the response rate for each LEA. CAPs are established with LEAs that have a response rate below 10% or a parent involvement score below the state target. SDPC educates parents and promotes surveys to parents that may be dissatisfied and less responsive to ensure that all parents are aware of their opportunity to respond to the survey. Additionally, the SEA advised LEAs via a webinar that LEAs with large populations of American Indian or Hispanic groups must ensure that these groups are being surveyed at the same rate as other race/ethnic groups.

The SEA will provide virtual trainings to LEAs on how to increase response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented. Given that parents of White students were slightly over-represented in responses, the SEA will send targeted training invitations to those districts that have a relatively high proportion of Native American and Hispanic students.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias.

First is analyzing the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. The SEA's response rate is 25.48%, which is fairly high for a survey of this nature.

Second, the representativeness of the responses can be examined. Although some differences were found in the respondent composition by disability and race/ethnicities, the actual responses of these different groups of parents showed no or small differences in the overall parent involvement percentage. Further, parents from a wide variety of LEAs from across the state responded to the survey.

Third, a comparison can be made with the responses of parents who responded early in the process to those who responded later in the process. The idea being that perhaps those who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond immediately. These results showed no statistically significant differences between parents who responded earlier and parents who responded later. Therefore, it was concluded that nonresponse bias was not present.

The SEA identifies LEAs with a response rate below 10% and requires them to review the district policy on survey dissemination and to identify strategies to improve response rate. The SEA also provides training to promote responses from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

Stakeholders recommended that along with analyzing race/ethnicity, the SEA should include disability category. The SEA and stakeholders compared the representation by race/ethnicity and disability category in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over- or under-representation.

Using this methodology, differences were found by race/ethnicity and disability. The students with disabilities population consists of 67% of Whites; the respondents consist of 75% of Whites. All other racial/ethnic groups were within +/- 3% of their population. There was one difference found by disability. The students with disabilities population consists of 21% of parents of students with speech/language impairments; but the respondents consist of 25% of parents of students with speech/language impairments.

Although the White race/ethnicity group was over-represented in response rate, there were not significant differences in the parent involvement rates between parents of White students and parents of student with other race/ethnicities. Parents of students with speech/language impairments were over-represented and their parent involvement rates tended to be somewhat higher than parents of students with other disabilities; however, most of these differences were small. Further, parents self-report their child’s primary disability, and thus, small differences in the composition could be partially due to parent self-report. It is important to note that every LEA is surveyed every year, which is the most effective way to get an overall parent involvement percent that is representative of the state as a whole in any given year. Although parents from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey and reflect the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution, there are still some differences in response rate by race/ethnicity and disability which suggest the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the demographics of the children receiving special education services.

**The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics**

The SEA will provide a statewide training to LEAs on how to use their district data to identify if any race/ethnicity or disability categories were underrepresented, as well as how to increase response rates to ensure representativeness of all demographics. The SEA will also complete a targeted data review of districts with high populations of Native American and Hispanic students. If these districts’ response rates are not representative of the race/ethnicity in their district, the district will be required to complete a targeted training on how to ensure representativeness of race/ethnicity and submit a plan for improved survey dissemination.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/-3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group was used.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO
If yes, provide a copy of the survey.	

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

### 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

#### Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the SEA reported that the FFY 2021 data is from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Additionally, the SEA analyzed and reported in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

### 8 - OSEP Response

#### 8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.





## Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

112

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	37	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

The SEA collects data for Indicator 9 through the December 1 child count (Edfacts files FS 002) and Fall Enrollment (Edfacts file FS052) collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the state are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is applied to LEAs with 20 or more students in the cell size for each racial/ethnic group (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. The SEA uses one year of data in the calculation.

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). If a racial/ethnic group is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification. For Indicator 9, all 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 37 met the minimum n requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated— one for each racial/ethnic group). Please note that many LEAs have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent the SEA from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

When an LEA meets the methodology for disproportionate representation, the SEA conducts a review regarding policy, procedure, and practices along with a compliance review. A representative sample of files that includes the identified race/ethnic category along with files from the comparison group are reviewed. SEA also conducts interviews to determine appropriate implementation of identification and eligibility procedures. If the LEA followed policy and procedures for the eligibility of the disability category and across the race/ethnic group, then the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification procedures. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed or implemented, then the LEA would receive a CAP in the area identified through the review.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In FFY 2020 the SEA posed to stakeholder groups the option to align Indicator 9 methodology with the SEA's significant disproportionality methodology. Based on favorable feedback, the SEA presented to stakeholders groups the potential alignment of the methodology for FFY 2021.

On June 15, 2022, the SDAPCD was provided a short history of Indicator 9 and 10 and significant disproportionality. There was discussion on the current Indicator 9 and 10 methodology verses the significant disproportionality methodology. It was proposed to change Indicator 9 and 10 methodology to align with the significant disproportionality methodology except only using 2 years of data in order to provide LEAs early notification of approaching the significant disproportionality methodology threshold. Advisory panel members brought up several considerations regarding how the change will impact capacity for the SEA to support the additional LEAs identified and if the change would have the desired effect.

Similar information was presented on the August 2022 monthly special education webinar requesting input from approximately 60 LEA representatives on the possible methodology change. The SEA used input on the Indicator 9 and 10 change and continued to analyze data to determine if the change was feasible and would provide the desired effect. After further examination, the number of LEAs identified would impact the state's capacity to provide support and the new methodology for Indicator 9 and 10 did not always align to significant disproportionality being identified in LEAs. Thus, a change in calculation would not always provide the positive impact of providing LEAs with advanced warning of approaching significant disproportionality. Following consideration of the data and stakeholder input, it was determined that no changes to methodology would be made.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

#### Data Source

State's analysis, based on State's Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State's definition of "disproportionate representation." Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

#### Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2020	0.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

131

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	18	0.00%	0%	0.00%	Met target	No Slippage

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The SEA collects data for Indicator 10 through the December 1 child count (FS 002) and Fall Enrollment (Membership File FS 052) collected on the last Friday in September. A Weighted Risk Ratio based on the identification rate for each racial/ethnic group at each LEA is calculated; thus, all data for all racial/ethnic groups in the state are examined. A Weighted Risk Ratio is determined only if there are 20 or more students in the cell size of interest (based on child count data) and if there are also 20 or more students in the comparison group. The SEA uses one year of data in the calculation. Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). Once a ratio is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification.

For Indicator 10, all of the 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 18 met the minimum N requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated— one for each racial/ethnic group times the six primary disability categories). Please note that many LEAs in SD have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity; when this is disaggregated further by type of primary disability, the numbers get extremely small. Thus, very small numbers prevent SEA from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

When an LEA meets the methodology for disproportionate representation, the SEA conducts a review regarding policy, procedure, and practices along with compliance review. A representative sample of files that includes the identified race/ethnic category along with files from the comparison group are reviewed. The SEA also conducts interviews to determine appropriate implementation of identification and eligibility procedures. If the LEA followed policy and procedures for the eligibility of the disability category and across the race/ethnic group, then the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification procedures. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed or implemented, then the LEA would receive a CAP in the area identified through the review.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In FFY 2020 the SEA posed to stakeholder groups the option to align Indicator 10 methodology with the SEA's significant disproportionality methodology. Based on favorable feedback, the SEA presented to stakeholder groups the potential alignment of the methodology for FFY 2021.

