

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2019**

South Dakota



**PART B DUE
February 1, 2021**

**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.

South Dakota implements a variety of activities to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met.

South Dakota's general supervision encompasses an accountability review of local education agency (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.

South Dakota's accountability review cycle distributes LEAs and educational agencies over a five-year period. Each LEA accountability review includes a review of LEA child count data in comparison to state level reporting, Indicator 13 data collection, one-on-one teacher file reviews, verification of certification and highly qualified status 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 file reviews, and other relevant areas.

LEAs may receive an on-site or off-site focused review. Focused reviews are generally related to corrective action received from a state complaint or due process complaint with findings of noncompliance, disproportionality, and extraordinary cost funding. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Coaches review specific areas related to the findings and to verify continued correction. If the LEA's performance on SPP compliance indicator(s) did not meet the target, then a focused review will occur to determine whether or not a systemic issue is present.

If noncompliance has been identified, a finding in the form of a corrective action plan (CAP) is issued by Special Education Programs (SEP). The CAP includes the specific 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 SEP. Correction and compliance in conformance with the OSEP 09-02 Memorandum is verified by SEP.

The accountability review process for FFY 2019 was impacted by COVID19 closures with regards to the on-site focused reviews only. The State Performance Plan indicator collection and verification completed during the on-site accountabilities was not impacted due to the review being completed by January 2020. During the school closures, on-site focused reviews were changed to virtual reviews. SEP requires LEAs to complete prong 1 noncompliance within 60 days, a few extensions were granted for completion due to COVID19 closures. Twenty-two LEA's who received a CAP from the accountability review and focused reviews were able to complete the required activities within the required 1-year timeframe from when the corrective action was issued.

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. SEP reviews each application to make certain it meets program requirements using a multi-faceted approach. SEP regional representatives complete an initial review and send it to the assistant director for a second review. Once the assistant director reviews, it is then sent on to the Grants Management Office where the application is reviewed to certify the budget and program costs are aligned and allowable. Grants Management also verifies that the LEA has met Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirements. Grants Management conducts a final review before sign-off by the Grants Management Director and SEP Director.

When the DOE conducts a fiscal review of the IDEA 611 and 619 funds, the LEA submits their accounting records. Grants Management compares accounting records with reimbursement requests and the grant application for the IDEA Part B 611, IDEA Part B 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 provided to non-identified students (not on an IEP) through fiscal review and special education monitoring 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.
2. MOE is reviewed and a determination is made as to whether the LEA is in compliance or if MOE needs to be addressed.
3. If the LEA has a private school, the DOE verifies the public LEA expended the required proportionate share indicated on the federal IDEA budget. 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. Also, the DOE determines whether or not the LEA used private school personnel to provide equitable services, services were performed outside of the regular duty hours and under the supervision of the public agency. DOE determines how 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. DOE will check 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 onsite accountability review, SEP confirms the item(s) purchased have been appropriately labeled and inventoried according to program requirements. The DOE identifies 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.

SEP 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 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 SEP webpage at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped> and shared with constituents at conferences and webinars, and notices of availability are sent on the special education listserv. Monthly Special Education Director Webinars are provided, recorded, and posted for later reference. Webinar topics include upcoming data collections, TA on needed areas identified through monitoring or complaints, and updates on policies. SEP 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, SEP utilizes contracted specialists. This includes (but is not limited to):

1. RDA Coaches (formerly known as Education Specialists). These individuals are contracted through educational cooperatives to conduct on-site monitoring reviews. They also conduct regional training around Individual Education Plans 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 pilot project that began in the 2017-2018 school year.
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 transitions. They make one-on-one connections with high school special education teachers and personnel. They provide technical assistance in writing compliant Individual Education Plans (IEP), 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 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). 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 LEA's on a variety of topics identified based on types of cases they are taking on and issues SEP identifies through accountability reviews and the dispute process. <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/navigator.aspx>

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 students with disabilities.

Professional development is provided in a variety of ways due to South Dakota's large area and rural nature. South Dakota has 77,116 square miles and of the 149 LEAs, 30 have enrollment 200 or less, 79 LEAs have an enrollment between 201 and 600, and 40 LEAs have an enrollment of over 600. State, regional, and webinar training allow LEA staff to access appropriate professional development. SEP professional development revolves around data collection, 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 South Dakota. In the fall of 2019 SEP offered several opportunities for basic, advanced and transition IEP workshops. IEP 101 targets new special education staff and covered the IEP process from referral, evaluation, eligibility to IEP development. Approximately 139 LEA staff statewide attended the basic workshop. The Advance IEP workshop focused on topics related to issues that the SEP identified as areas of concern statewide based on accountability review data. The Advanced workshop had approximately 359 LEA staff attend. The Transition IEP workshop is for high school transition and IEP processes. The Transition workshop had approximately 129 LEA staff attend. The Early Childhood workshop was offered for the second year and due to high attendance, the previous year, a third day was added in 2019. The Early Childhood workshop focuses on Part C to Part B transition, preschool outcomes, and least restrictive environments. There were approximately 77 LEA staff that attended the Early Childhood workshop.

SEP develops a monthly newsletter, distributes it through the listserv, and posts it to the web. The newsletter includes SEP highlights, federal updates, the agenda for monthly Special Education Director webinars, and features a general and special education program area. The newsletter includes professional development opportunities available for teachers and administrators. A Special Education Director Webinar is held every third Tuesday of the month and is recorded for viewing later 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.