On June 15, 2022, the SDAPCD was provided a short history of Indicator 9 and 10 and significant disproportionality. There was discussion on the current Indicator 9 and 10 methodology versus the significant disproportionality methodology. It was proposed to change Indicator 9 and 10 methodology to align with the significant disproportionality methodology except only using 2 years of data in order to provide LEAs early notification of approaching the significant disproportionality methodology threshold. Advisory panel members brought up several considerations regarding how the change will impact capacity for the SEA to support the additional LEAs identified and if the change would have the desired effect.

Similar information was presented on the August 2022 monthly special education webinar requesting input from approximately 60 LEA representatives on the possible methodology change. The SEA used input on the Indicator 9 and 10 change and continued to analyze data to determine if the change was feasible and would provide the desired effect. After further examination, the number of LEAs identified would impact the state's capacity to provide support and the new methodology for Indicator 9 and 10 did not always align to significant disproportionality being identified in LEAs. Thus, a change in calculation would not always provide the positive impact of providing LEAs with advanced warning of approaching significant disproportionality. Following consideration of the data and stakeholder input, it was determined that no changes to methodology would be made.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 11: Child Find

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State's timeline for initial evaluations.

#### Measurement

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child's previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	99.86%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.69%	99.89%	99.94%	99.85%	99.67%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
5,593	5,588	99.67%	100%	99.91%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

5

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

The SEA did not meet 100% compliance, however, 99.91% demonstrates a high rate of compliance and does not indicate a systemic issue. Five evaluations were not completed within SEA's established 25-school day timeline. Considering teacher shortages and LEAs evaluating 80 more students in FFY 2021 compared to FFY 2020 (5,413 students), 5 evaluations not completed within the 25-school day timeline indicates an overall initiative of the LEAs to ensure Child Find is being completed in a timely manner.

Five of the 149 LEAs (total of 5 students) did not meet the 100% target. The reason for failure to meet the 25-school day timeline was due to procedural errors. All five LEAs identified in FFY 2021 were in 100% compliance in FFY 2020.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

1 evaluation exceeded by 9 days

1 evaluation exceeded by 8 days

1 evaluation exceeded by 5 days

1 evaluation exceeded by 2 days

1 evaluation exceeded by 1 day

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State's timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

The SEA has defined the initial evaluation timeline as 25-school days from the date signed permission is received by the LEA, unless alternative timelines are mutually agreed to by the school administration and the parents in accordance with Administrative Rules of South Dakota (ARSD) 24:05:25:03-Preplacement evaluation.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

LEAs are required to utilize a state database to record and annually report initial evaluations conducted in the LEA. LEAs may utilize a state developed spreadsheet located at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> to record initial evaluations of students throughout the school year and upload to the state database. All LEAs are required to enter or upload student data directly into the state database and sign-off by August 1 of the reporting year.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Starting in FFY 2022, the SEA will be utilizing a new database to collect Indicator 11 data. The SEA contracted with an outside entity to build the system for Indicator 11 compliance monitoring. The system will automatically count the school days based on the school calendar entered by the LEA, the date consent was received and the date of the last evaluation, thereby alleviating the potential for counting errors.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
18	18	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

When an LEA misses an evaluation timeline, they are unable to correct the timeline for the student specific file. The SEA verified that all 18 student files (14 LEAs) whose evaluations were not completed within the 25-school day timeline have been evaluated and eligibility determined by requiring the LEA to submit the students' Parental Prior Written Notices (PPWNs) and evaluation reports.

LEAs are required to provide training to staff on policies and procedures, including how to document Indicator 11 and how to calculate the 25-school day timeline. The SEA also verified each LEA cited for noncompliance completed training on the 25-school day timeline by having the LEA submit to the SEA a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training. Each LEA



is also expected to submit a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year. The SEA verified all 14 LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data submitted through the electronic system for FFY 2021(Prong 2).

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

The SEA verifies that each LEA provides training to staff on policies and procedures by submitting a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training, which includes how to document Indicator 11 and how to calculate the 25-school day timeline.

One LEA had been placed on a CAP in FFY 2019 and placed on a second year CAP in FFY 2020. This LEA was required to review and, if applicable, update and revise LEA policies and procedures; submit quarterly Indicator 11 reports; a desk audit was completed for students out of compliance; and a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year FFY 2021, was submitted. Child-specific incidences of noncompliance cannot be corrected for Indicator 11 evaluation timeline (prong 1); therefore, training was required. The SEA verified the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of corrective action plan requirements listed previously (prong 2) for FFY 2020.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2019	1	1	0

**FFY 2019**

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

The LEA that did not achieve 100% compliance in FFY 2019 and FFY 2020 was issued a second year CAP for FFY 2020 that included a review of their policies and procedures, training for all special education staff on the LEA policies and procedures including how to correctly implement the 25-school day timeline, a desk audit to verify noncompliance and evaluations were completed, submit quarterly Indicator 11 reports (Prong 1) and a compliant FFY 2021 report (Prong 2). The LEA completed the second year CAP requirements by submitting a copy of the policies and procedures, a sign in sheet of all special education staff attending the training on the policies and procedures, and how to correctly implement the 25-school day timeline. The LEA submitted a compliant FFY 2021 report via the state database.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

As stated above, LEAs who do not meet the evaluation timeline are unable to correct the timeline for individual files for Indicator 11 but must complete training on policies and procedures. The SEA verified the one student file from one LEA whose evaluation was not completed within the 25-school day timeline in FFY 2020 had been evaluated and eligibility determined by requiring the LEA to submit to the SEA the student's PPWNs and evaluation report. In addition to providing training on policies and procedures related to timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly Indicator 11 reports, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2021 report (Prong 2). The SEA verified the LEA completed the requirements for the FFY 2020 CAP through documents submitted to the SEA. The LEA submitted a compliant FFY 2021 report via the state database.

**11 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019.

When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 : (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The one LEA with continued non-compliance received and completed a CAP and is in compliance in FFY 2021 as outlined above.

**11 - OSEP Response**

**11 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.



## Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.
- b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.
- c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.
- d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.
- e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.
- f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

### Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	100.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.77%	97.72%	96.65%	NVR	99.23%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	665
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	166

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	487
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	1
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

Measure	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	487	498	99.23%	100%	97.79%	Did not meet target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

FFY 2020 data was 99.23% of early childhood transition evaluations being completed by the student's 3rd birthday. The increase (8 more students) in the number of transitions occurring on or after the third birthday in FFY 2021 compared to FFY 2020 which caused slippage. LEAs started the evaluation process less than 40 days prior to the student's 3rd birthday; if the LEAs had started the evaluation process when the referral from Part C was received (usually 90 calendar days prior to the 3rd birthday) there would have been enough time prior to the 3rd birthday to allow for unforeseen circumstances.

In FFY 2020 there were 605 transition evaluations completed compared to 665 transition evaluations completed in FFY 2021. The increase of 60 student transition evaluations may have placed a greater burden on LEA staff members to complete the evaluations prior to the student's 3rd birthday.

COVID19 illnesses played a role in LEAs missing the timeline and slippage occurring. When a student or parent are ill due to COVID19, valuable evaluation days are missed due to scheduling complications.

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

11

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

The SEA did not meet 100% compliance, however, 97.79% of students referred to Part C prior to age three who are found eligible for Part B and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their 3rd birthday demonstrates a high rate of compliance and does not indicate a systemic issue. There was a total of 11 incidences occurred in seven LEAs. Substantial training efforts have been made to inform LEAs of the policies and procedures necessary to meet the eligibility determination timeline for students turning age three. All seven LEAs were in 100% compliance during FFY 2020.