SEP partners with The Center for Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to offer webinar training on specialized topics. Topics include challenges in evaluating, classifying and programming for English learners, individual health plans, prior written notice, transportation, surrogate parents, Who is the Parent, accommodations, legal updates, general educators role in special education, and discipline. A new special education director webinar series is conducted every two-years targeting five areas of general supervision including the state performance plan, 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> for later viewing.

Face to face training occurs regionally around the state 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. Due to COVID19, in-person trainings that were scheduled in the spring of 2020 were canceled or provided virtually, when possible.

SEP 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 conference. SEP hosts two major conferences each year. One targets special education professionals, and the other targets all educators with a focus on making learning accessible for all students. YLF, the Early Childhood conferences, and summer conferences were held virtually due to COVID19 closures. The spring SEP hosted conference scheduled for March 2020 was canceled due to COVID19 closures.

Entities such as the Center for Disabilities workgroup provide frequent and timely feedback and technical assistance through Skype, Facetime, and other avenues.

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

Stakeholder Involvement

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

SEP values broad stakeholder representation. Stakeholder groups include representation from various departments, special education administrators, superintendents and building principals, teachers (including general and special educators), SDPC staff, professors, parents, educational cooperative staff, advisory panel members, and contractors. To establish a representative sample that reflects diversity across South Dakota, SEP includes stakeholders from varying geographic areas and LEA enrollment sizes.

SEP staff collaborates across departments throughout the DOE. All nine staff are integrated and assist other offices in the implementation of regulations and strategies to improve results. DOE participates in cross-department stakeholder meetings, DOE strategic planning sessions, and other projects.

Once a stakeholder group has made recommendations, proposed decisions are shared during SDAPCD meetings and Special Education Director Webinars for additional input. The Special Education Director Webinars have approximately 60 live participants and many listen to the recording located on the SEP website.

Stakeholder groups met related to the FFY 2019 SPP/APR and SSIP on February 10, July 16 and October 20th, 2020. Input was sought from the SDAPCD at the January 6, 2021 meeting.

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

NO

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY18 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 2018 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, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2018 APR in 2020, is available.

Following the submission of the SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Education, SEP disseminated the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, and LEA public information in the following ways:

1. Posted the final version and SPP/APR, and LEA public reports on the SEA website at <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx>. SEP publicly reports at the LEA level public reports on the required indicators as soon as practical, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its SPP/APR each year.
2. SEP 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 in eleven (11) major South Dakota newspapers to notify the public of the website <http://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> where the SPP/APR 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. SEP program staff presents current SPP/APR information to the SDAPCD in January and LEA administrators/special education directors in February.
3. SDPC shares via newsletter and weekly updates with parents on how to access the publication of the FFY 2018 SPP/APR on the SEP website.
4. Providing electronic copies to all SDAPCD members.
5. 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

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies,

including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short-term and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities is impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

Response to actions required in FFY 2018 SPP/APR

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) graduating from high school 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 of Education (Department) under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Measurement

States may report data for children with disabilities using either the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA or an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate under the ESEA, if the State has established one.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Targets should be the same as the annual graduation rate targets for children with disabilities under Title I of the ESEA.

States must continue to report the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for all students and disaggregated by student subgroups including the children with disabilities subgroup, as required under section 1111(h)(1)(C)(iii)(II) of the ESEA, on State report cards under Title I of the ESEA even if they only report an extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate for the purpose of SPP/APR reporting.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2011	64.23%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	84.50%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%	85.00%
Data	59.35%	59.92%	60.42%	60.18%	62.98%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	85.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	422
SY 2018-19 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS151; Data group 696)	07/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	585
SY 2018-19 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec FS150; Data group 695)	07/27/2020	Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	72.14%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
422	585	62.98%	85.00%	72.14%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using:

4-year ACGR

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

South Dakota has one diploma. The minimum requirements for receiving a diploma are established by SDCL 13-33-19.

A Personal Learning Plan is required for every student in grades 9 through 12, and each student's plan must document a minimum of 22 credits that include the following:

1) Four units of Language Arts – must include:

- a. Writing – 1.5 units
- b. Literature – 1.5 units (must include .5 unit of American Literature)
- c. Speech or Debate – .5 unit
- d. Language Arts elective – .5 unit

2) Three units of Mathematics – must include:

- a. Algebra I – 1 unit
- b. *Algebra II – 1 unit
- c. *Geometry – 1 unit

3) Three units of Lab Science – must include:

- a. Biology – 1 unit
- b. Any Physical Science – 1 unit
- c. *Chemistry or Physics – 1 unit

4) Three units of Social Studies – must include:

- a. U.S. History – 1 unit
- b. U.S. Government – .5 unit
- c. World History – .5 unit
- d. Geography – .5 unit

5) One unit of the following-any combination:

- a. Approved Career & Technical Education
- b. Capstone Experience or Service Learning
- c. World Language

6) One unit of Fine Arts

7) One-half unit of Personal Finance or Economics

8) One-half unit of Physical Education

9) One-half unit of Health or Health Integration

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 Department of Education. The application must include: course syllabus; standards-based curriculum; teacher certification; and assessment of standards by methods including end-of-course exams, authentic assessment, project-based learning or rubrics.

*With school and parent/guardian approval, a student may be excused from this course in favor of a more appropriate course. A student may be excused from Algebra II or Geometry, but not both. A student is still required to take three units of Math. If a student is excused from Chemistry or Physics, the student must still take three units of Lab Science.

With regards to the health requirement: Beginning with students who are freshmen in the fall of 2013, students will be required to take .5 unit of health at any time grades 6-12. A LEA may choose to integrate health across the curriculum at the middle or high school level in lieu of a stand-alone course.

Local decision: A LEA may decide to offer credit for extracurricular Fine Arts activities. Students may be granted up to one credit in Fine Arts for participation in extracurricular activities. A maximum of ¼ credit may be granted for each activity in each school year.

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.

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)

The graduation data was not impacted by COVID19 because the data collection period did not overlap with the dates of the pandemic. This Indicator data reflects the 2018-2019 graduates and the data was collected prior to the pandemic.

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 dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

OPTION 1:

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.

OPTION 2:

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

OPTION 1:

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 left high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

OPTION 2:

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.

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

OPTION 1:

Use 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019). Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) received a certificate; (c) reached maximum age; (d) dropped out; or (e) died.

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.

OPTION 2:

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.

If the State has made or proposes to make changes to the data source or measurement under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012, the State should include a justification as to why such changes are warranted.

Options 1 and 2:

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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), and compare the results to the target.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth and, if different, what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs. If there is a difference, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	2.53%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	2.90%	2.90%	2.80%	2.50%	2.40%
Data	2.76%	3.03%	3.09%	3.30%	3.01%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	2.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Please indicate the reporting option used on this indicator

Option 2

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a)	478

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (b)	47
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (c)	42
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (d)	136
SY 2018-19 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85)	05/27/2020	Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education as a result of death (e)	7

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2, when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? (yes/no)

NO

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

YES

Change numerator description in data table (yes/no)

NO

Change denominator description in data table (yes/no)

YES

If use a different calculation methodology is yes, provide an explanation of the different calculation methodology

South Dakota calculates dropout percentage based on the number of students age 14-21 with IEPs who dropped out, divided by the number of students with disabilities on child count age 14-21. The calculation represents the percentage of students with IEPs who dropped out yearly.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of High School Students with IEPs by Cohort	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
136	5,336	3.01%	2.40%	2.55%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

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), 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 below.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 2 uses lag year (SY2018-2019) data, this data was not impacted by COVID19.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 FS185 and 188.

Measurement

B. 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. 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 3B: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates, inclusive of all ESEA grades assessed (3-8 and high school), for children with IEPs. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in all grades assessed, 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.

3B - Indicator Data

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
A	Overall	99.10%	Actual	99.19%	99.23%	99.42%	99.32%	99.32%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2005	Target >=	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%	99.40%
A	Overall	99.17%	Actual	99.21%	99.11%	99.40%	99.25%	99.22%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	99.40%
Math	A >=	Overall	99.40%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			99.32%	99.40%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			99.22%	99.40%		N/A	N/A

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.

<https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>

Due to the COVID19 pandemic, SD applied for a waiver, as allowed under ESSA, to not administer statewide assessments in the 2019-2020 school year. Thus, the most current statewide assessment information will be from the 2018-2019 school year.

<https://doe.sd.gov/essa/documents/SDCovid19-WaiverResponse.pdf>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March 2020, the U.S. Department of Education approved a waiver of the statewide assessment and accountability and reporting requirements in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread school closures related to the novel Coronavirus disease (COVID19).

The waiver specifically focused on assessment requirements for the school year 2019-2020 and report card provisions related to assessments and accountability in section 1111(h) based on data from the 2019-2020 school year, including Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) (assessment results). Due to this, there is no data available for Indicator 3B.

<https://doe.sd.gov/essa/documents/SDCovid19-WaiverResponse.pdf>

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

- A. Indicator 3A – Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level and alternate 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 grade level and 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)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. 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 reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (combining regular and alternate) for children with IEPs, in all grades assessed (3-8 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

Reporting Group Selection

Based on previously reported data, these are the grade groups defined for this indicator.

Group	Group Name	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	HS
A	Overall	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Historical Data: Reading

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2018	Target >=		25.85%	32.59%	39.33%	26.26%
A	Overall	18.43%	Actual	18.86%	20.45%	18.64%	18.83%	18.43%

Historical Data: Math

Group	Group Name	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	Overall	2018	Target >=		25.06%	31.87%	38.86%	23.51%
A	Overall	16.73%	Actual	18.01%	19.25%	18.36%	17.78%	16.73%

Targets

Subject	Group	Group Name	2019
Reading	A >=	Overall	33.31%
Math	A >=	Overall	28.82%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

FFY 2019 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Include the disaggregated data in your final SPP/APR. (yes/no)

YES

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

Reading Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

Data Source:

SY 2019-20 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

Math Proficiency Data by Grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned											
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			18.43%	33.31%		N/A	N/A

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group	Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A	Overall			16.73%	28.82%		N/A	N/A

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.

<https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>

Due to the COVID19 pandemic, SD applied for a waiver, as allowed under ESSA, to not administer statewide assessments in the 2019-2020 school year. Thus, the most current statewide assessment information will be from the 2018-2019 school year.

<https://doe.sd.gov/essa/documents/SDCovid19-WaiverResponse.pdf>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

In March 2020, the U.S. Department of Education approved a waiver of the statewide assessment and accountability and reporting requirements in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) for the 2019-2020 school year due to widespread school closures related to the novel Coronavirus disease (COVID19).

The waiver specifically focused on assessment requirements for the school year 2019-2020 and report card provisions related to assessments and accountability in section 1111(h) based on data from the 2019-2020 school year, including Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(ii) (assessment results). Due to this, there is no data available for Indicator 3C.