Seven of the 149 LEAs (total of 11 students) did not meet the 100% target. The reason for failure to meet the student's third birthday timeline was due to procedural errors.

Range of days beyond timeline:

- 1 evaluation exceeded by 48 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 34 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 11 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 3 days
- 7 evaluations exceeded by 1 day

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Part C Service Coordinators submit Part C exit data to DOE Part C office. All exit code data are entered into the Part C data system by the Part C Data Manager. LEAs are required to submit transition data into the secured website annually by September 1st. The Part B 619 Coordinator then analyzes the data submitted, verifies all students are accounted for per Part C records, addresses any data quality issues, verifies noncompliance issues, and provides LEAs with technical assistance on correct procedures. LEAs that do not meet the required timeline are contacted and justification is required for students not having an IEP in place by their third birthday to verify noncompliance.

The SEA also verifies the data collected from Part C during accountability reviews. The team reviews sample of early childhood files and monitors students referred from Part C to Part B that were determined eligible and to verify the student had an IEP in place by their third birthday.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Starting in FFY 2022, the SEA will be utilizing a new state database to collect Indicator 12 data. The SEA contracted with an outside entity to build the system for Indicator 12 compliance monitoring. The system will automatically count the school days based on the school calendar entered by the LEA, the date consent was received and the date of the last evaluation, thereby alleviating the potential for counting errors.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

When an LEA misses a transition timeline, they are unable to correct the student specific file but are required to complete training on policies and procedures. The SEA verified each student did receive an evaluation and eligibility was determined by requiring the LEAs to submit the referral form, Parental Prior Written Notice (PPWN) and eligibility documents for each student in which the LEA was issued a CAP.

LEAs are required to provide training to staff on policies and procedures, including how to document Indicator 12 and how to ensure the LEA meets the early childhood transition timeline. The SEA also verified each LEA cited for noncompliance completed training on early childhood transition timelines by requiring the LEA to submit to the SEA a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training. Each LEA is also expected to submit a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year. The SEA verified the three LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data submitted through the state database for FFY 2021(Prong 2).

In addition to verifying the student specific noncompliance through desk-audits and training (Prong 1), the SEA verified each LEA completed the steps outlined in the CAP through electronic submission of the FFY 2021 data via the state database (Prong 2). The SEA determined the three LEAs out of compliance in FFY 2020 were in compliance in FFY 2021.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

As stated above, LEAs who do not meet the transition timeline are unable to correct individual student files for Indicator 12 but did provide documentation that each individual student had eligibility determined, and an IEP written for eligible students by requiring LEAs to submit to the SEA the referral form, PPWN and eligibility documents for each student in which the LEA was issued a CAP.

The SEA verifies that each district provides training to staff on policies and procedures by submitting a training agenda, sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training explaining the early childhood transition timelines required of Indicator 12.

In addition to verifying the student specific noncompliance through desk-audits and training (Prong 1), the SEA verified each LEA completed the steps outlined in the CAP through electronic submission of the FFY 2021 data via the state database (Prong 2).

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**12 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The three LEAs out of compliance in FFY 2020 received and completed corrective action findings of and are in compliance in FFY 2021 as outlined above.

**12 - OSEP Response**

**12 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

#### Instructions

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2009	100.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	90.29%	93.71%	83.97%	87.18%	66.41%

### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
181	228	66.41%	100%	79.39%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

Indicator 13 data is collected during accountability reviews. LEAs must have all disability categories represented and two files per case manager available for the reviewers collecting Indicator 13 data. When an issue of noncompliance is identified in a file, the LEA is required, through a CAP, to correct the individual file issue within 60 days of the date of the report and submit an additional file within one year showing continued correction and compliance from each teacher. The correction is verified upon submission of the documentation either through a transition report, the process of documentation of consent to invite an outside agency, an updated transition IEP, a meeting notice or a student invite, or a parental prior written notice.

Each LEA receives an onsite review once every 5 years.

Question	Yes / No
Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
43	43	0	0

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

In FFY 2020, the SEA identified 43 individual files of noncompliance in 16 LEAs. Sixteen LEAs received a CAP. The CAP requires each LEA to correct the individual files of noncompliance or in cases where the noncompliance cannot be corrected in that file, the LEA is required to undergo training and update policies and procedures around the area of noncompliance identified. The SEA verified that all students received the services as indicated in the IEP, and policies and procedures were updated. The LEAs submitted additional files to verify continued correction and correct implementation of regulatory requirements. The SEA verified that all 16 LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

All 16 LEAs corrected and submitted individual student file corrections with 100% compliance for the 43 findings of noncompliance. The LEAs were also required to submit an additional file within one year showing continued correction and compliance from each teacher to verify maintaining 100% compliance.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**13 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

All 16 LEAs received and completed corrective action for the 43 findings of noncompliance as outlined in previous answers.

**13 - OSEP Response**

**13 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.



## Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

#### I. Definitions

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

#### II. Data Reporting

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;
2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);
3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);
4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also

happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

### III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

**Measure A:** For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

**Measure B:** All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

**Measure C:** All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
A	2020	Target >=	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	11.04%
A	11.04%	Data	20.53%	27.35%	16.93%	22.96%	11.04%
B	2020	Target >=	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%	68.50%	61.96%
B	61.96%	Data	76.00%	65.81%	70.61%	66.35%	61.96%
C	2020	Target >=	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%	82.00%	77.30%
C	77.30%	Data	82.67%	78.63%	82.11%	80.82%	77.30%

### FFY 2020 Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	11.50%	12.50%	14.00%	15.50%	17.00%
Target B >=	63.00%	64.50%	66.00%	67.50%	69.50%
Target C >=	78.00%	79.00%	80.00%	81.00%	82.50%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2021 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 14 will be maintained for FFY 2021.

Stakeholders suggested strategies to improve engagement and response rate which included: work with the Office of Career and Technical Education to promote CTE courses through venues such as Transition Round Up webinars; share National Technical Assistance Center on Transition’s (NTACT’s) predictors of success when presenting on high school transition at different conferences; continue to edit the survey to make it user/student friendly; and explore ways to use technology to collect survey information beyond the online survey such as QR code linking, and texting students about the survey.

### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census	781
Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	291
Response Rate	37.26%
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	38
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	180
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	8
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	13

Measure	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	38	291	11.04%	11.50%	13.06%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	218	291	61.96%	63.00%	74.91%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	239	291	77.30%	78.00%	82.13%	Met target	No Slippage

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

FFY	2020	2021
Response Rate	23.69%	37.26%

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The SEA sent post cards with information about Indicator 14 surveys to LEA special educators across the state; postcards will be shared with exiters and families at their final IEP meeting, these will then be mailed to the students prior to being surveyed. The SEA utilized National Post-School Outcomes Center (NPSO) strategies for contacting hard-to-find youth, such as sending pre-notification (postcards) and creating familiarity with the survey. Updated training information will be provided to all callers that includes strategies for calling (e.g., call at three different times over the course of three days, call close to holidays when family members may have been in contact with exiters, etc...). With there being an underrepresentation in certain regions of the state, LEAs in those regions will be asked to contact their students. Potential LEA callers will be contacted in March so that calls can be made in late April while teachers are still on payroll (as opposed to asking teachers to call during the summer). LEAs will be instructed to make additional attempts to contact students in the disability category of specific learning disability.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias.

First, is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. The SEA's response rate is 37.26%, which is an increase of 13.57% from last year's response rate of 23.69%. Lower response rates in certain categories such as specific learning disabilities may contribute to nonresponse bias.