<https://doe.sd.gov/essa/documents/SDCovid19-WaiverResponse.pdf>

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - 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 districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs

(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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

If the State has established a minimum n size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target <=	1.30%	1.30%	33.33%	33.33%	33.33%
Data	0.00%	0.67%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target <=	0.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The target was changed to 0.00%. Because South Dakota has only had between one and three LEAs that meet the N size that have suspended students for greater than 10 days, the previous target of 33.33% allowed for one LEA to be found to have significant discrepancies for suspension. The new target of 0.00% is the only numerical option to reflect improvement over the baseline.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

146

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	2	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

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for Part A means 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. South Dakota chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the South Dakota Department of Education does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Indicator 4A uses lag year (SY2018-2019) data, this data was not impacted by COVID19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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.

33 LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than ten days. Of the 33 LEAs, two met the minimum N size of 10 students for removals and of those two, none had suspended over 5% of their special education students for greater than 10 days and therefore were not 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 2018

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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4A - OSEP Response

4A - Required Actions

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

B. Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, 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 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 districts that meet the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that 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) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n 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 size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n size. If the State used a minimum n size requirement, report the number of districts 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 2019 SPP/APR, use data from 2018-2019), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions 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.

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of districts that met the State-established n size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those districts 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 district with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy 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 the Office of Special Education Programs (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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for 2018-2019), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Has the state established a minimum n-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 size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.

147

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies procedure, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	2	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

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for Part A means 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. South Dakota chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the South Dakota Department of Education does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Because Indicator 4B uses lag year (SY2018-2019) data, this data was not impacted by COVID19.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2019 using 2018-2019 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.

South Dakota's definition of significant discrepancy for 4B means more than 5% of the unduplicated students with disabilities by race/ethnicity at the LEA level with 10 or more students included in the numerator and the LEA child count included in the denominator. South Dakota chose this option for analyzing suspension data because the South Dakota Department of Education does not collect data on suspensions of students who are not on IEPs in a format that allows a comparison between the two groups. IEP students per race and ethnic group suspended or expelled at the LEA > than 10 days in a school year ÷ Child Count at the LEA X 100 = %

Significant Discrepancy: If greater than 5% of the LEA child count population by race have been suspended for >10 days.

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 2018

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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

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

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4B - OSEP Response

4B- Required Actions

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Education environments (children 6-21): Percent of children with IEPs 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

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2005	Target >=	66.50%	67.00%	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%
A	65.00%	Data	68.44%	69.21%	70.40%	71.01%	72.08%
B	2005	Target <=	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%	6.00%
B	6.50%	Data	5.54%	5.64%	5.40%	5.46%	5.57%
C	2005	Target <=	3.69%	3.59%	3.49%	3.39%	3.29%
C	3.30%	Data	2.11%	2.20%	2.07%	1.94%	1.99%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	68.00%
Target B <=	6.00%
Target C <=	3.29%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	19,136
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,143
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,029

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	198
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	165
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74)	07/08/2020	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	17

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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Education Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	14,143	19,136	72.08%	68.00%	73.91%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	1,029	19,136	5.57%	6.00%	5.38%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	380	19,136	1.99%	3.29%	1.99%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID19 had no impact on the data because the collection period did not overlap with the dates of the pandemic.

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: Preschool environments: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs 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.

(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

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 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 aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Percent = [(# of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

Instructions

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

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.

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

Part	Baseline	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2011	Target >=	21.45%	21.45%	21.45%	21.55%	21.65%
A	20.94%	Data	20.19%	22.38%	24.02%	24.24%	23.33%
B	2011	Target <=	16.26%	16.26%	16.26%	16.16%	16.16%
B	16.76%	Data	15.59%	13.74%	13.72%	14.45%	14.85%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	21.65%
Target B <=	16.16%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	3,039
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	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	723
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	405

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b2. Number of children attending separate school	9
SY 2019-20 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)	07/08/2020	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	0

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 2019 SPP/APR Data

Preschool Environments	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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	723	3,039	23.33%	21.65%	23.79%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	414	3,039	14.85%	16.16%	13.62%	Met Target	No Slippage

Use a different calculation methodology (yes/no)

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID19 did not impact Indicator 6 because the data collection period did not overlap with the dates of the pandemic.

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A1	2008	Target >=	79.15%	79.15%	79.15%	79.25%	79.35%
A1	78.10%	Data	75.50%	75.86%	71.65%	70.00%	67.11%
A2	2008	Target >=	84.15%	84.15%	84.15%	84.25%	84.35%

A2	84.00%	Data	85.93%	84.62%	81.95%	80.64%	71.79%
B1	2008	Target >=	65.50%	66.50%	67.50%	68.50%	69.50%
B1	69.40%	Data	66.73%	66.85%	67.97%	62.41%	56.71%
B2	2008	Target >=	55.96%	55.96%	55.96%	56.96%	57.96%
B2	54.90%	Data	62.17%	56.28%	59.39%	56.87%	51.89%
C1	2008	Target >=	68.10%	69.10%	70.10%	71.10%	71.60%
C1	71.20%	Data	71.27%	69.83%	68.97%	61.49%	58.35%
C2	2008	Target >=	72.10%	72.10%	72.10%	72.60%	73.60%
C2	11.00%	Data	76.95%	73.46%	72.80%	71.14%	66.13%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target A1 >=	79.35%
Target A2 >=	84.35%
Target B1 >=	69.50%
Target B2 >=	57.96%
Target C1 >=	71.60%
Target C2 >=	73.60%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

685

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	100	14.60%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	82	11.97%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	128	18.69%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	375	54.74%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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>	210	310	67.11%	79.35%	67.74%	Did Not Meet Target	No 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	503	685	71.79%	84.35%	73.43%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
program. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$							

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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	202	29.49%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	156	22.77%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	120	17.52%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	207	30.22%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	276	478	56.71%	69.50%	57.74%	Did Not Meet 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. Calculation: $(d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)$	327	685	51.89%	57.96%	47.74%	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	0	0.00%
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	135	19.71%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	93	13.58%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	110	16.06%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	347	50.66%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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. Calculation: $(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)$	203	338	58.35%	71.60%	60.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	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>	457	685	66.13%	73.60%	66.72%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B2	<p>SD set ambitious targets at the time of the previous 2014 SPP package and LEAs have continuously struggled to meet targets as they have risen over the past 6 years. However, in the past two years, the gap has grown significantly. Stakeholders, which included LEAs with varying demographics, identified reasons for lower outcomes and slippage to be different staff evaluating students' entries and exits, data quality, students entering with more significant needs, and lack of programming due to the state not adopting or funding a statewide preschool.</p> <p>LEAs in South Dakota began virtual learning on March 16, 2020, due to COVID19. Between March 16, 2020 and June 30, 2020, two hundred four students within the Part B (619) system did not receive the BDI-2 exit evaluation to determine Indicator 7 Child Outcomes. COVID19 prevented evaluators from administering the Part B Exit evaluation, therefore baseline entry scores could not be compared to the exit scores for those students turning 6 between March 16 and June 30, 2020. SEP advised LEAs to use the BDI2 Data Manager to identify students who did not receive a Part B exit evaluation due to COVID19 by entering "COVID19 no exit scores" into the Program Note within the BDI2 Data Manager system for those students turning 6 during the pandemic. Also, LEA closures due to COVID19 impacted the number of students reported last year compared to the number of students this year (Outcome B had 130 less students evaluated than the previous year).</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."

South Dakota defined "comparable to same-age peers" as any student who received a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on the Battelle Developmental Inventory II (BDI-2) scoring chart. This corresponds to the 10th percentile rank on the BDI-2 for a given outcome area.

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

The Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) is used to gather data for this indicator. When a student exits the Part C program and transitions to Part B (619), the student is assessed in the areas of cognitive, physical, communication, social-emotional, and adaptive development using the BDI-2. The exit data for Part C becomes the baseline data for students who become eligible for Part B (619). Students who enter the Part B (619) system at or after age three, will be tested using the BDI-2 in the areas of the development listed previously to establish a baseline. Upon exiting the 619 program (student exits early or turns 6), a student is assessed in the same five areas of development using the BDI-2. The baseline entry scores will be compared to the exit scores in the five evaluated areas of development to determine progress in the three indicator outcome areas.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the student, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the 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

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	62.20%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=	77.30%	77.50%	78.00%	78.50%	79.00%
Data	83.49%	84.35%	84.74%	88.41%	87.77%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	79.00%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
5,281	6,019	87.77%	79.00%	87.74%	Met Target	No Slippage

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

20,060

Percentage of respondent parents

30.00%

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.

Parents of all students with disabilities ages 3-21 are given many opportunities to complete the survey. As in previous years, in FFY 2019, the survey was distributed via mail and an online link. Parents could also complete the survey at the annual IEP meeting, parent-teacher conferences, and community dinners. This personalized distribution method ensured all parents received the survey; furthermore, school staff members personally encourage the parents to complete the survey.

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
The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.	YES

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.

The representativeness of the responses was examined by using statistical significance testing to determine if a particular group was over-represented or under-represented in the response rate.

The representativeness of the surveys was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children reported on the parent survey and the demographic characteristics of all special education students. This comparison indicates the results are representative (1) by geographic region where the child attends school; (2) by the grade level of the child; and (3) by the primary disability of the child. For example, 32% of the parents who returned a survey are a parent of a child with a specific learning disability, and 33% of students with disabilities in the population have a specific learning disability.

However, results indicated that parents of white students with disabilities were more likely to respond than parents of non-white students. 73% of the parents who returned a survey indicated that their children are white compared to 67% of students with disabilities in the population are white.

Although the data indicated that parents of non-white students were slightly less likely to respond than parents of white students, the data indicated no significant differences in the parent involvement percentage by race/ethnicity, so we are confident that the results are representative. In previous years, parents of non-white students were NOT less likely to respond than parents of white students. The overall response rate in 2019-20 is about six percentage points lower than the previous three years. The SDDOE believes this might be due to COVID19. When in-person schooling stopped in March, parent surveys could no longer be handed out in person after the IEP meeting.

Some action items for the SDDOE will include following up with LEAs to see if there are particularly effective communication and dissemination strategies that LEAs are using for their parents, especially parents of non-white students. The SDDOE will also ask LEAs for actions that the SDDOE and/or LEAs could take to increase the response rate of parents of all students with disabilities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

State-wide district closures at the end of the 2019-2020 school year due to COVID19 impacted the percentage of parents that completed a survey. The response rate decreased by 5.88 percentage points from 2018-19 to 2019-20 (35.88% to 30.00%). The Parent Involvement Percentage decreased 0.03 percentage points from 87.77% in 2018-19 to 87.74% in 2019-20 as well. The survey was available online at all times and information was communicated to families. Due to COVID19, family priorities were focused on other areas and therefore a reduced response rate was anticipated.