Second, is the representativeness of the responses. There are some differences in respondent composition by disability and the regions of the state and the responses to engagement after high school. These differences are discussed in the next section. Students with specific learning disabilities (20%) and emotional disability (19%) have a higher percentage in post-secondary education; and emotional disability (72%), and intellectual (cognitive) disability (64%) have higher percentages in competitive employment.

Third, is the collection method. Almost all of the responses were from calls and very few were from the online survey. Most of the survey calls were made by LEA staff who volunteer to call LEA leavers. Not all LEAs volunteer to call their students which contributes to lower response rates in certain regions of the state.

The SEA promotes responses from a broad cross-section of youth by continuing to encourage LEAs to call leavers. This will be followed up by personal invitations for those in the underrepresented areas to call their students. Postcard reminders will continue to be used to remind leavers of the upcoming survey. The SEA will contact LEAs in August with hard-to-find leavers and enlist the LEA's help.

**Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

The SEA used the NPSO Response Rate Calculator to calculate response representativeness in the following areas: 1) Disability, 2) Ethnicity, 3) Gender and 4) Exit Status to determine if the respondent group of students was similar to the total population of leavers for 2020-2021 school year. The SEA took a closer look at disability category and geographic location by regions in the state as requested by stakeholders. Stakeholder input was to use the disability categories and to break them out more discreetly than the NPSO calculator due to change/increases in demographics in some of the categories such as autism and other health impaired. Stakeholders also suggested to analyze different regions of the state because of the different diversities in some of the regions.

According to representativeness data, there were 781 leavers with 291 respondents. For disability categories, the specific learning disability category is most highly represented with 356 leavers (45.6% leaver representation) but with a response rate with 116 respondents (39.86% response rate) showing an underrepresentation of -5.72%. Other health impaired (147 leavers, 59 respondents; 18.2% leaver representation, 20.27% response rate) and cognitive (intellectual) disability (101 leavers, 42 respondents; 12.93% leaver representation, 14.43% response rate) were the next highest represented categories as leavers, and emotional disability (64 leavers, 32 respondents; 11% response rate), and autism spectrum disorder (72 leavers, 25 respondents; 9.22% leaver representation; 8.59% response rate) rounded out the responses.

In race/ethnicity the white (Caucasian) group was the most highly represented with 534 leavers and 195 responders, followed by Native Americans with 118 leavers and 45 responders, with Hispanic/Latino (43 leavers, 13 responders), Black or African American (41 leavers, 20 responders), low incident race/ethnicity groups of Asian, native Hawaiian/other pacific Islander and unknown (17 leavers, 6 responders) and 2 or more races (28 leavers, 12 responders) round out the representativeness. All race/ethnicity categories were within +/- 3% discrepancy range.

The SEA analyzed data around the seven geographic regions of the state. Three regions showed an under-representation: Northeast (99 leavers, 12.68%; 0 responders, 0%), South Central (54 leavers, 6.91%; 0 responders, 0%), and Northwest (46 leavers, 5.89%; 0 responders, 0%). Two regions showed an over-representation: Southeast (260 leavers, 33.29%; 124 responders, 42.61%) and Southwest (171 leavers, 21.9%; 104 responders, 35.74%). Two regions showed representativeness: North Central (115 leavers, 14.72%; 41 responders, 14.09%) and Central (36 leavers, 4.61%; 17 responders, 5.84%). The two largest LEAs are in the southeast and the southwest regions of the state which corresponds with the NPSO calculator for rural and urban. The two urban LEAs were identified by the United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service ([www.ers.usda.gov](http://www.ers.usda.gov)) as the largest populated areas in SD. This year's data indicates that 29% of leavers were in the urban LEAs and 71% of leavers were in the rural areas (response rate 54.64%). Three regions showed underrepresentation: Northeast (-12.68%), South Central (-6.91%), and Northwest (-4.71%). So, while the NPSO calculator indicates an overrepresented number of rural students surveyed, it's important to note that the majority of the population falls under the definition of rural.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

NO

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

The SEA identified strategies that will be used to increase response rate, particularly in the areas for specific learning disabilities, and the geographic regions of northeast, south central and northwest: contacting LEAs with low response rate in the geographic regions of the state listed above and developing a plan to increase response rate; working with LEAs on ways to get leavers to respond to the survey, such as providing a draft copy of the survey so leavers understand what will be asked; working with the LEAs to ensure most current email and phone numbers for sending the online survey link are provided at the time the student leaves school, and providing a way to call if the online survey is not used; asking LEAS with a high response rate for strategies that have been effective, especially in the southeast regions, north central region, central region and the southwest region; reaching out to LEAs with low response rates to discuss strategies and develop a plan to raise their response rates; and instructing LEAS to make additional attempts to contact students in the disability category of specific learning disability.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

+/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to the target group was used.

<b>Sampling Question</b>	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was sampling used?	NO
<b>Survey Question</b>	<b>Yes / No</b>
Was a survey used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised survey?	NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The SEA level reports can be found at <https://www.sdposthighsurvey.org/reports.statewide.php>

**14 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

In FFY 2020 there was an over representation of the learning disability category and in FFY 2021 there is an under representation. This may be due to the increase in responses this year which is at 37.26% up from 23.69% last year.

The SEA will continue to use strategies to increase the response rate including enlisting the help of LEAs in areas of over or under representation, using postcards to remind youth about the upcoming survey, and creating a sample version of the survey to share with LEAs and youth to create familiarity with the survey. The SEA will work with LEAs in regions of the state with under representation to develop a plan for reaching the hard-to-reach youth in their area. LEAs will be instructed to make additional attempts to contact students in the disability category of specific learning disability.

**14 - OSEP Response**

**14 - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

### 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	3
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/02/2022	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	1

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 15 data was reported to the SDAPCD on September 29, 2022 and January 5th, 2023. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified as noncompliance in both state complaints and due process hearings as well as the current improvement strategies used. The stakeholder group suggested improving resources and guidance that is provided to parents regarding their parental rights for children with disabilities, including but not limited to dispute resolution.

#### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	100.00%	0.00%	0.00%	100.00%

#### Targets

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=					

#### FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
1	3	100.00%		33.33%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The SEA had less than 10 resolutions for FFY 2021, therefore no baselines or targets have been set. The number of requests received was average for SD.

**15 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**15 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

**15 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 16: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1 times 100.

#### Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1 Mediations held	10
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/02/2022	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	6

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 16 data was reported to the SDAPCD on September 29, 2022 and January 5th, 2023. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified as noncompliance in both state complaints and due process hearings as well as current improvement strategies used. The stakeholder group suggested improving resources and guidance that is provided to parents regarding their parental rights for children with disabilities, including but not limited to dispute resolution. The SEA had an increase in mediation requests during the FFY 2021 reporting period, due to this increase stakeholders also discussed setting baselines and targets. The SEA proposed setting FFY 2021 as the baseline year with a target of 90% and the end target to be 91% due to the small number of mediations held. The data and recommendations for baseline and targets were also presented to stakeholders through the monthly special education webinar. Stakeholders agreed that the recommended baseline and targets were reasonable given the FFY 2021 year was not a typical year. Historically when parents decide to file a state complaint, they have exhausted options to come to an agreeable solution. In FFY 2021 there were more requests for mediation in conjunction with the filing of the state complaint, which may be an indication of families filing a complaint with an initial concern instead of waiting or trying other conflict resolution or dispute options.

### Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2021	90.00%

FFY	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Target >=					
Data	100.00%	62.50%	100.00%	100.00%	33.33%

### Targets



FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	90.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%	91.00%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
3	6	10	33.33%	90.00%	90.00%	N/A	N/A

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The SEA's historical trend for mediation requests is typically under 10. During the FFY 2021 reporting year, the SEA received a higher number of requests for mediation through the state complaint process. Although this increased the number of mediation agreements, parties were able to resolve state complaint issues in a more timely and effective manner.

**16 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**16 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State provided targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**16 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

#### Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

#### Instructions

**Baseline Data:** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets:** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

#### Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

##### **Phase I: Analysis:**

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

**Phase II: Plan** (which, in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation** (which, in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

#### Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

##### **Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

##### A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

##### B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023; for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

### C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

#### Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

### Section A: Data Analysis

#### What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

All students with disabilities and a subset of students with disabilities (i.e., specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment) will increase their 3rd-5th grade reading proficiency rates by 5 percentage points from spring 2021 to spring 2026 as measured by the regular statewide assessment.

#### Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR.

An analysis of state test data over time, child count data over time, the evaluation results from the previous SSIP, the SPDG, and the MTSS projects were examined. There are many similarities across the three projects and the evaluation activities completed by participants within each of the three projects indicated the implementers were having an impact on more than just students with a specific learning disability. All students with disabilities were being impacted and benefitted from the projects. Thus, the State decided to systematically examine the impact of the projects on all students with disabilities. Stakeholders believed it was important to continue the focus on students with a specific learning disability, but to also add students with a speech-language impairment and students with other health impairment given that these two groups of students (along with specific learning disability), make up a large percentage of students with disabilities in grades 3-5.

#### Please list the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR.

State test data, child count, evaluation measures from the SSIP, SPDG, and MTSS projects.

#### Provide a description of how the State analyzed data to reach the decision to change the SiMR.

The SEA examined data from the last SiMR which focused on grade 3 specific learning disability students and decided that a wider net needed to be cast. Thus, through discussion with stakeholders, it was determined to focus on all students with disabilities in grades 3-5 with a specific focus on students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment.

#### Please describe the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR.

Indicator 17 SSIP baselines and targets were reviewed and determined during the SPDG advisory committee on September 22, 2021. During the meeting, stakeholders reviewed data from all programs that provide literacy support to pilot LEAs, including the SPDG, SSIP, and MTSS. The data included disaggregation by initiative, grade, and disability category. Based on the data reviewed for specific learning disability and all disability categories, stakeholders recommended revising and expanding the SiMR for FFY 2021 to include students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities as these students would all greatly benefit from the evidence-based practices implemented. The rationale to wait to revise the SiMR until FFY 2021 instead of revising for FFY 2020 was to ensure the SEA and LEAs had time to get in place the recommendations for training, progress monitoring, evaluation, and interventions to add the additional students and disability categories. Additionally, stakeholders expressed concern about adding additional requirements to LEAs and students when they were already facing significant disruptions to learning and attendance due to COVID19.

Since stakeholders recommended adding the two additional disability categories in FFY 2021, the group determined the FFY 2020 target should align to the trajectory for the additional subgroups. The FFY 2020 target was lowered from 44.49% to 17.49%. The FFY 2021 to FFY 2025 would continue trajectory based on the FFY 2020 data reflected with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities.

#### Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

#### Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

41 schools from 27 districts that participated in the SPDG and/or the state MTSS initiative.

Indicator 17 SSIP baselines and targets were reviewed and determined during the SPDG advisory committee on September 22, 2021. During the meeting, stakeholders reviewed data from all programs that provide literacy support to pilot LEAs, including the SPDG, SSIP, and MTSS. The data included disaggregation by initiative, grade, and disability category. Based on the data reviewed for specific learning disability and all disability categories, stakeholders recommended revising and expanding the SiMR for FFY 2021 to include students with specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities as these students would all greatly benefit from the evidence-based practices implemented. The rationale to wait to revise the SiMR until FFY 2021 instead of revising for FFY 2020 was to ensure the SEA and LEAs had adequate time to implement the recommendations for training, progress monitoring, evaluation, and interventions to add the additional students and disability categories. Additionally, stakeholders expressed concern about adding additional requirements to LEAs and students when they were already facing significant disruptions to learning and attendance due to COVID19.

Since stakeholders recommended adding the two additional disability categories in FFY 2021, the group determined the FFY 2020 target should align to the trajectory for the additional subgroups. The FFY 2020 target was lowered from 44.49% to 17.49%. The FFY 2021 to FFY 2025 would continue trajectory based on the FFY 2020 data including specific learning disabilities, other health impairments, and speech and language disabilities.

#### Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

**Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.**

The names of the standards of action changed (Data Analysis to MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making, Instructional Practices & Strategies to Literacy/Instruction, and Family & Community Involvement to Family Engagement). The standard of action for Collaboration was replaced with Coaching. Details are outlined in the new theory of action for the new Coaching standard of action.

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

<https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/SDTheoryA.docx>

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).**

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

YES

**Historical Data**

Part	Baseline Year	Baseline Data
A	FFY2020	18.31%
B	FFY2020	18.12%

**Targets**

FFY	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A >=	18.31%	18.94%	19.56%	20.81%	23.31%
Target B >=	18.12%	18.75%	19.37%	20.62%	23.12%

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

Part	Number of students in grades 3-5 who scored proficient on regular state reading test. Part A = All students with disabilities. Part B = Students with specific learning disability, speech-language impairment, or other health impairment	Number of students in grades 3-5 who participated in the state reading test. Part A = All students with disabilities. Part B = Students with specific learning disability, speech-language impairment, or other health impairment	FFY 2020 Data	FFY 2021 Target	FFY 2021 Data	Status	Slippage
A	138	703		18.31%	19.63%	N/A	N/A
B	111	545		18.12%	20.37%	N/A	N/A

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

Data for this indicator is collected through the SD English Language Arts regular statewide assessment for grades 3-5.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.**

SSIP stakeholders proposed that the SSIP focus on four groups of students with disabilities: (1) all students with disabilities, (2) students with specific learning disabilities, (3) students with other health impairments, and (4) students with speech language impairments. The last three groups each have different needs, and as such, the stakeholders thought it important to focus on these three groups separately. Since the template doesn't allow for four targets, the SEA has combined the last three groups into one group. The SEA will continue to track these three groups individually (as well as one group).

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

Benchmark data from 2021-22 for participating LEAs shows the percentage of all students with disabilities and the subset of students with disabilities a (i.e., specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment) scoring at benchmark from fall 2021 to fall 2022 increased at each grade (K-5).

The percentage of all students with disabilities scoring at benchmark in fall 2021 and spring 2022:

Grades K-5: increased (33.9% to 40.5%)  
Kindergarten: increased (50.0% to 53.2%)  
Grade 1: increased (34.4% to 41.9%)  
Grade 2: increased (32.0% to 35.9%)  
Grade 3: increased (34.6% to 40.3%)  
Grade 4: increased (27.3% to 41.0%)  
Grade 5: increased (30.9% to 35.6%)

The percentage of students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment scoring at benchmark in fall 2021 and spring 2022:

Grades K-5: increased (33.4% to 41.0%)  
Kindergarten: increased (52.0% to 56.6%)  
Grade 1: increased (36.4% to 44.2%)  
Grade 2: increased (31.7% to 35.1%)  
Grade 3: increased (36.1% to 41.2%)  
Grade 4: increased (26.0% to 42.9%)  
Grade 5: increased (28.5% to 34.8%)

The evaluation measures included in the combined evaluation plan allow the SEA to assess outcomes achieved in each infrastructure improvement strategy. The current evaluation plan can be viewed at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/22-23-EvalPlan.pdf>

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

## **Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.**

<https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/22-23-EvalPlan.pdf>

**Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

There were two minor changes from the 2021-22 evaluation plan to the 2022-23 evaluation plan. The Team Problem-Solving Checklist for Individual Students was removed, and the Family Engagement measures were updated.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The Team Problem-Solving Checklist for Individual Students was removed because participants did not find it valuable. The Family Engagement Survey and Family Friendly Walk-Through Checklist were part of the SPDG project but are not going to be used in the current school year. For 2022-23, there are Family Literacy Training Evaluations for the Read to Succeed trainings.