While SDDOE suspects COVID19 had an impact on the response rate and in particular the response rate of non-white parents, there is no reason to believe that the COVID19 had an impact on the positivity of the survey responses. The 2019-20 parent involvement percentage and individual item responses are very similar to those obtained in 2018-19 with a slight increase from 2018-19 to 2019-20.

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

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 FFY 2018, 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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.

116

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and 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-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
1	0	33	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).

South Dakota collects data for Indicator 9 through the state December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment 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. South Dakota 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 9, all of South Dakota’s 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 33 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 in South Dakota have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular race/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent the State 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, Special Education Programs (SEP) conducts a review. The LEA will provide special education files across disability categories based on race/ethnicity. The SEP team reviews the LEA’s identification policy and procedures. The SEP team compares these to document practices for all students identified with a disability, students in specific categories, and students in identified race/ethnic categories.

If the LEA followed appropriate policy and procedures for disability categories and race/ethnicity groups, the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification procedures. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed, then the LEA would receive a CAP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID19 had no impact because the data collection period did not overlap with the dates of the pandemic during this collection.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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 FFY 2019, 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 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 2019 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2020).

Instructions

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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
2016	0.00%

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	0%

FFY 2019 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.

135

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of Districts that met the State's minimum n-size	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
2	0	14	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).

South Dakota collects data for Indicator 10 through the state December 1 child count and Fall Enrollment 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. South Dakota 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 South Dakota's 149 LEAs are included in the analyses. Of these 149 LEAs, 14 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 South Dakota 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 the State 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, Special Education Programs (SEP) conducts a review. The LEA will provide special education files across disability categories based on race/ethnicity. The SEP team reviews the LEA's identification policy and procedures. The SEP team compares these to document practices for all students identified with a disability, students in specific categories, and students in identified race/ethnic categories.

If the LEA followed appropriate policy and procedures for disability categories and race/ethnicity groups, the LEA is identified as having appropriate identification procedures. If policy and procedures were not appropriately followed, then the LEA would receive a CAP.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

COVID19 had no impact because the data collection period did not overlap with the dates of the pandemic during this collection.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.84%	99.85%	99.69%	99.89%	99.94%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
4,070	4,064	99.94%	100%	99.85%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

6

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.

South Dakota did not meet 100% compliance, however, the state showed substantial compliance with 99.85% of students who were evaluated within the state's established 25-school day timeline. Six incidents of noncompliance do not indicate a statewide systematic issue. Substantial training efforts have been made to inform LEAs of the policies and procedures necessary to meet the evaluation timeline. Of the six incidents of noncompliance, all six LEAs were found in compliance previously during FFY 2018.

Six of the 149 LEAs did not meet the 100% target due to the evaluator being unavailable, the parent wanted further testing, teacher counting error, poor scheduling, and failure to obtain parental permission to extend the timeline. Each LEA had one student file that did not meet the 25-school day evaluation timeline.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

- 1 exceeded the timeline by 19 days
- 1 exceeded the timeline by 7 days
- 2 exceeded the timeline by 1 day
- 1 exceeded the timeline by 4 days
- 1 exceeded the timeline by 3 days

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).

South Dakota 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 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.

SEP created an electronic system that all LEAs are required to utilize 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. All LEAs enter student data directly into the secure electronic system.

The data collected includes student ID, date permission received, date of last evaluation, the number of school days from permission received to evaluation completed, date eligibility is determined, and, if needed, the reason the timeline was exceeded. LEAs submit an updated school calendar, evaluation data and sign-off annually by August 1. SEP reviews the responses for accuracy and works with the LEAs to ensure accuracy of data before finalizing.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

South Dakota's LEAs began virtual learning on March 16, 2020, due to mandatory COVID19 closures. SEP advised LEAs to seek parental permission to extend the evaluation timeline on initial evaluations in which parental consent had been obtained but the evaluation could not be completed within the 25-school day timeline due to LEA closures in accordance with Administrative Rules of South Dakota 24:05:25:03 - Preplacement Evaluation. SEP also advised LEAs to complete the initial evaluation when schools resumed for FFY 2020. SEP expects to see an increase statewide for initial evaluations during the FFY 2020 due to LEAs completing the FFY 2019 evaluations in which parents extended the evaluation timeline due to COVID19 closures.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

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	2	1	0

FFY 2018 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. SEP verifies that each student who did not receive an evaluation within the 25-school day timeline has been evaluated and eligibility determined. 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. Each LEA is also expected to submit a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year. SEP verified that three of the three LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

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. However, SEP verified each student received an evaluation and eligibility was determined. An LEA who was determined not to meet compliance for a second year is required to complete additional requirements and is placed on a new CAP. In addition to providing training on policies, and procedures related to timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2019 report. SEP verified the LEA completed requirements in the new CAP and was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2017	1	1	0

FFY 2017

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. SEP verifies that each student who did not receive an evaluation within the 25-school day timeline has been evaluated and eligibility determined. 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. Each LEA is also expected to submit a timely and accurate report for FFY 2019. SEP verified the LEA was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

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. However, SEP verified each student received an evaluation and eligibility was determined. An LEA who was determined not to meet compliance for a second year is required to complete additional requirements and is placed on a new CAP. In addition to providing training on policies, and procedures related to timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2019 report. SEP verified the LEA completed requirements in the new CAP and was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

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.

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.

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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.76%	99.54%	99.77%	97.72%	96.65%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	605
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	146

c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	423
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.	3
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	29
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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 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.	423	427	96.65%	100%	99.06%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

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

4

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.

Although South Dakota did not meet the 100% compliance, the state showed substantial compliance with 99.06% 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 third birthday. Four incidents of noncompliance do not indicate a statewide systematic issue. 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 four LEAs were in 100% compliance during FFY 2018.

Four LEAs, with one student in each LEA (total of 4 students) of the 149 LEAs, did not meet the 100% target. The reason for failure to meet the student's third birthday timeline was due to the evaluation process starting less than 30 calendar days prior to the student's third birthday.

Range of days beyond timeline:

- 2 students over by 1 day
- 1 student over by 8 days
- 1 student over by 36 days

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 the State 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.

SEP also verifies the data collected from Part C during onsite accountability monitoring visits. The team reviews early childhood files and monitors all students referred from Part C to Part B that were determined eligible and had an IEP in place by their third birthday.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

South Dakota's LEAs began virtual learning on March 16, 2020, due to mandatory COVID19 closures. SEP advised LEAs to report Part C to Part B transition students in Indicator 11 for FFY 2020-2021, if the student was evaluated after their third birthday and after July 1, 2020. Students transitioning from Part C to Part B 619 must be evaluated and an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthday, therefore no flexibilities to Indicator 12 timelines are allowed. LEAs could have extended the evaluation timeline in accordance with Administrative Rules of South Dakota 25:05:25:03 - Preplacement Evaluation. However, if the LEA extended the initial evaluation timeline due to COVID19 closures or the parent refused and the extension surpassed the student's third birthday, the LEA did not meet Indicator 12 transition requirement. SEP expects to see an increase in Indicator 11 students under the age of 4 due to COVID19 impacting the transition process.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
16	14	2	0

FFY 2018 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. However, SEP verified that each student did receive an evaluation and eligibility determination. SEP also verified that each LEA cited for noncompliance completed training on the transition timeline and requirement to develop and implement a student's IEP by their third birthday (prong 1).

In addition to verifying the child specific noncompliance, SEP verified each LEA completed the steps outlined in the CAP, was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements and submitted a compliant FFY 2019 report.

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 files for Indicator 12. An LEA who is determined not to meet compliance for a second year is required to complete additional requirements and is placed on a new CAP. In addition to providing training on policies and procedures related to transition timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2019 report. SEP verified the LEA completed requirements in the new CAP and was correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
FFY 2017	2	2	0

FFY 2017

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. However, SEP verified that each student did receive an evaluation and eligibility determination. SEP also verified that each LEA cited for noncompliance has received training on the transition timeline and requirement to develop and implement a student's IEP by their third birthday (prong 1).

SEP verified the two LEAs completed the steps outlined in the year two CAP, were correctly implementing the regulatory requirement and submitted a FFY 2019 report that was in 100% compliance (prong 2).

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 files for Indicator 12. An LEA who is determined not to meet compliance for a second year is required to complete additional requirements and is placed on a new CAP. In addition to providing training on policies and procedures related to transition timelines, the LEA is also required to complete a desk audit, submit quarterly initial evaluation data, and submit a 100% compliant FFY 2019 report. SEP verified the two LEA's completed requirements in the new CAP and were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based upon a review of updated data (prong 2) for FFY 2019.

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Secondary transition: 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 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 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 2019 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2018), 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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	85.28%	82.02%	90.29%	93.71%	83.97%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target	100%

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
170	195	83.97%	100%	87.18%	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 on-site accountability review. LEAs receive an accountability review once during a five year cycle. Reviewers utilize the Indicator 13 checklist (which includes eight areas of compliance) to review files for each case manager and disability category in the LEA. To be found compliant, LEAs must demonstrate appropriate procedures in at least one file from each represented disability categories and in two files from each case manager.

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)

The accountability review process, which included Indicator 13 file reviews, for FFY 2019 was not impacted by COVID19 closures. The State Performance Plan indicator collection and verification completed during the on-site accountabilities review was completed by January 2020. All LEAs cited for noncompliance were able to complete the required activities within the required 1-year timeframe from when the corrective action was issued.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2018

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
21	21		0

FFY 2018 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2018, SEP identified 21 individual cases of noncompliance in eleven LEAs. All eleven LEAs received a CAP. In the CAP, LEAs corrected the individual files of noncompliance. The LEAs were required to undergo training and update policies and procedures around the area of noncompliance. Special Education Programs (SEP) verified that all individual files were corrected, all students received the services as indicated in the IEP, and policies and procedures were updated. The LEAs submitted additional files to ensure verified correction and correct implementation of regulatory requirements.

SEP verified that all eleven LEAs implemented the regulatory requirements with 100% compliance.

Indicator 13 is collected during on-site 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 one year of the date of the report. The correction is verified upon submission of the documentation either through a transition report, 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.

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

All eleven of the LEAs submitted the required student corrected file with 100% compliance. The LEAs were also required to submit additional student files to verify they were maintaining 100% compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2018

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2018 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Post-school outcomes: Percent 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.

Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

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 2020 on students who left school during 2018-2019, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2018-2019 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” in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, due February 2021:

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, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). 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

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.

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.

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 should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, disability category, and geographic location in the State.