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

The four infrastructure improvement strategies are: 1) MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making, 2) Literacy/Instruction, 3) Coaching, and 4) Family Engagement. Each of the standards of action have improvement strategies within them. The SEA continues to implement activities within each of these standards of action.

### **MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making**

General education and special education teachers in participating LEAs continue to take part in schoolwide data analysis training and grade level student data reviews using the MTSS Data Workbook. Data analysis training provides LEAs with a process and tools to review student benchmark data to determine instructional effectiveness and student need. Grade level student data reviews provide teams with a process and tools for reviewing ongoing progress monitoring data to adjust intervention supports. LEAs use meeting fidelity checklists to ensure building leadership team meetings and grade level meetings are timely, effective, and on-topic. When teams demonstrate high meeting fidelity over time, less support is provided by state coordinators. LEAs continue to use data to drive instructional planning for core classroom and intervention groups.

### **Literacy/Instruction**

LEAs continue to receive training in foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. Foundational literacy training provides a basic understanding of literacy skills (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) along with modeling and practice of evidence-based instructional strategies. Participants leave the training with a copy of the Teaching Reading Sourcebook, visual aides, and the knowledge and skills needed to provide effective instruction in their respective classrooms. LEAs who are new to the initiative receive onsite training by a trained coordinator or coach. The SEA continues to partner with other DOE divisions to provide annual regional training in foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook when LEAs have new staff join their district. Regional training is open to all LEAs.

### **Coaching**

Participating LEAs continue to receive coaching support from their respective LEA coaches. Coaches conduct fall walkthroughs to collect data and develop a coaching plan to provide differentiated coaching cycles to teachers. Coaching cycles include a pre-conference, lesson observation or modeling, and debrief. Coaches continue to receive ongoing training and support through monthly meetings and quarterly training. The meetings and training provide continuous support on collecting coaching data, implementing coaching cycles, and working through challenging conversations and situations.

### **Family Engagement**

Through the state MTSS Initiative, the SEA continues to provide regional training and support to all LEAs in the implementation of family literacy

modules. Modules 1 and 2 focus on phonological awareness and phonics skills. Modules 3 and 4 focus on reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Modules 1 and 3 can be offered face-to-face or completed online using the guided Nearpod training housed on the Read to Succeed website (<http://bit.ly/ReadtoSucceedSD>). Modules 2 and 4 are self-paced online activities completed by participants in the Read to Succeed website. These modules provide a basic understanding of foundational literacy skills and activities that families can do at home to build literacy skills. The SEA continues to provide weekly family literacy tips to LEAs that can be included in newsletters, websites, and social media.

Ongoing infrastructure analysis and improvement efforts continue to focus on alignment across common initiatives, including MTSS, SPDG, and SSIP. Intentional planning meetings continue to be held with leadership and key stakeholders from SSIP, MTSS and SPDG to discuss ongoing alignment efforts.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

#### MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

LEAs participated in 13 trainings on data-driven decision-making strategies. 81 participants (including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators) responded to training evaluations. 98% of survey respondents indicated that the trainings were useful, 93% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 90% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

These short-term outcomes are related to the both the data and professional development area of a systems framework. LEAs who participate in data-driven decision-making have a clear understanding of the importance of collecting and analyzing high-quality data. Providing professional development in the area of MTSS and data-driven decision-making supports student-level, grade level, and systems-level change at the LEA level and are necessary for sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

#### Literacy/Instruction

Instructional coaches and state trainers provided 40 literacy or instruction trainings to participating LEAs. 254 participants (including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators) responded to training evaluations. 97% of survey respondents indicated that the trainings were useful, 96% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 89% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

These short-term outcomes are related to the professional development area of a systems framework. Providing professional development in the area of literacy and instruction supports system change by improving instructional skills for teachers, which leads to a positive impact on student outcomes. Professional development in the areas of literacy and instruction are necessary for both achievement of the SiMR and sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

#### Coaching

121 staff members from participating LEAs completed a coaching survey. 92% of survey respondents stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with support received by the coach. Coaches at participating LEAs completed 1,476 coaching activities during the 2021-22 school year. The topics of the coaching activities include student data, intervention, and assessment.

These short-term outcomes are related to the technical assistance area of a systems framework. Instructional coaching provides hands-on, direct support to teachers and supports system change by impacting both the skill level of the teachers and the instructional outcome of the students. Instructional coaching is necessary for both achievement of the SiMR and sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

#### Family Engagement

During the 2021-22 school year, the SEA shared access to a Read to Succeed Online Family Literacy training to families of both participating and non-participating LEAs. The asynchronous training modules were accessed by unique participants across the state. As of June 30, 2022, there were 481 unique clicks on the website and 33 unique video views. 963 family members and 374 educators completed a Family Engagement Survey. 79% of family members and 87% of educators reported that they are engaged in the school. 103 team members (family members, community members, school administrators, and school staff) completed a Family Friendly Walk-Through Checklist. Team members awarded the school 85% of the possible points. Thus, the schools had an 85% "Family Friendliness" rating.

These short-term outcomes are related to the professional development area of a systems framework. Family literacy training and resources support system change by impacting the level of understanding and ability to support children in key areas of foundational literacy. Provide asynchronous options online for families to access the training and support increases access to families across the state and is necessary for scale-up.

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.**

The SEA implemented the following new infrastructure improvement strategies in the areas identified below:

#### MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

The SEA reviewed the training and resources offered in the area of data-driven decision making and identified areas of continued need for LEAs. The review showed that additional assessment tools are used by LEAs that are not reflected in the current MTSS Data Workbook. Feedback from districts also indicated a need for additional training in data collection and progress monitoring for students with the highest needs. The SEA will update the MTSS Data Workbook to include additional assessment tools and will seek training opportunities that focus on data-driven decision-making for students in Tier 3.

#### Literacy/Instruction

The SEA continues to partner with divisions across DOE to provide a variety of evidence-based foundational literacy training for all LEAs. DOE continues work on the state literacy plan. DOE is currently contracting with several entities for technical assistance in planning, developing, and implementing the plan. Workgroups are currently working to develop the written plan with an anticipated roll out scheduled for spring 2023. Training will begin in the summer or fall of 2023.

#### Coaching

Feedback from LEAs indicates an increasing desire for ongoing coaching supports. In the district applications for the most recent cohort of LEAs, 60% of applicants indicated an interest in receiving coaching support and 40% already had district-employed coaches. In response, The SEA increased the number of LEAs receiving coaching support in the most recent cohort.

#### Family Engagement

The SEA continues to work across divisions to provide access to family literacy resources. The SEA continues providing Train the Trainer events to equip more LEAs in the family literacy training. Train the Trainer participants leave with copies of all presentation materials, trainer notes, and ample practice in delivering the training content.

#### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

The SEA anticipates implementing the following infrastructure improvement strategies in the following areas.

#### MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

The SEA is developing a data website that will allow LEAs to enter data and review reports included in the evaluation plan. The detailed plan can be found at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/22-23-EvalPlan.pdf>. This will provide LEAs with more frequent opportunities to review data and implementation progress. The SEA will update the MTSS Data Workbook to include additional assessment tools and will seek training opportunities that focus on data-driven decision-making for students in Tier 3.

#### Literacy/Instruction

DOE is in the planning stages of developing a state literacy plan. This plan will provide access to literacy training to all LEAs in the areas of early childhood through high school. DOE is contracting with several agencies to assist in the development of the plan and related training. The state literacy plan will be available spring 2023 and accompanying training will be available beginning in summer 2023. Data collected on effectiveness of the training and support provided through SSIP, SPDG, and MTSS continue to guide the strategies and evaluation plans for the state literacy plan.

#### Coaching

Providing coaching in a virtual platform will reduce the need for extensive rural travel and minimize weather delays. The SEA will continue to explore options for providing virtual coaching to LEAs. The SEA will work with other DOE divisions to identify virtual coaching platforms and equipment that best fit the needs of supported LEAs.

#### Family Engagement

Feedback from districts and survey results indicated that families were not using the online modules as frequently as they were accessing the face-to-face training. The SEA plans to update the Read to Succeed family literacy training from four modules provided both online and face-to-face to two face-to-face modules. This will allow for the online support previously provided in modules 2 and 4 to be incorporated into the face-to-face modules. Module 1 will focus on phonological awareness and phonics skills, and Module 2 will focus on reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. The SEA will continue to monitor evaluation results and district feedback for continued revisions of the training as needed.

#### **List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

Foundational Literacy Training  
LETRS Training Cohorts  
Facilitated Coaching Supports

#### **Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

##### Foundational Literacy Training

The SEA continues to provide onsite training in foundational literacy to supported LEAs. The SEA continues to partner with other divisions in DOE to offer summer Foundational Literacy training to all LEAs. Both the onsite and summer trainings provide a basic understanding of foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. This training is ideal for new teachers, as well as experienced teachers who would like to strengthen their understanding and refine teaching practices. Providing continued training in foundational literacy will strengthen the knowledge and skills of teachers and build a common understanding across LEAs. With improved knowledge and skills, teachers can provide effective instruction which will improve outcomes for all students, including students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment.

##### LETRS Training Cohorts

During the 2020-2021 school year, the SEA began to offer a two-year LETRS training to an initial cohort of literacy coaches and instructional leaders from participating LEAs. This cohort completed units 1 through 4 during the 2020-2021 school year and completed units 5 through 8 during the 2021-2022 school year. A second cohort began training on units 1 through 4 during the 2021-2022 school year and will complete units 5 through 8 during the 2022-2023 school year. The LETRS training provides participants with an in-depth understanding of foundational literacy skills. Participants who complete the training gain experience with evidence-based instructional practices that allow them to identify and support struggling readers, including those with dyslexia.

##### Facilitated Coaching Support

The SEA continues to facilitate coaching support in participating LEAs. The SEA offers annual coach training using the Jackson Coaching model to all LEAs. Instructional coaches and LEA leadership attend this training to develop strong coaching supports in their buildings. When teachers are provided ongoing coaching supports, they are receiving job-embedded professional development and opportunities for ongoing feedback and refinement of instructional strategies. This will lead to improved instruction and improved outcomes for all students, including students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment.

#### **Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

##### Foundational Literacy Training

Participants in the Foundational Literacy Training receive training in foundational literacy skills. Improved understanding of foundational literacy and skills in providing effective instruction will lead to improved teacher knowledge and instruction. The students receiving this high-quality instruction will demonstrate improved outcomes.

##### LETRS training cohorts

Participants in the LETRS training cohort receive advanced training in foundational literacy skills. Highly skilled educators will provide high-quality instruction and support to students. The students receiving this high-quality instruction will demonstrate improved outcomes.

#### Facilitated Coaching Support

Teachers who receive coaching support are receiving job-embedded professional development. This level of support will lead to improved instructional strategies and improved student outcomes.

#### **Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI): 84% of schools indicated that they are implementing the Tier 1 skills with fidelity (fidelity score of 70% or higher), 82% for Tier 2, and 61% for Tier 3. A trained facilitator leads the school team through a structured process to complete the R-TFI and collect the data. The data is reviewed annually by school teams during summer training and each fall with a group of stakeholders.

Classroom Observation Checklist: 71% of teacher participants observed are implementing the literacy strategy skills with fidelity and 50% are implementing explicit instruction skills with fidelity. Instructional coaches observe in a percentage of classrooms at each LEA. Instructional coaches meet in the spring to review all observation data collected and identify common areas of need across LEAs.

Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Training: 95% of the trainings observed had 80% or more of the essential elements included in the training. This data is collected through a combination of self-assessment and external observations. Trainers review the results annually to identify any common strengths or areas of need.

#### **Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

The SEA collects data on each of the infrastructure areas through the combined evaluation plan. Data is collected and reported at the LEA and state level to be used for continuous feedback and improvement. The 2021-2022 state-level data dashboard report can be found at <https://doe.sd.gov/grants/documents/SDSPDGDashBoardReport21-22.pdf>.

The SEA collects data on each of the infrastructure areas through the combined evaluation plan. Data is collected and reported at the LEA and state level to be used for continuous feedback and improvement.

#### MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

\* 90-93% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased, and they will change what they do on the job as a result of the trainings. From the interviews conducted in spring 2022:

\* 82% of participants said they are implementing the skills in the classroom that they learned in the MTSS/Data-Driven Decision-Making trainings.

\* 96-100% of participants said the project positively impacted the Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions that teachers are using and positively impacted students with disabilities receiving Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions.

#### Literacy/Instruction

92-96% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased, and they will change what they do on the job as a result of the trainings. Based on the Intervention Tracking Forms, 4% of students receiving a Tier 2 intervention in November no longer needed intervention supports in May; 4% receiving a Tier 3 intervention moved to a less intensive (Tier 2) intervention in May, and 1% no longer needed intervention supports in May.

#### Coaching

Based on the interviews, 96% of teacher participants said that coaches are effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools; 100% of coach participants said they are implementing the skills in the schools that they learned in the coaching trainings. From the Coaching Survey, 92% of teacher participants said that coaches are effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools.

#### Family Engagement

Based on the interviews, 87% of participants said that schools were more welcoming as a result of family engagement efforts through the project. From the Family Engagement Surveys conducted in fall 2021:

\* 79% of family members said that they are engaged in the school.

\* 60% of family members said that they are involved in literacy activities with their children.

#### **Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

#### MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

The SEA plans to develop a MTSS data website for districts to upload MTSS-related data and access real-time reports. These reports can be used during monthly building leadership team meetings to inform LEA implementation progress and action planning.

The SEA will also develop online modules on data-driven decision making. These online modules will provide LEAs with asynchronous training on how to develop decision rules around data, conduct grade level data meetings, and effectively use data to drive decision-making at the student, building, and district levels.

#### Literacy/Instruction

The SEA will continue to provide onsite foundational literacy training to new districts in the state MTSS initiative. The SEA will also continue to partner with the DOE Division of Learning and Instruction (DLI) to provide summer foundational literacy training. The foundational literacy training provides a basic understanding of reading research (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) as well as modeling and practice in providing effective reading instruction. This training is held as two summer sessions - one session for kindergarten through third grade teachers, and a separate session for fourth through eighth grade teachers. Both sessions incorporate strategies to support students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment.

The SEA will identify a partner organization to provide advanced literacy training to all educators who have completed foundational literacy training. The advanced literacy training will be a component of the state literacy plan.

#### Coaching

The SEA will continue to partner with DLI to provide annual coach training. Annual coach training provides instructional coaches with the tools and skills



to collect data to determine starting skills for coaching, complete coaching cycles, and troubleshoot challenging coaching situations. As part of the state literacy plan, The SEA will develop a state coaching network to support all instructional coaches statewide.

#### Family Engagement

The SEA will host four regional family literacy train-the-trainer trainings. During these trainings, LEAs will send a team to receive the training and materials needed to provide a family literacy training at their respective LEAs. The family literacy training provides family-friendly definitions of key literacy terms and easy-to-implement activities that families can do at home or on the go to improve children's literacy skills.

The SEA will continue to distribute weekly family literacy tips to LEA contacts. The tips can be included in LEA newsletters, social media, and other family communication tools.

#### **Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

#### **If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The SEA utilized data and feedback during summer LEA trainings and the annual stakeholder meeting to determine plans for continued implementation. While the SSIP will continue without modifications, The SEA will expand the focus to include all students with disabilities. The data indicated that some improvements have been made surrounding reading proficiency for students with specific learning disabilities, but LEA and stakeholders feedback indicated that more students with disabilities could be positively impacted by expanding the focus. Data from the Classroom Observation Checklist indicated that teachers are implementing key literacy strategies with fidelity. Data from the Intervention Tracking Form indicated that students receiving Tier II and Tier III interventions are making progress.

### **Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

#### **Description of Stakeholder Input**

Indicator 17 SSIP progress was reviewed with stakeholders during the SPDG Advisory Committee meeting on October 13, 2022. SPDG Advisory Committee members included educators, administrators, family organizations, higher education representatives, and staff from several divisions of DOE. While the focus of the meeting was to review data and progress of districts implementing the SPDG, data from all programs that provide literacy support to pilot LEAs was reviewed.

Indicator 17 data was also reviewed during the MTSS Stakeholder meeting held on November 17, 2022. MTSS stakeholders included educators, administrators, MTSS coordinators, parents, and school board members from LEAs participating in the state MTSS initiative. The stakeholders represented school staff who serve students from multiple race/ethnicities and multiple disability categories. Stakeholders reviewed data and progress of the MTSS initiative and also participated in a facilitated feedback process for each component of the MTSS initiative. MTSS stakeholders also provided feedback on the updated Theory of Action and implementation activities related to each Theory of Action component.

#### **Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

Prior to the meeting, stakeholders in both the SPDG Advisory Committee and MTSS Stakeholder meeting were given access to state-level reports disaggregated by initiative in a Google folder. The Google folder also contained copies of the presentation materials and handouts. During each meeting, the meeting facilitator led stakeholders in a guided feedback-gathering process to ensure all voices were heard. The facilitators used a variety of small-group and whole-group sharing as well as written feedback tools to gather input from all stakeholders.

#### **Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

YES

#### **Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Stakeholders shared positive outcomes of participating in SSIP initiatives as well as concern about the SEA's capacity to support an increased interest in SSIP related activities. In response to stakeholder feedback, The SEA plans to work with other DOE divisions to pursue a second SPDG that will expand universal supports available to all LEAs and targeted supports to LEAs who demonstrate a significant need.

#### **Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

#### **Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

The state recalculated the FFY 2020 data. Previously, only students with a specific learning disability were included in the calculation. Since the SSIP population changed, the FFY 2020 data was recalculated for all students with disabilities and the subset of students with disabilities (i.e., specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment). Because the SSIP calculation changed, The SEA, along with stakeholder input, changed the baselines. Prior to FFY2021, the SEA was not tracking all students with disabilities and were not tracking specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment students, as part of the SSIP. Feedback collected from stakeholders indicated a request to use the first year that these groups would be targeted (FFY2021) as the baseline year.

### **17 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

The State did not provide a working link to the Theory of Action. The State must provide a working link to the current Theory of Action in the FFY2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Link to the current Theory of Action: <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/SDTheoryA.docx>

**17 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and OSEP accepts that revision.

The State revised its FFY 2021-2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**17 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role:**

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Linda Turner

#### **Title:**

Division Director of Special Education and Early Learning

#### **Email:**

linda.turner@state.sd.us

#### **Phone:**

605-773-3327

#### **Submitted on:**

04/27/23 7:23:18 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

## 2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination<sup>1</sup>

Percentage (%)	Determination
84.03%	Meets Requirements

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

	Total Points Available	Points Earned	Score (%)
<b>Results</b>	24	19	79.17%
<b>Compliance</b>	18	16	88.89%

2023 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

Reading Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	94%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	92%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	31%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	95%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	24%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	90%	1

Math Assessment Elements

Math Assessment Elements	Performance (%)	Score
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	94%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments	92%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	49%	2
Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	94%	1
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	27%	2
Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress	89%	1

<sup>1</sup> For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B."

**Exiting Data Elements**

<b>Exiting Data Elements</b>	<b>Performance (%)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out</b>	31	0
<b>Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma**</b>	61	0

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, "the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential."

2023 Part B Compliance Matrix

Part B Compliance Indicator <sup>2</sup>	Performance (%)	Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020	Score
Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.	0.00%	N/A	2
Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation	99.91%	YES	2
Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday	97.79%	YES	2
Indicator 13: Secondary transition	79.39%	YES	1
Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data	93.32%		1
Timely State Complaint Decisions	100.00%		2
Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions	N/A		N/A
Longstanding Noncompliance			2
Specific Conditions	None		
Uncorrected identified noncompliance	None		

<sup>2</sup> The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: [https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023\\_Part-B\\_SPP-APR\\_Measurement\\_Table.pdf](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

Data Rubric

FFY 2021 APR<sup>3</sup>

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data		
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Total
1	1	1
2	1	1
3A	1	1
3B	1	1
3C	1	1
3D	1	1
4A	0	0
4B	1	1
5	1	1
6	1	1
7	1	1
8	1	1
9	1	1
10	1	1
11	1	1
12	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
15	1	1
16	1	1
17	1	1
	<b>Subtotal</b>	20
<b>APR Score Calculation</b>	<b>Timely Submission Points</b> - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.	5
	<b>Grand Total</b> - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =	25

<sup>3</sup> In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

	618 Data <sup>4</sup>			
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Total
Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 4/6/22	1	0	1	2
Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022	1	1	1	3
Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22	1	1	1	3
MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22	1	0	1	2
			<b>Subtotal</b>	19
<b>618 Score Calculation</b>			<b>Grand Total</b> (Subtotal X 1.23809524) =	23.52

<sup>4</sup> In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.



<b>Indicator Calculation</b>	
A. APR Grand Total	25
B. 618 Grand Total	23.52
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	48.52
Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0
Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator	0.00
<b>Denominator</b>	52.00
D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator*) =	0.9332
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.32

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

---

## APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

### SPP/APR Data

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

### Part B 618 Data

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

618 Data Collection	EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey	Due Date
Part B Child Count and Educational Environments	C002 & C089	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in April
Part B Personnel	C070, C099, C112	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Exiting	C009	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Discipline	C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B Assessment	C175, C178, C185, C188	Wednesday in the 3 <sup>rd</sup> week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date)
Part B Dispute Resolution	Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in November
Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services	Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS	1 <sup>st</sup> Wednesday in May

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check** – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>