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	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
A	2009	Target >=	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%	15.50%
A	14.62%	Data	20.18%	15.79%	20.53%	27.35%	16.93%
B	2009	Target >=	67.00%	67.50%	68.00%	68.50%	68.50%
B	66.08%	Data	74.22%	76.56%	76.00%	65.81%	70.61%
C	2009	Target >=	81.00%	81.00%	81.00%	81.50%	82.00%
C	80.41%	Data	82.29%	82.06%	82.67%	78.63%	82.11%

FFY 2019 Targets

FFY	2019
Target A >=	15.50%
Target B >=	68.50%
Target C >=	82.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	318
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	73
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	138
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)	19
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).	27

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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	73	318	16.93%	15.50%	22.96%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	211	318	70.61%	68.50%	66.35%	Did Not Meet Target	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)	257	318	82.11%	82.00%	80.82%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

Part	Reasons for slippage, if applicable
B	There was an increase in the number of respondents that continued to live with their family or custodial guardian one year after exiting high school in this reporting period, increasing to 76%. Last year, only 57% of the respondents reported living with their family or custodial guardian. It is expected that a decrease in competitive employment opportunities due to COVID19 and the remoteness of the state impacting access to employment opportunities that more respondents were unable to secure employment and therefore to live independently.
C	Because there was a decrease in competitive employment as described in B, the overall combined total was negatively impacted and showed a decrease from the previous year.

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.

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.

Survey Question	Yes / No
Was a survey used?	NO

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.

There was an over-representation in the categories of Specific Learning Disability and minority and an under-representation in the areas of all other disabilities and the geographic location of rural. In 2017-2018, rural (or geographic location) was a new consideration for determining the representation of respondents. Each state can decide how they want to determine geographic location. This year, Rural was calculated by subtracting respondents from two urban school LEAs (Sioux Falls and Rapid City). The two urban LEAs were identified by the United States Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service (www.ers.usda.gov). So, while the NPSO calculator indicates an underrepresented number of rural students surveyed, it's important to note that the majority of South Dakota's population falls under the definition of rural. Therefore, it is extremely unlikely that we will ever meet the +/-3 % interval in the category of Rural.

The over-representativeness of the LD category may explain the underrepresented data included for All Other Disabilities. An over-representation of minority students is not typical for South Dakota.

The representativeness may have been affected by COVID19 in a lower response rate than anticipated and the respondents that were willing to answer the survey questions at this time of unrest.

Question	Yes / No
Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school?	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.

SEA will continue to recruit LEA personnel, who know the leavers, to participate in collecting the survey information. This strategy will help increase the response rate and help with the representativeness. The SEA will work to develop an online survey to help with the survey collection to go along with the mailed surveys and follow-up phone calls.

With the data collection in the spring and summer of 2020, the response rate was lower than anticipated as this may not have been a priority by schools or families at this time. The SEA anticipates the response rate will increase as the pandemic subsides and people are able to refocus time and priorities.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Due to COVID19, the employment patterns seen nationally during much of 2020 are similar to those shown in the outcome data, with a decrease in competitive employment opportunities, especially in rural areas. SD had been and will continue to work on increasing the number of LEA's conducting follow up surveys. Although the response rate was similar to the previous year, it is suspected that the rate could have been higher but was impacted by fewer people being willing to answer unknown numbers and take time for surveys during this time when health and safety were the priority. It is expected to see a more significant impact from COVID19 next year as that data will more fully reflect what occurred during the pandemic, whereas this data may have had some impact on the employment rate but a greater impact on the response as the survey occurred during the spring through early fall.

Additional post-school outcome reports can be found at <https://www.sdposthighsurvey.org/reports.statewide.php>. The website provides longitudinal data.

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2019 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 2018 SPP/APR

In FFY 2018, the female and rural subgroups showed negative representativeness. Targeted LEAs with hard-to-find leavers were contacted and some were recruited to conduct the questionnaires verse only using mailings and phone interviews. The monthly special education director's call was used to recruit other special educators who were willing to volunteer to contact their leavers to help increase the number of respondents. Based on this recruitment, there were a few new callers from within the LEAs. Due to COVID 19, school districts prioritized the shift in learning and instruction. SEP was cautious to overburden districts therefore recruitment was limited to districts that would most impact the negative representativeness. Additional district recruitment will occur moving forward.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

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 ED Facts 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, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	1
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/04/2020	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	0

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

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data	100.00%		100.00%	100.00%	0.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
0	1	0.00%		0.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Over the past ten years, South Dakota on average receives approximately 3 due process requests per year, resulting in very few resolution sessions. The data for 2019-20 reporting year did not change and the results are similar to previous years, which indicates there were no impacts due to COVID19.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

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 ED Facts 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 resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline, targets and improvement activities, 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 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1 Mediations held	6
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	3
SY 2019-20 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/04/2020	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	3

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

There were no changes to the targets for FFY 2019.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target >=					
Data	75.00%	100.00%	100.00%	62.50%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2019
Target >=	

FFY 2019 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 2018 Data	FFY 2019 Target	FFY 2019 Data	Status	Slippage
3	3	6	100.00%		100.00%	N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Over the past ten years, South Dakota on average receives approximately 6 mediation requests per year. The data for 2019-20 reporting year did not change and the results are similar to previous years, which indicates there were no impacts due to COVID19.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

16 - 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:

Director of Special Education Programs

Email:

linda.turner@state.sd.us

Phone:

605-773-3327

Submitted on: