

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART B

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

**For reporting on
FFY 2022**

South Dakota



PART B DUE February 1, 2024

**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 the IDEA Part B requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions).

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

Accountability Reviews

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

LEAs may also receive an on-site or off-site focused accountability review. Focused reviews are generally related to disproportionality, board recommended review for state funded extraordinary cost fund (ECF) recipients, high rates of alternate assessment participation, and follow-up of corrective actions resulting from a state complaint or due process complaint with findings of noncompliance. Results Driven Accountability (RDA) Coaches review specific areas related to the findings and verify continued compliance.

If noncompliance has been identified, a finding in the form of a corrective action plan (CAP) is issued by the SEA. The CAP includes the noncompliance issue, citation of the statute or regulation, and/or data supporting the conclusion and outlines the action the LEA must take to meet compliance. 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 as well as documentation of continued compliance. Part of the corrective action may include targeted technical assistance overseen by the SEA.

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

Fiscal Monitoring

Fiscal monitoring includes the review and approval of the IDEA application that LEAs submit to the Department of Education (DOE) to apply for IDEA Part B 611, Part B 619, and, if applicable, Coordinated Early Intervention Services (CEIS)/Comprehensive CEIS (CCEIS) funds. The SEA reviews each application to make certain it meets program requirements using a multi-faceted approach.

During a fiscal review of the IDEA funds, the LEA submits its accounting records. Grants Management compares accounting records that have a separate identifier to track IDEA Part B 611, Part B 619, CEIS/CCEIS, and private school proportionate share separately. Grants Management then compares accounting records with reimbursement requests and the approved grant application.

If the LEA utilized voluntary CEIS funds, up to 15%, to provide services to non-identified students (not on an IEP) the DOE verifies usage through a fiscal review and special education accountability review. This process is also used for CCEIS requirements. CCEIS requires funds to be spent on non-identified students and students with IEPs. The LEA separately tracks and accounts for IDEA funds used for CCEIS and/or CEIS in the LEAs accounting software. LEAs must submit a separate budget for these funds which are reviewed in the same manner as Part B 611 and 619 funds.

Maintenance of Effort (MOE) uses an eligibility test or compliance test to determine if each LEA will meet MOE to be eligible to receive the IDEA grant. Each year during the eligibility test, which takes place during the IDEA application, the LEA will input their estimated expenditures for the reporting fiscal year. LEAs are provided with comparison year data, which is the last time they met MOE using the specific method. The compliance test takes place each year to determine if an LEA has spent enough local expenditures, state and local combined expenditures, local per capita expenditures, or state and local per capita expenditures. There are federally allowable exceptions that allow for an LEA to reduce its required expenditure threshold. Documentation and verification are used to ensure they are allowable exceptions. If the LEA is unable to establish an allowable exception, noncompliance will be issued and the LEA will be required to pay the shortfall amount.

If the LEA has a private school, the DOE verifies the LEA expended the required proportionate share designated and budgeted in the application for IDEA funds. The LEA is required to document and upload the private school consultation. If the LEA used private school personnel to provide equitable services, the SEA verifies that services were performed outside of the regular duty hours and under the supervision of the public agency.

The DOE does a fiscal cross-cutting review to ensure the LEA is supplementing and not supplanting federal funds. The DOE conducts checks to determine 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 or special education program. During the accountability review, the SEA confirms the LEA is maintaining equipment as required. 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, evidence-based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

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

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

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

1. RDA Coaches. These individuals are contracted through educational cooperatives to conduct accountability reviews. They also conduct regional training around IEP procedures for students ages 3 through 21, present at teacher preparation programs, and conduct training related to CAPs. The coaches support the implementation of RDA as outlined in the LEA action plan.
2. Transition Services Liaison Project (TSLP). This program is a collaborative partnership between the DOE and the Department of Human Services, Division of Rehabilitation Services. TSLP staff are regionally located and focus on supporting high school transition. They make one-on-one connections with high school special education teachers and personnel. They provide technical assistance in writing compliant IEPs, identify 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 to support students. The coordinators are trained in Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) processes.
4. Educational cooperatives, South Dakota Services for the Deaf (formerly SD School for the Deaf), and the Center for Disabilities. These organizations provide specialized training and technical assistance in areas of regional and statewide need identified through LEA accountability review and input.
5. The Navigator Program. This program is contracted through South Dakota Parent Connection (SDPC), the State's OSEP funded parent training and information center (PTI). Each Navigator Program consultant serves as an objective and neutral party while assisting parents and school personnel. Navigators also assist in locating and utilizing information, improving communication, building (or re-building) partnerships, and making progress toward mutual agreements. SDPC develops and presents to parents and LEAs on a variety of topics based on the types of cases they are receiving and issues the SEA identifies through accountability reviews and the dispute resolution process. The SEA also analyzes the areas of concern identified by the Navigator Program to determine what technical assistance and professional development is needed for parents and LEAs. The Navigator Program webpage is located at <https://sdparent.org/about/information-center/#Navigator-Program>.

Professional Development System:

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

Professional development is provided in a variety of ways due to South Dakota's (SD) large area and rural nature. SD has 77,111 square miles and 149 LEAs. The LEAs are differentiated by the total student population with 31 that have an enrollment of 200 or less, 79 have an enrollment between 201 and 600, and 39 have an enrollment of over 600. Trainings are offered in a variety of formats including state level, regionally, and virtually which allows LEA staff to access appropriate professional development. The SEA professional development revolves around data collection, the IEP process, behavior, response to intervention, instructional coaching, early childhood, and other pertinent areas. Professional development areas are identified through accountability reviews, RDA internal review feedback, dispute resolution, LEA input, and input from the stakeholder groups (including the South Dakota Advisory Panel for Children with Disabilities (SDAPCD) and SDPC).

IEP process workshops are held every fall across SD. In the fall of 2022, the SEA offered several opportunities for basic, advanced, transition, and early childhood IEP workshops virtually and in person. The IEP basic workshop targets new special education staff and covers the IEP process from referral, evaluation, and eligibility to IEP development. Approximately 137 LEA staff statewide attended the basic workshop. The advanced IEP workshop focused on utilizing data throughout the special education process. Approximately 400 LEA staff statewide attended the advanced training. The transition IEP workshop covers high school transition and IEP processes. The transition workshop had approximately 126 LEA staff attend. The early childhood workshop focuses on Part C to Part B transition, preschool outcomes, and least restrictive environments. There were approximately 83 LEA staff that attended the early childhood workshops.

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

The SEA partners with Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) to offer webinar training on specialized topics. Topics include legal updates, behavior, bullying, restraint and seclusion, discipline, attendance and absenteeism, and confidentiality of student records. A new special education director webinar series is conducted every two to three years targeting five areas of general supervision including the SPP/APR, budget and fiscal, dispute resolution, accountability, and child count. All TAESE webinar recordings and handouts mentioned above are posted at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/webinars.aspx>. Specialized training for IEP facilitators, mediators, complaint investigators, and hearing officers is also provided through TAESE and The Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE).

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

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

Entities such as the Center for Disabilities provide frequent and timely feedback and technical assistance through virtual meetings, in-person, and other avenues to parents and LEAs. Other professional development offered includes training on meeting the needs of students with autism spectrum disorder and challenging behaviors, administration of the Autism Diagnostic Observation Schedule (ADOS), supporting mental health, Program for the Education and Enrichment of Relational Skills (PEERS) training, and training for general education teachers on supporting students with disabilities.

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

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

Stakeholder Engagement:

The mechanisms for broad stakeholder engagement, including activities carried out to obtain input from, and build the capacity of, a diverse group of parents to support the implementation activities designed to improve outcomes, including target setting and any subsequent revisions to targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The SEA seeks broad stakeholder representation utilizing existing DOE stakeholder groups, other government agency groups, and at conferences conducted by other educational and disability focused entities. Stakeholders are invited to serve on stakeholder groups through targeted emails, announcements in publications and webinars, and individual invitations from LEAs, tribal education, Head Start Collaboration Office, Part C, and by working with Disability Rights of South Dakota (DRSD) and SDPC to increase involvement of parents and individuals with disabilities. Stakeholders include representatives from DOE divisions, LEA administrators, general and special education teachers, related services personnel, SDPC staff, professors, parents, educational cooperative staff, SDAPCD, and contractors. To establish a representative sample that reflects diversity across SD, the SEA includes stakeholders from varying demographics, geographic areas, and LEA enrollment sizes. Targeted recruitment efforts include working with LEAs to identify and directly invite stakeholders in communities with more diverse populations. Although the stakeholder participants were mainly White or American Indian, they did represent students of varying race and ethnicities by either working directly with students or providing supports to students and families. The students that stakeholders served included American Indian, White, African American, Asian, Hispanic, and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. The stakeholder participants also represented students aged 3-21 and in the 14 disability categories.

The SEA builds capacity by educating stakeholders, including parents, on the indicators at each meeting and by presenting throughout the year on data collection and results on individual indicators. Presentations include what is being measured and how it is calculated, current results, historical data, how the data is collected, how the indicators impact each other as well as how student outcomes are impacted and areas of strength and need. Stakeholders also receive information on what can be done to improve data quality and improvement activities to address areas of need.

In addition to opportunities to share input in person, stakeholders were provided opportunities to review recommendations and proposals and provide input through email and chat during webinars.

The SEA utilizes SDAPCD quarterly meetings to build stakeholder capacity and gain feedback on the SPP. In January, the SEA provides an overview of the SPP, panel expectations and opportunities to provide feedback related to the SPP, information on each indicator and the relationship to student outcomes, historical and current data, and activities occurring to improve student outcomes. In September, the SEA reviews OSEP determinations with panel members, what the results mean, areas of strength and need, and requests stakeholder feedback. Dispute resolution information is shared with SDAPCD and feedback is provided on how to improve practices. During the September meeting, the panel identifies a priority area to work on throughout the year based on a review of data from the SPP, accountability reviews, dispute resolution, Navigator Program data, and stakeholder feedback.

The SEA met with a large stakeholder group in September 2023 to review FFY 2021 data, historical data, and to gather stakeholder feedback. Stakeholders who attended the data drill down were provided training and information on the SPP indicators and why they are important to student outcomes, historical and current data, and activities to improve student outcomes. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to review and analyze statewide data through small group activities using guided activity and feedback sheets. Information from each group was shared during the drill down and participants had an opportunity to share additional information via email. The SEA staff used the feedback to prepare and share information with other stakeholder groups.

On December 14, 2023, SEA staff presented the FFY 2021 SPP to students, parents, family advocates, general and special education teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals, and probation officers at the Lakota Nations Education conference. Stakeholders represented early childhood through high school, college, multiple regions throughout the state, multiple disability categories, and several race and ethnicities (Black, American Indian, White, and Hispanic). Information shared included what the SPP is, how the indicators connect, areas the SEA is doing well, and areas to improve. The SEA shared background information, state data, previous stakeholder information, and SEA supports. Stakeholders were provided an opportunity to work in small groups or individually to develop ideas based on the information presented to improve results and to share their ideas verbally and through feedback forms.

On January 8, 2024, SEA staff presented the SPP to parents during a SDPC family advisory committee meeting. SDPC sent the public meeting invite to all parents on their listserv. Information shared included an overview of the SPP, how the indicators connect to each other and student improvement,

areas of strengths, and areas of need. The SEA shared background information, state data, previous stakeholder information, and SEA supports. The parent group was provided an opportunity to share feedback during the session.

On January 26, 2024, the SDAPCD reviewed preliminary data results of the FFY 2022 SPP and provided feedback. The SDAPCD is made up of parents of children with disabilities, individuals with disabilities, administrators, DRSD, vocational rehabilitation, higher education, juvenile justice, private schools, McKinney Vento Homeless Education, and other state agencies. This meeting was broadcast live through public broadcasting and recordings are made available at <https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=16> under the "Archived Meetings" tab. The SDAPCD represents a variety of student ages, disabilities, race and ethnic backgrounds, and locations throughout the state.

The SEA also offers stakeholder opportunities throughout the year on targeted indicators.

In the spring, the SEA conducted the following activities:

1. During five assessment workshops, LEA assessment coordinators and special education directors are asked to share input on Indicator 3 regarding increasing the participation of students in statewide assessments and improving the proficiency of students with disabilities on both the regular and alternate assessments.
2. Feedback was solicited from LEA and parent stakeholders on the Indicator 8 parent survey to assist the SEA with revising the survey questions and improving collection methods.
3. Indicator 13 and 14 data was presented to the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Board. Data was shared and feedback was provided on improvement strategies and activities for secondary transition.

In the fall, the SEA conducted the following activities:

1. Indicator 17 SSIP progress and activities were reviewed with stakeholders during the SEA Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Advisory Committee.
2. During the MTSS stakeholder meeting, stakeholders reviewed data and progress of the MTSS initiative and participated in a facilitated feedback process for each component of the initiative in relation to Indicator 17.
3. Stakeholder input is obtained directly from LEAs on specific indicators through the RDA process. LEAs in level 2 and 3 participate in a data retreat using indicator data at the LEA and the SEA level. The analysis focuses on instruction, curriculum, environment, and learner needs along with the IEP's role in improving indicator data. After analysis of the data, LEAs identify improvement strategies to support root cause areas and develop an action plan and progress measures. The SEA reviews the LEA's data analysis and action plan to determine supports needed by the LEAs.

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

NO

Number of Parent Members:

28

Parent Members Engagement:

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

Parents from the SDAPCD, SDPC, DRSD, and other parents of students with disabilities were invited to formal stakeholder meetings to engage in reviewing and analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, evaluating progress, and to collaborate with other stakeholders with a variety of backgrounds. During the stakeholder meetings, the SEA provided guiding questions to assist stakeholders with completing an in-depth dive into the data to help them identify areas of need and recommend improvement activities.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

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

The SEA developed a Parent Guide to the IEP Process for LEAs to educate parents on the components of the IEP and special education processes. The guide is intended to increase parents' understanding of special education and IEP development to improve parent involvement and improve outcomes for students with disabilities. The SEA also shares out resources such as checklists and brochures on preschool outcomes, transition, and post-school outcomes through conferences and topical listservs.

Partner entities provide additional support and training on special education topics to help parents build their capacity to provide input and engage in special education and stakeholder processes. SDPC offers online workshops, technical assistance, and written resources for parents and LEAs. DRSD offers training in "Partners in Policymaking."

Soliciting Public Input:

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

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

The SPP/APR FFY 2021 webinar was made available and has been shared out with stakeholders since February 2023. In June 2023, SEA staff began identifying potential stakeholders and groups to assist with providing stakeholder feedback for FFY 2022. The SEA began notifying and recruiting stakeholders in August 2023 to attend the large stakeholder data drill down in September 2023. Notifications went out via the DOE listserv, targeted LEA email, SD Tribal Education, individual parent invites in August 2023, and through the SDAPCD.

Making Results Available to the Public:

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

The SEA posts the SPP/APR at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> by June 1st. In May 2023, announcements via DOE listservs, monthly special education webinars, and public notices went out alerting stakeholders that the FFY 2021 would be posted. The SEA presented FFY 2022 preliminary dispute resolution results to the SDAPCD in January 2024. The SEA presented all preliminary FFY 2022 data in January 2024. In February of each year, the SEA presents the final SPP/APR data that was submitted to OSEP on the monthly special education webinar.

Reporting to the Public

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.

Following the submission of the SPP/APR to the U.S. Department of Education, the SEA disseminated the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and LEA public information in the following ways:

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

The SEA disseminated the FFY 2021 SPP/APR and LEA public information by:

1. The SEA alerted constituency groups via existing listservs, email, and workshops.
2. The SEA staff presented current SPP/APR preliminary data and results to the SDAPCD in January of each year.
3. The SEA staff presented the data and results submitted to OSEP on February 1st during the monthly special education webinar in February.
4. SDPC shared with parents directions via newsletter and weekly updates on how to access the publication of the FFY 2021 SPP/APR on the SEA website.
5. The SEA provided electronic copies to all SDAPCD members.
6. The SEA provided access to alternative formats of this document (e.g., Braille, large print, hard copy, or digital) on request. Alternative forms can be requested at: South Dakota Department of Education Attn: Special Education Programs 800 Governor's Drive Pierre, SD 57501-2294.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Intro - OSEP Response

Intro - Required Actions

Indicator 1: Graduation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2019 | 67.99% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 67.99% | 67.99% |
| Data | 60.18% | 62.98% | 72.14% | 75.40% | 61.06% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 68.45% | 68.91% | 71.84% | 73.67% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies to improve the graduation rate. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 1 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Strategies suggested by stakeholders included continued training on graduation requirements, exit codes in the student information management system, and identifying accommodations versus modifications.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 617 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 72 |

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 265 |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 617 | 954 | 61.06% | 68.45% | 64.68% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

Graduation Conditions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NO

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling is not allowed.

Data for this indicator are "lag" data. Describe the results of the State's examination of the section 618 exiting data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), and compare the results to the target.

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

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

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

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2019 | 19.35% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 2.50% | 2.40% | 2.40% | 19.35% | 19.35% |
| Data | 3.30% | 3.01% | 2.55% | 18.17% | 31.49% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target <= | 18.38% | 17.40% | 14.60% | 10.70% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies to improve (decrease) dropout rate. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 2 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Strategies stakeholders suggested included continuing to examine data at the SEA and LEA levels to identify who is dropping out versus moved not known to continue, analyzing attendance rates and related targeted interventions, and identifying interventions and strategies to keep students engaged at the LEA level.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|--|------------|--|------|
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 617 |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | |
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (ED Facts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 72 |

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2021-22 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/24/2023 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 265 |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out | Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 265 | 954 | 31.49% | 18.38% | 27.78% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

The following criteria are used when counting youth as dropping out:

- 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) A student who has moved and is not known to continue in another LEA;
- 5) Does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: Transfer to another accredited education program, Temporary absence due to suspension or illness, Excused from public school attendance (SDCL 13-27-3), or Death.

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

NO

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3A - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3A will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Based on data review and analysis, stakeholders expressed that statewide assessment participation is increased by the SEA's policy of not having an opt-out option on the state assessment; students can only be excused from state testing if they submit and receive approval on a medical exemption. LEA stakeholders expressed that a few situations arise where parents refuse for their student to be tested, high school students do not come to school during testing, or students enrolled in on-line learning are out of state or not accessible for in-person assessment in a secure testing environment. Despite these special circumstances, LEAs express that participation in the state assessment overall is positive. LEA stakeholders who use interim assessments throughout the school year stated that their use of interims has increased their students' comfort level with the assessment platform, which has allowed the students to approach the state assessment with confidence.

Based on this stakeholder input, the SEA will continue training LEAs on the SEA policy of having all students participate in state assessments and will continue encouraging LEAs to use interim assessments to foster positive participation in the state assessment. The SEA will review medical exemption applications as needed.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**Data Source:**

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 2,136 | 1,346 | 944 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,768 | 1,114 | 737 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 235 | 129 | 98 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 119 | 88 | 79 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|---|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs (2) | 2,136 | 1,347 | 944 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations (3) | 1,604 | 978 | 766 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations (3) | 397 | 264 | 71 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 120 | 87 | 79 |

(1) The children with IEPs who are English learners and took the ELP in lieu of the regular reading/language arts assessment are not included in the prefilled data in this indicator.

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

(3) The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments, as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 2,122 | 2,136 | 99.33% | 95.79% | 99.34% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 1,331 | 1,346 | 98.06% | 95.00% | 98.89% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 914 | 944 | 95.20% | 95.00% | 96.82% | Met target | No Slippage |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Participating | Number of Children with IEPs | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 2,121 | 2,136 | 99.43% | 97.50% | 99.30% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 1,329 | 1,347 | 97.99% | 95.00% | 98.66% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 916 | 944 | 95.08% | 95.00% | 97.03% | Met target | No Slippage |

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3A - OSEP Response

3A - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3B - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3B will be maintained for FFY 2022.

LEA stakeholders expressed that proficiency scores appear low over the years and some students continually perform at the lowest level. Stakeholders expressed that the reported data does not reflect those students who are still not proficient but did move up one level in their assessment results. LEA stakeholders felt the focus for increasing proficiency needs to be on instruction and targeting students to help close the gaps. LEAs and the SEA have access to reports in the statewide longitudinal data system that identifies students who are closing the gap. Stakeholders recommended the SEA focus training on utilizing the data to help plan and target instruction for students. Parent stakeholders agreed that LEAs should be looking at what is being taught to the students and inquired how the SEA could better support LEAs and families in understanding the connection between assessment and instruction, particularly for low performing students. LEA stakeholders who use interim assessments as instructional tools throughout the school year

stated that their use of interims has increased their students' comfort level with the assessment platform, which has allowed the students to approach the state assessment with ease of mind and technology accessibility. This comfort level helps remove barriers to proficiency.

Based on this stakeholder input, the SEA will provide focused training to LEAs on using interim assessments to prepare students and to use the results to inform instruction. The SEA will continue to encourage LEAs to have students navigate the assessment platform and digital tools through interim tests throughout the school year. The SEA trains teachers on the importance of choosing the least restrictive environment/placement for students, so students have access to the maximum amount of general education grade level content as possible. The SEA also provides targeted RDA coaching to LEAs identified as needing support. The SEA provides SSIP supports and trainings directly to LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from ED Facts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (ED Facts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,003 | 1,243 | 835 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 369 | 128 | 122 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 19 | 12 | 11 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (ED Facts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,001 | 1,242 | 837 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 403 | 86 | 33 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 40 | 5 | 2 |

(1)The term "regular assessment" is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 388 | 2,003 | 21.71% | 19.14% | 19.37% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 140 | 1,243 | 10.60% | 10.91% | 11.26% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 133 | 835 | 17.30% | 16.33% | 15.93% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The SEA reviewed high school reading proficiency data and found that while the proficiency of students with disabilities decreased by 1.37%, the proficiency of all students also decreased similarly by 1.79%. Possible reasons for slippage in proficiency for Group C in the Reading Assessment could be that this group of students were in 8th grade during COVID19 school closures, therefore they missed out on vital basic reading instruction in their 8th grade year. When they entered their freshman year of high school with higher level reading courses, they fell behind in proficiency because they were never able to make up for that year of missed basic skills. Additionally, this is the group's first time participating in state assessment since before the pandemic.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 443 | 2,001 | 21.51% | 21.22% | 22.14% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 91 | 1,242 | 6.47% | 7.09% | 7.33% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 35 | 837 | 4.16% | 3.86% | 4.18% | Met target | No Slippage |

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3B - OSEP Response

3B - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

3C - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3C will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Stakeholders discussed that the academic proficiency scores for this population of students only reflect the academic performance of the students and do not incorporate the full scope of their instruction, including adaptive communication, life and career skills, and the use of accessibility tools or assistive technology. Stakeholders discussed that even with extensive supports, it is difficult for many students with significant cognitive needs to make substantial gains in proficiency. A student moving up one level of proficiency would be significant. Stakeholders suggested that self-contained classroom teachers need more options and support for collaboration to incorporate academic instruction on grade level standards using the Core Content Connectors.

Based on this stakeholder input, the SEA will provide targeted training and technical assistance on how to utilize alternate academic achievement standards for student IEP goals and instruction and will explore effective ways to foster SEA communication with the LEA educators of students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provides educators with instructional resources found at <https://doe.sd.gov/assessment/alternate.aspx>. The SEA also provides in-person and virtual training to test coordinators and test administrators on how to administer the alternate assessment.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 119 | 88 | 79 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 33 | 22 | 27 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | 120 | 87 | 79 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | 56 | 30 | 29 |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 33 | 119 | 29.17% | 38.63% | 27.73% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 22 | 88 | 31.76% | 33.71% | 25.00% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| C | Grade HS | 27 | 79 | 39.56% | 56.70% | 34.18% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the LEA IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate with the regular state assessment.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEA's increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some LEA IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score worsened. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in worsening alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the LEA IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate with the regular state assessment instead.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEAs increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score decreased. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in decreasing alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate

with the regular state assessment instead.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEA's increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score worsened. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in worsening alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards | Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| A | Grade 4 | 56 | 120 | 58.33% | 54.63% | 46.67% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 30 | 87 | 38.82% | 39.56% | 34.48% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 29 | 79 | 40.66% | 57.36% | 36.71% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage for Group A, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the LEA IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate with the regular state assessment instead.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEA's increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some LEA IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score worsened. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in worsening alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group B, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the LEA IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate with the regular state assessment instead.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEA's increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some LEA IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score worsened. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in worsening alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Provide reasons for slippage for Group C, if applicable

The first reason for slippage in alternate assessment proficiency across all groups and subjects may be due to the SEA's increased diligence in monitoring the 1% cap in the alternate assessment. The SEA sent emails to LEAs with student(s) who consistently scored at the highest proficiency level. The email provided an outline of the alternate assessment participation criteria and advised that the LEA IEP teams should consider if alternate assessment participation is appropriate for the student or if the student should be more involved in general education to the maximum extent appropriate with the regular state assessment instead.

A second reason for slippage may be due to the SEA's increased technical assistance regarding students with significant cognitive disabilities. The SEA provided webinars and in-person trainings specific to the alternate assessment participation criteria, alternate academic achievement standards, and how to provide alternate instruction on grade level content standards. Some LEAs did not realize the implications of alternate assessment participation and alternate academic achievement standards on the student's path to obtaining a regular high school diploma.

As a result of the monitoring and training described in the above two reasons, some LEA IEP teams determined that students who were most proficient on the alternate assessment should instead take the regular assessment because it is more appropriately ambitious for students. Because students who were more proficient no longer participated in the alternate assessment, the statewide alternate assessment proficiency score worsened. The SEA anticipates that this statewide shift in alternate assessment participation will result in worsening alternate assessment proficiency data across all groups in FFY 2023 as well.

A third reason for slippage may be due to students with the most significant needs returning to school buildings and participating in state testing after COVID19 school closures. Some of these students may achieve at lower score levels due to their severe disabilities and due to decreased rigorous instruction while these students were homebound during COVID19 school closures and the years following. These lower scores therefore worsen the statewide alternate assessment proficiency.

The SEA notes that current alternate assessment proficiency targets are significantly higher than current regular assessment proficiency targets. The SEA predicts that current and future alternate assessment proficiency scores are a more accurate reflection of proficiency due to students' recent appropriate identification and participation in the alternate assessment. Because alternate assessment proficiency targets were unmet on prior SPP/APRs and on this SPP/APR, the SEA will gather stakeholder input to determine if the alternate assessment proficiency targets for all groups and subjects should be adjusted for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR.

Regulatory Information

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

Public Reporting Information

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

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

- 1) Go to <https://sdschools.sd.gov/#/home>.
- 2) Scroll to the bottom of the screen. To explore State results, click on the "State" icon. To explore School or District results, click on the "Schools" or "Districts" icon, or type the school or district name in the "Find Your School" search box.
- 3) Click on "Student Performance".
- 4) Scroll down to the "Performance by Student Population" section.
- 5) Click the green "View Details" button and select "Students With Disabilities."
- 6) Below the "Interactive Analysis" title, click on "Table".
- 7) The data can be filtered and explored by proficiency, participation, grade level, subject, regular or alternate assessment, and with or without

accommodations. To view full results, scroll to the bottom of the table and drag the slide bar to the right.

8) To export data, go to the upper right corner of the Student Performance Table. Hover cursor over the three dots and select a document type.

9) To view data from previous years, go to the upper right corner of the screen. Click the red "Options" menu and select "Prior Year Report Cards."

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

1) Go to <https://doe.sd.gov/assessment/alternate.aspx>.

2) Expand "1% Monitoring."

3) Select "District 1% Participation Justification."

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

<https://doe.sd.gov/assessment/alternate.aspx>

3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3C - OSEP Response

3C - Required Actions

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

Instructions

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

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

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2022-2023 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

3D - Indicator Data

Historical Data:

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

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 3D will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Stakeholders were pleased to see the targets were met across all groups and subjects. Stakeholders expressed that the correct identification and implementation of accommodations for students on IEPs contributed to closing the gap.

Based on this stakeholder input, the SEA will continue providing SSIP supports and trainings directly to LEAs to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

FFY 2022 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

Date:

01/10/2024

Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,300 | 10,487 | 9,331 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,003 | 1,243 | 835 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 4,706 | 4,980 | 5,870 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 185 | 199 | 188 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 369 | 128 | 122 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 19 | 12 | 11 |

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

Date:

01/10/2024

Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade (1)

| Group | Grade 4 | Grade 8 | Grade HS |
|--|---------|---------|----------|
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 10,329 | 10,524 | 9,342 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 2,001 | 1,242 | 837 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 4,742 | 3,827 | 3,383 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 203 | 158 | 99 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 403 | 86 | 33 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | 40 | 5 | 2 |

(1)The term “regular assessment” is an aggregation of the following types of assessments as applicable for each grade/ grade group: regular assessment based on grade-level achievement standards, advanced assessment, Innovative Assessment Demonstration Authority (IADA) pilot assessment, high school regular assessment I, high school regular assessment II, high school regular assessment III and locally-selected nationally recognized high school assessment in the prefilled data in this indicator.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 19.37% | 47.49% | 27.68 | 29.54 | 28.11 | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 11.26% | 49.38% | 38.69 | 41.14 | 38.12 | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 15.93% | 64.92% | 45.97 | 49.66 | 49.00 | Met target | No Slippage |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

| Group | Group Name | Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|-------|------------|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A | Grade 4 | 22.14% | 47.87% | 26.16 | 26.26 | 25.74 | Met target | No Slippage |
| B | Grade 8 | 7.33% | 37.87% | 30.96 | 32.57 | 30.54 | Met target | No Slippage |
| C | Grade HS | 4.18% | 37.27% | 33.44 | 35.49 | 33.09 | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3D - OSEP Response

3D - Required Actions

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| Target <= | 33.33% | 33.33% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | Not Valid and Reliable |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought related to OSEP’s comments from the FFY 2021 SPP, adjusting or maintaining the current targets for FFY 2022, and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. The SEA informed stakeholders that due to Indicator 4A being a lag year indicator that the FFY 2022 calculation had been completed before OSEP’s determination and comment that the methodology used was not valid and reliable for FFY 2021. Stakeholders inquired about reliable methodologies for LEAs with low numbers of students suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days that would not skew the data and result in inappropriate identification of LEAs with significant discrepancy. Stakeholders recommended that the SEA provide options for updating the validity and reliability of the data and methodology used for determining 4A for FFY 2023. The SEA is researching and calculating alternative methodologies and will present options and seek further stakeholder input to identify a comparison method that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table. The SEA will then adopt the methodology and apply it to the upcoming calculation that will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP. Based on this discussion and following consideration of the FFY 2022 SPP data, stakeholders and the advisory panel determined that the target for Indicator 4A will be maintained for FFY 2022.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

147

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|----------|
| 0 | 2 | Not Valid and Reliable | 0.00% | Not Valid and Reliable | N/A | N/A |

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

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

State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology

The SEA defines significant discrepancy as a LEA having 5% or greater of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days out of the total number of students with disabilities in the LEA after applying the minimum cell size.

The initial criterion necessitates that an LEA has a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities, subjected to suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days. Subsequently, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to ascertain if any LEA surpasses the specified 5.00% threshold. The SEA utilizes the formula ((# of students with disabilities suspended/expelled in the LEA > 10 days) / (Total # of students with disabilities on annual child count in the LEA)*100) when calculating significant discrepancy.

Among 149 LEAs, 80.54% (120) reported no instances of students with disabilities receiving suspension or expulsion for more than 10 days, while 19.46% (29) of LEAs reported students with disabilities receiving suspension or expulsion for more than 10 days.

The 29 LEAs suspending or expelling one or more students for greater than 10 days are broken out as follows:

- Fourteen LEAs suspended one student
- Five LEAs suspended two students
- Two LEAs suspended three students
- Three LEAs suspended four students
- Three LEAs suspended five to eight students

Of the 29 LEAs with one or more students suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, two LEAs met the minimum cell size of 10 students for inclusion in the calculation of significant discrepancy.

The SEA has engaged with stakeholders on many occasions to receive input on the methodology to define and calculate significant discrepancy. Due to the utilization of a minimum cell size, a significant number of LEAs are excluded from the significant discrepancy calculation. Due to the demographics and size of LEAs across SD, the overall number of students with disabilities suspended in any given LEA is minimal. To ensure LEAs excluded from the calculation are implementing appropriate policies and procedures for suspension/expulsion, the SEA incorporates a review of policy, practices, and procedures related to suspension and expulsion during LEA accountability reviews as well as reviewing individual files for each student suspended for greater than 10 days.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Although the SEA utilizes a minimum cell size that excludes a majority of the LEAs, through internal data analysis and accountability reviews, the SEA has determined that there is not a significant rate or systemic issue of suspensions and expulsions for greater than 10 days.

Due to the demographics and size of LEAs across SD and the number of students with disabilities suspended in any given LEA, not finding any LEA with a significant discrepancy is reasonable and representative of the SEA population.

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 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.

Twenty-nine LEAs reported suspending or expelling one or more student(s) for greater than 10 days. Of the 29 LEAs, two met the minimum cell size of 10 students for removals. However, no LEAs suspended over 5% of their special education students for greater than 10 days and therefore no LEAs were required to review policies, procedures, and practices.

Although no LEAs were identified as having significant discrepancy for this indicator, the following processes have been identified to verify LEAs are implementing appropriate policies and procedures related to the suspension and expulsion of students with disabilities if there was a significant discrepancy:

1. The SEA will review the LEA's policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure that these policies, procedures, and practices comply with IDEA.
2. The SEA will interview LEA staff and select files from different school levels to determine if implementation of the policies, procedures, and practices related to the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports are being implemented to reduce suspension/expulsions.
3. The SEA will also require the LEA to review, and as necessary, revise their policies, procedures, and practices if noncompliance was identified.

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 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the inherent limitations posed by a small student population and the consequent difficulty in achieving statistical significance, the SEA is actively collaborating with stakeholders to refine its methodology for FFY 2023. The SEA is focusing on exploring multiple alternatives for determining a SEA mean, to identify LEAs with significant discrepancies. To address the challenges associated with small sample sizes and highly right skewed data, alternative methodologies such as density-based clustering and leveraging domain knowledge are being considered. These strategic revisions aim to produce a more accurate and comprehensive measure that aligns with federal requirements.

The SEA will engage with stakeholders and provide options for updating the methodology used for determining 4A for the FFY 2023. The SEA is researching and calculating alternative methodologies and will present options and seek stakeholder input to identify a comparison method that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table. The SEA will then adopt the methodology and apply it to the upcoming calculation that will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP. No change was made in the FFY 2022 SPP due to Indicator 4 being a lag year indicator and that the FFY 2022 calculation had been completed prior to OSEP's determination and comment that the methodology used was not valid and reliable for FFY 2021.

4A - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported it compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "The initial criterion necessitates that an LEA has a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities, subjected to suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days. Subsequently, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to ascertain if any LEA surpasses the specified 5.00% threshold. The SEA utilizes the formula ((# of students with disabilities suspended/expelled in the LEA > 10 days) / (Total # of students with disabilities on annual child count in the LEA)*100) when calculating significant discrepancy." It is unclear to OSEP whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must provide valid and reliable data for this indicator for FFY 2023 using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance Indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Include State's definition of "significant discrepancy."

Instructions

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

Describe the results of the State's examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, use data from 2021-2022), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State's examination must include one of the following comparisons:

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

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

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the section 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2021-2022 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported section 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2022-2023, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2021-2022 section 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2021-2022 (which can be found in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR introduction).

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, dated July 24, 2023.

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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

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

YES

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

147

| Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity | Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements | Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell-size | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---|---------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------|----------|
| 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.00% | 0% | Not Valid and Reliable | N/A | N/A |

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

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

The SEA defines significant discrepancy as a LEA having 5% or greater of students with disabilities suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days out of the total number of students in the LEA after applying the minimum cell size.

The initial criterion necessitates that an LEA has a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities, with at least 10 students with disabilities subjected to suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days. Subsequently, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to ascertain if any LEA surpasses the specified 5.00% threshold to calculate significant discrepancy. The SEA utilizes the formula ((# of students with disabilities suspended/expelled in the LEA > 10 days) / (Total # of Students with Disabilities on annual child count in the LEA) * 100) when calculating significant discrepancy.

The SEA follows this same process for each and every race/ethnic group. Every LEA has a suspension/expulsion rate calculated for each of the seven race/ethnicity categories. Some LEAs do not have students with disabilities suspended or expelled in a given race/ethnicity, but the SEA calculates it for every race/ethnic category that is present at the LEA. The suspension/expulsion-rate bar that the SEA uses for each race/ethnic group is the same suspension/expulsion-rate bar that was used for 4A (i.e., the 5.00%); in other words, the same suspension/expulsion-rate bar for each and every race/ethnic group. A LEA has a significant discrepancy if the suspension/expulsion rate for children with disabilities from any race/ethnic group is 5.00% or higher and the group met the minimum cell size.

Of the 149 LEAs, 120 LEAs did not report suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days.

Twenty-nine LEAs reported suspending one or more students for greater than 10 days. This means only 19.46% of the LEAs have data to be considered in the analysis.

Because 4B is based on race/ethnicity, the SEA disaggregated the data by instances of race/ethnicity groups. For example: LEA A had white students and also had Black students suspended for greater than 10 days. LEA A would be identified with two instances even though they belong to one LEA.

The breakdown of the data by instances of a sub-category of students in each LEA with suspension and expulsion of more than 10 days by race/ethnic

group is as follows:

24 instances had 1 student in a race/ethnic group,
 7 instances had a total of 2 students in a race/ethnic group,
 2 instances had a total of 3 students in a race/ethnic group,

Of the 31 instances across 29 LEAs, two LEAs met the minimum cell size of 10 students. The race/ethnic groups included White, two or more races, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian or Alaska Native race/ethnic groups for removals.

Subsequently, only one LEA suspended or expelled 5% or greater in a race/ethnic group and met the minimum cell size to be identified with significant discrepancy for the race/ethnic group of American Indian.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2022 using 2021-2022 data)

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

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

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

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In response to the inherent limitations posed by a small student population and the consequent difficulty in achieving statistical significance, the SEA is actively collaborating with stakeholders to refine its methodology for FFY 2023. The SEA is focusing on exploring multiple alternatives for determining a SEA mean, to identify LEAs with significant discrepancies. To address the challenges associated with small sample sizes and highly right skewed data, alternative methodologies such as density-based clustering and leveraging domain knowledge are being considered. These strategic revisions aim to produce a more accurate and comprehensive measure that aligns with federal requirements.

The SEA will engage with stakeholders and provide options for updating the methodology used for determining 4B for the FFY 2023. The SEA is researching and calculating alternative methodologies and will present options and seek stakeholder input to identify a comparison method that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table. The SEA will then adopt the methodology and apply it to the upcoming calculation that will be reported in the FFY 2023 SPP. No change was made in the FFY 2022 SPP due to Indicator 4 being a lag year indicator and that the FFY 2022 calculation had been completed before OSEP's determination and comment that the methodology used was not valid and reliable for FFY 2021.

4B - OSEP Response

OSEP cannot determine whether the data are valid and reliable. The State reported it compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State. However, in its narrative, the State reported, "The initial criterion necessitates that an LEA has a minimum cell size of 10 students with disabilities, with at least 10 students with disabilities subjected to suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days. Subsequently, the SEA applies the suspension/expulsion-rate bar method to ascertain if any LEA surpasses the specified 5.00% threshold to calculate significant discrepancy. The SEA utilizes the formula ((# of students with disabilities suspended/expelled in the LEA > 10 days) / (Total # of Students with

Disabilities on annual child count in the LEA)*100) when calculating significant discrepancy." Therefore, it is unclear whether the State's chosen methodology meets one of the two comparison methods as required by the Measurement Table. Therefore, OSEP could not determine whether the State met its target.

4B- Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must provide valid and reliable data for this indicator for FFY 2023 using a methodology that meets one of the two comparison methods as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.170(a) and the Measurement Table.

The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that any districts identified with noncompliance in FFY 2022 have corrected the noncompliance, including that the State verified that each district with noncompliance: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirement(s) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data, such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the district, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance (greater than 0% actual target data for this indicator), provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

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

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.

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

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

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Part | Baseline | FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 67.50% | 68.00% | 68.00% | 75.96% | 75.96% |
| A | 75.96% | Data | 71.01% | 72.08% | 73.91% | 75.96% | 75.52% |
| B | 2020 | Target <= | 6.00% | 6.00% | 6.00% | 5.57% | 5.57% |
| B | 5.57% | Data | 5.46% | 5.57% | 5.38% | 5.57% | 5.63% |
| C | 2020 | Target <= | 3.39% | 3.29% | 3.29% | 1.67% | 1.67% |
| C | 1.67% | Data | 1.94% | 1.99% | 1.99% | 1.67% | 1.37% |

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 5 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

The goal for Indicator 5 is for all students to be educated in a regular education classroom to the maximum extent possible. In order to achieve the goal, stakeholders provided suggested strategies: Develop IEP examples to include IEP documentation focused on why the student will be in the general education setting instead of focusing on why the student is removed and the IEP team utilizing data and interventions to support students in the classroom. Stakeholders suggested the SEA develop training for both general education and special education staff that focuses on effective teaching methods for all students such as reading instruction, accommodations and supports, and behavior support techniques.

Stakeholders identified that students with cognitive needs are more likely to be in restrictive educational environments instead of general education with modifications. Stakeholders suggested instructional trainings for teachers and information for parents to improve inclusion was needed. The SEA began providing more instructional trainings and resources for this population.

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|--------|
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 21,399 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 16,359 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,194 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 140 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 124 |
| SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 08/30/2023 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 37 |

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 2022 SPP/APR Data

| Education Environments | Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 16,359 | 21,399 | 75.52% | 76.68% | 76.45% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 1,194 | 21,399 | 5.63% | 5.57% | 5.58% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 301 | 21,399 | 1.37% | 1.67% | 1.41% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

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

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

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

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

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

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

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

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

6 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data (Inclusive) – 6A, 6B, 6C

| Part | FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | Target >= | 21.55% | 21.65% | 21.65% | 21.76% | 22.00% |
| A | Data | 24.24% | 23.33% | 23.79% | 21.76% | 21.34% |
| B | Target <= | 16.16% | 16.16% | 16.16% | 18.15% | 17.93% |
| B | Data | 14.45% | 14.85% | 13.62% | 18.15% | 19.23% |
| C | Target <= | | | | 1.67% | 1.27% |
| C | Data | | | | 1.27% | 0.86% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current targets should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and discussion of the advisory panel, it was determined the targets for Indicator 6 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Stakeholder discussion centered around the availability of preschool placement options. SD does not fund preschool for all children thereby impacting the placements available for 6A. LEA and parent stakeholders commented that daycares in communities are experiencing shortages and closures which contributes to the challenge for LEAs without preschools to provide services outside of the service provider location or home. Stakeholders recommended the SEA share promising practices in communities meeting targets and preschool funding options to expand preschool placement options.

Stakeholders have reported that since the pandemic some preschoolers are being identified later and entering the program with significantly increased

needs and behaviors. Due to the needs of these students, they may be placed in more restrictive environments at a higher rate. Stakeholders identified the need for expanding child find awareness and behavior training for preschool staff. The SEA will explore expanding behavior training offerings to include preschool or with a preschool specific focus. The SEA will work with entities such as SDPC and Head Start to boost awareness of preschool screening under child find.

Targets

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

Inclusive Targets

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

Target Range not used

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

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

Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B

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

Inclusive Targets – 6C

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target C <= | 1.26% | 1.24% | 1.22% | 1.20% |

Prepopulated Data

Data Source:

SY 2022-23 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

Date:

08/30/2023

| Description | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 through 5 - Total |
|--|-----|-----|-----|---------------------|
| Total number of children with IEPs | 583 | 872 | 378 | 1,833 |
| 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 | 110 | 161 | 82 | 353 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 113 | 149 | 60 | 322 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 3 | 6 | 5 | 14 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| c1. Number of children receiving special education and related services in the home | 14 | 10 | 3 | 27 |

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 2022 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5

| Preschool Environments | Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served | Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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 | 353 | 1,833 | 21.34% | 22.75% | 19.26% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 337 | 1,833 | 19.23% | 17.60% | 18.39% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 27 | 1,833 | 0.86% | 1.26% | 1.47% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

Students receiving the majority of their special education and related services in a regular early childhood program did not meet the target and had slippage. To meet the FFY 2022 target, 64 additional students needed to be served in the regular early childhood program. The total number of students receiving services in FFY 2021 was 1,852 compared to 1,833 in FFY 2022, a difference of 19 fewer students.

The SEA disaggregated the data to determine why the percentage for 6A decreased and slippage occurred. If 28 more students had received their services in the regular early childhood program slippage would not have occurred. In the fall of the 2022-2023 school year, one small LEA and one large LEA each implemented a separate class for students with disabilities. The small LEA's 6A percentage decreased from 20.00% to 12.50%. The large LEA increased the number of separate classroom placements by implementing an early childhood learning center in preparation for an "inclusive" early childhood learning center to open in the fall of 2023. While the change is encouraging for FFY 2023 targets, the LEA's percentage for 6A changed from 4.35% in FFY 2021 to 0.00% in FFY 2022. The decrease in two LEA's 6A percentages contributed to the slippage.

The SEA determined that 1,116 students were receiving services in other locations. The LEAs, with support from the SEA, need to continue to develop strategies to increase the number of students receiving services in 6A. If 64 more of the 1,116 students had been served in the regular early childhood program the target would have been met.

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

The home environment did not meet the target and had slippage. If four fewer students had been served in 6C the target would have been met. In FFY 2021, 16 students were served in the home compared to 27 students being served in the home in FFY 2022.

In determining the cause for slippage in FFY 2022, the SEA sought assistance from several LEAs to verify the educational environment of the students. It was determined that two LEAs incorrectly reported the placement for two students respectively (totaling four students) on child count. If the students had been reported correctly, the SEA would have reported that 1.25% of students were receiving services in the home, and the target of 1.26% would have been met. LEAs also made home placements for two students with compromised immune systems and in another case provided teletherapy in the home due to the remote location and travel time for the student.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SEA has provided professional development during the state Special Education Conference (attendance from LEAs, special education cooperatives, and Bureau of Indian Education agencies), Early Childhood Conference (attendance from LEAs, Head Starts, private preschools, childcare staff, and parents), Early Childhood Special Education workshops, LEA file reviews, LEA technical assistance via Zoom and phone, and monthly special education calls. The professional development components focused on state data to support LEAs on collaboration techniques with LEAs and outside early childhood providers and parents, funding resources for LEA preschools, and services and support within the preschool setting to support the students, staff, and parents. Another component of professional development focused on video examples of direct instruction techniques used by service providers while providing services in the regular early childhood classroom. The SEA has provided professional development to ensure accurate documentation of placement in the student information system and IEPs. The focus has been on helping LEAs determine the correct preschool environment for students based on their individual needs. Additionally, the SEA has scheduled 30-minute virtual sessions twice a month to guide early childhood teachers on decisions and processes related to Indicator 6. The SEA will continue to provide professional development as outlined above and host online training for stakeholders.

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 3 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|------|----------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A1 | 2018 | Target >= | 79.25% | 79.35% | 79.35% | 67.11% | 67.11% |
| A1 | 67.11% | Data | 70.00% | 67.11% | 67.74% | 70.02% | 66.12% |

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A2 | 2018 | Target >= | 84.25% | 84.35% | 84.35% | 71.79% | 71.79% |
| A2 | 71.79% | Data | 80.64% | 71.79% | 73.43% | 72.37% | 71.44% |
| B1 | 2018 | Target >= | 68.50% | 69.50% | 69.50% | 56.71% | 56.71% |
| B1 | 56.71% | Data | 62.41% | 56.71% | 57.74% | 56.10% | 57.09% |
| B2 | 2018 | Target >= | 56.96% | 57.96% | 57.96% | 51.89% | 51.89% |
| B2 | 51.89% | Data | 56.87% | 51.89% | 47.74% | 50.17% | 47.26% |
| C1 | 2018 | Target >= | 71.10% | 71.60% | 71.60% | 58.35% | 58.35% |
| C1 | 58.35% | Data | 61.49% | 58.35% | 60.06% | 60.78% | 56.45% |
| C2 | 2018 | Target >= | 72.60% | 73.60% | 73.60% | 66.13% | 66.13% |
| C2 | 66.13% | Data | 71.14% | 66.13% | 66.72% | 63.58% | 65.87% |

Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current targets should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and discussion of the advisory panel, it was determined that the targets for Indicator 7 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Since the pandemic, stakeholders identified that students are entering the program with increased significant needs and behaviors and suggested LEA early childhood staff receive training on managing students' behaviors. It was recommended the SEA share promising practices in LEAs meeting targets and improve early childhood teachers' knowledge and skills to work with students with significant needs and behaviors. The SEA will explore expanding behavior training offerings to include preschool or with a preschool specific focus.

Stakeholders also discussed the decline in attendance of preschool-aged students enrolled in an early childhood setting and parents canceling special education service time. Lack of attendance provides challenges for LEAs to address goals consistently to achieve substantial growth by the age of 6. Stakeholders recommended the SEA provide training and support to LEAs on addressing attendance to improve preschool outcomes. The SEA will work with entities such as SDPC and Head Start to promote the importance of students regularly attending the early childhood setting and special education services.

Stakeholders suggested continued training and information on the importance of collaboration between LEAs, Head Start programs, private preschools, and daycares to improve student outcomes through embedded instruction in various early childhood settings.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed

942

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 | 4 | 0.42% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 141 | 14.97% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 107 | 11.36% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 139 | 14.76% |

| Outcome A Progress Category | Number of children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 551 | 58.49% |

| Outcome A | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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> | 246 | 391 | 66.12% | 67.35% | 62.92% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 690 | 942 | 71.44% | 72.07% | 73.25% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| Outcome B Progress Category | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 15 | 1.59% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 249 | 26.43% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 150 | 15.92% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 180 | 19.11% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 348 | 36.94% |

| Outcome B | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 330 | 594 | 57.09% | 57.12% | 55.56% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 528 | 942 | 47.26% | 52.15% | 56.05% | Met target | No 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 | 10 | 1.06% |

| Outcome C Progress Category | Number of Children | Percentage of Children |
|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 205 | 21.76% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 120 | 12.74% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 104 | 11.04% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 503 | 53.40% |

| Outcome C | Numerator | Denominator | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|-----------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)</i> | 224 | 439 | 56.45% | 58.81% | 51.03% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. <i>Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)</i> | 607 | 942 | 65.87% | 66.36% | 64.44% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|---|
| A1 | <p>To determine why there was slippage in A1, the SEA examined results by LEA to determine how many LEAs experienced slippage. Data indicated that 31% of LEAs saw a decrease in their A1 score.</p> <p>Because this was not specific to a few LEAs, the SEA implemented a process to determine a cause for slippage. At the state level, 13 more students out of the 391 who had scores for A1 would have needed to show growth for there to be no slippage. Historically, there has been a higher percentage of males than females in the denominator for A1 and historical data shows males are less likely than females to make growth. In FFY 2022, 73% of the students exiting A1 were males compared to 70% in FFY 2021. In FFY 2022, 61% of the males made growth compared to 66% in FFY 2021, contributing to the slippage.</p> <p>In addition, there was a higher percentage of students with autism and students with multiple disabilities than other disabilities in the denominator for A1 in FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2021; and based on historical data, students with autism and multiple disabilities have shown less growth than students with other disabilities. Students with multiple disabilities showed less growth in FFY 2022 with 13.8% compared to 26.1% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>Slippage can also be attributed to the decline in attendance of preschool-aged students enrolled in an early childhood setting and parents canceling special education service time, as noted by stakeholders. Lack of student attendance provides challenges for LEAs to address goals consistently to achieve substantial growth by the age of 6.</p> <p>When disaggregating individual Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-2 and BDI-3) student data, 69 students were excluded contributing to the slippage. The exclusion of data was due to LEAs incorrectly entering student data in the online system, incomplete exit assessments, and the use of the BDI-2 for the entry assessments and the BDI-3 for the exit assessments. Due to the norming difference between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 students need to be administered the same BDI assessment when entering and exiting the program.</p> <p>Note that each LEA was provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregation of the scores over time and by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, placement, etc. LEAs can begin to determine which students showed growth and which did not. With LEAs and the SEA examining data for patterns, and then targeting select subgroups for increased performance, the growth rates for A1 should increase.</p> |
| B1 | <p>To determine why there was slippage in B1, the SEA examined results by LEA to determine how many experienced a slippage. Data indicated that 35% of the LEAs saw a decrease in their B1 score.</p> <p>Because this was not specific to a few LEAs, the SEA implemented a process to determine a cause for slippage. At the state level, 9 more students out of the 594 who had scores for B1 would have had to show growth for there to be no slippage. Historically, there has been a higher percentage of males than females in the denominator for B1 and historical data shows males are less likely than females to make growth. In FFY 2022 68% of the students exiting B1 were males compared to 64% in FFY 2021. In FFY 2022, 51% of the males</p> |

| Part | Reasons for slippage, if applicable |
|------|--|
| | <p>made growth compared to 55% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>In addition, there was a higher percentage of students with autism and students with multiple disabilities than other disabilities in the denominator for B1 in FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2021; and based on historical data, students with autism and multiple disabilities have shown less growth than students with other disabilities. Students with multiple disabilities showed less growth in FFY 2022 with 0.0% compared to 7.4% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>Slippage can also be attributed to the decline in attendance of preschool-aged students enrolled in an early childhood setting and parents canceling special education service time, as noted by stakeholders. Lack of student attendance provides challenges for LEAs to address goals consistently to achieve substantial growth by the age of 6.</p> <p>When disaggregating individual BDI student data 69 students were excluded contributing to the slippage. The exclusion of data occurred due to LEAs incorrectly entering student data in the online system, incomplete exit assessments, and the use of the BDI-2 for the entry assessments and the BDI-3 for the exit assessments. Due to the norming difference between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 students need to be administered the same BDI assessment when entering and exiting the program.</p> <p>Note that each LEA is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregation of the scores over time and by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, placement, etc. LEAs can begin to determine which students showed growth and which did not. With LEAs and the SEA examining data for patterns, and then targeting select subgroups for increased performance, the growth rates for B1 should increase.</p> |
| C1 | <p>To determine why there was slippage in C1, the SEA examined results by LEA to determine how many LEAs experienced a slippage. Data indicated that 40% of LEAs saw a decrease in their C1 score.</p> <p>Because this was not specific to a few LEAs, the SEA implemented a process to determine a cause for slippage. At the state level, 24 more students out of the 439 who had scores for C1 would have had to show growth for there to be no slippage. Historically, there has been a higher percentage of males than females in the denominator for C1 and historical data shows males are less likely than females to make growth. In FFY 2022 72% of the students exiting C1 were males compared to 68% in FFY 2021. In FFY 2022, 50% of the males made growth compared to 62% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>In addition, there was a higher percentage of students with autism and students with multiple disabilities than other disabilities in the denominator for C1 in FFY 2022 than in FFY 2021; and based on historical data, students with autism and multiple disabilities have shown less growth than students with other disabilities. Students with multiple disabilities showed less growth in FFY 2022 with 0.0% compared to 7.4% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>Slippage can also be attributed to the decline in attendance of preschool-aged students enrolled in an early childhood setting and parents canceling special education service time, as noted by stakeholders. Lack of student attendance provides challenges for LEAs to address goals consistently to achieve substantial growth by the age of 6.</p> <p>When disaggregating individual BDI student data 69 students were excluded contributing to the slippage. The exclusion of data occurred due to LEAs incorrectly entering student data in the online system, incomplete exit assessments, and the use of the BDI-2 for the entry assessments and the BDI-3 for the exit assessments. Due to the norming difference between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 students need to be administered the same BDI assessment when entering and exiting the program.</p> <p>Note that each LEA is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregation of the scores over time and by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, placement, etc. LEAs can begin to determine which students exited at age level and which did not. With LEAs and the SEA examining data for patterns, and then targeting select subgroups for increased performance, the growth rates for C1 should increase.</p> |
| C2 | <p>To determine why there was slippage in C2, the SEA examined results by LEA to determine how many LEAs experienced slippage. Data indicated that 40% of the LEAs saw a decrease in their C2 score.</p> <p>Because this was not specific to a few LEAs, the SEA implemented a process to determine a cause for slippage. At the state level, 14 more students out of the 942 who had scores for C2 would have had to exit at age level for there to be no slippage. Historically, there has been a higher percentage of males than females in the denominator for C2 and historical data shows males are less likely than females to make growth. In FFY 2022, 64% of the students exiting C2 were males compared to 62% in FFY 2021. In FFY 2022, 60% of males made growth compared to 64% in FFY 2021, contributing to the slippage.</p> <p>In addition, there was a higher percentage of students with autism and students with multiple disabilities than other disabilities in the denominator for C2 in FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2021; and based on historical data, students with autism and multiple disabilities have shown less growth than students with other disabilities. Students with multiple disabilities showed less growth in FFY 2022 with 3.3% of the students compared to 3.7% in FFY 2021, contributing to part of the slippage.</p> <p>Slippage can also be attributed to the decline in attendance of preschool-aged students enrolled in an early childhood setting and parents canceling special education service time, as noted by stakeholders. Lack of student attendance provides challenges for LEAs to address goals consistently to achieve substantial growth by the age of 6.</p> <p>When disaggregating individual BDI student data 69 students were excluded contributing to the slippage. The exclusion of data occurred due to LEAs incorrectly entering student data in the online system, incomplete exit assessments, and the use of the BDI-2 for the entry assessments and the BDI-3 for the exit assessments. Due to the norming difference between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 students need to be administered the same BDI assessment when entering and exiting the program.</p> <p>Note that each LEA is provided with detailed reports of their Indicator 7 data which includes disaggregation of the scores over time and by gender, race/ethnicity, disability, placement, etc. LEAs can begin to determine which students exited at age level and which did not. With LEAs and the SEA examining data for patterns, and then targeting select subgroups for increased performance, the exit rates for C2 should increase.</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 (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

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

As outlined by the SEA business rules, a student attains the classification of "comparable to same-aged peers" upon achieving a standard score of -1.27 or above the norm on either the BDI-2 or BDI-3 scoring chart. This score aligns with the 10th percentile rank for a specified outcome area assessed by the BDI-2 and BDI-3 assessments.

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

Data for this indicator is collected using the BDI-2 and the BDI-3. When a student transitions from the Part C program to the Part B 619 program, they are assessed in the areas of adaptive, social-emotional, communication, motor, and cognitive abilities. If initially assessed with the BDI-2 upon entering the Part B 619 program, subsequent assessments occur with the same tool either upon exiting the program or before reaching six years of age.

Starting July 1, 2021, the BDI-3 has been universally applied for new entries into the Part B 619 program. For students transitioning at age three a baseline is established by re-assessing them using the BDI-3 across the developmental domains.

The exit data from Part C serves as the baseline for students transitioning to Part B 619. Upon exit from the Part B 619 program, whether early or before turning six, assessments are conducted in the same five developmental areas using the BDI-2 or the BDI-3 depending upon the entry assessment tool. Progress in the three indicator outcome areas is determined by comparing entry and exit scores across the three developmental domains.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SEA has provided professional development at the Early Childhood Conference (attendance from LEAs, Head Starts, private preschools, childcare staff, and parents), Early Childhood Special Education workshops, LEA file reviews, LEA technical assistance via Zoom and phone, Indicator 7 data drill down, and monthly special education calls. The professional development components focused on state data to support LEAs on collaboration techniques with parents and public and private early childhood programs to improve child outcomes through embedded instruction in daily routines, accommodations and supports for students and staff, and regular monitoring of progress to guide instruction. The SEA promotes LEAs to provide special education and related services in the least restrictive environment, when possible, to ensure the regular education staff and daycare providers can support the students' outcomes during their daily routines. The SEA will continue to provide professional development as outlined above, BDI Office Hours for LEA staff to seek support, and host online training to understand Indicator 7.

To help ensure the fidelity and reliability of the BDI-3, the SEA has secured on-demand BDI-3 training through Riverside Training Academy, at no cost to LEA staff. LEAs are reminded of the training through monthly special education webinars, emails, and the BDI listserv. The SEA provides targeted training to LEA staff emphasizing the importance of reliable student data in the BDI data management systems. This training is completed through Early Childhood IEP workshops, monthly special education webinars, and emails sent to specific LEAs to correct BDI data entry errors.

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 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross-section of parents of children with disabilities.

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

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

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

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

8 - Indicator Data

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 8 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

LEA stakeholders requested trainings on the scales measured in the parent survey (information, communication, partnership, and IEP) and on how LEAs can support parents to increase the parent involvement scores in those areas. LEA stakeholders also suggested that the SEA provide preliminary LEA survey response rate results prior to the closure of the survey. LEA stakeholders requested that the survey be provided in more languages than English and Spanish.

The SEA proposed changes to the 2024-2025 school year survey to stakeholders, including removing one survey question, simplifying the wording on all survey questions, editing the comment box to ensure parents understand their comments are for the SEA only, and increasing the LEA response rate required by the SEA to 20.00%. Both LEA stakeholders and parent stakeholders supported these changes. The SEA will continue to provide printed surveys to every LEA, as well as offer the survey online and expand the online version to include the 10 additional languages.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2012 | 77.30% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 78.50% | 79.00% | 79.00% | 81.00% | 81.00% |
| Data | 88.41% | 87.77% | 87.74% | 86.20% | 87.28% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 81.50% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 85.00% |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 5,364 | 6,079 | 87.28% | 81.50% | 88.24% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

The SD Parent Survey was designed for all parents of students with disabilities ages 3-21. Parents of preschool children ages 3-5 and parents of students ages 6-21 were given the same parent survey instruction letter and parent survey questions. The survey was distributed to both groups via the same procedures, including distribution by LEAs in person, via mail, email, QR code, an online link, and in both English and Spanish. The data analysis methodology was the same for both groups. While the age 3-21 data is combined for reporting, the SEA can analyze the data separately by school and grade level as needed. Therefore, the combined data from school age and preschool surveys is valid and reliable.

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.

23,152

Percentage of respondent parents

26.26%

Response Rate

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 25.48% | 26.26% |

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

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

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

The SEA and stakeholders compared the representation by race/ethnicity, grade level, and disability category in the population to the representation in the respondents using a +/- 3% criteria to identify over- or under-representation.

Using this methodology, one difference was found by race/ethnicity. The students with disabilities population consists of 66% of Whites; however, the respondents consist of 73% of Whites. All other racial/ethnic groups were within +/- 3% of their population. Although the White race/ethnicity group was over-represented in the response rate, there were no significant differences in the parent involvement rates between parents of White students and parents of students with other race/ethnicities. It is important to note that every LEA is surveyed every year, which is the most effective way to get an overall parent involvement percentage that is representative of the state as a whole in any given year. Although parents from a wide range of districts from across the state responded to the survey and reflected the population of parents in terms of geographic distribution, there is still one difference in response rate by race/ethnicity, which suggests the demographics of the parents responding are not representative of the race/ethnicity of the children receiving special education services.

When analyzing the demographics of grade level, including preschool, and disability category, all grade levels and all disability categories represented in the respondents were within +/- 3% of their population. Therefore, the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the grade level and disability category of the children receiving special education services.

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

NO

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

Since the White race/ethnicity group was over-represented in response data, the SEA contacted all LEAs via a letter in the fall of 2023 that stressed the importance of demographic representativeness, noting specifically that each LEA must monitor the representativeness of race/ethnicity in their survey responses. The SEA presented a webinar for LEAs on how to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity. The SEA also translated the 2023-2024 school year parent survey to 10 additional languages beyond the current English and Spanish versions, making the survey more accessible to parents outside of the White race/ethnicity group. The SEA notified LEAs of the available translated surveys, the LEA requests the number and type of translated surveys needed, and the SEA prints and mails the surveys to the LEAs. These statewide activities, to ensure representativeness of race/ethnicity, will continue in future school years.

The two largest LEAs in the state serve a significant number of minority students with disabilities. Both LEAs had response rates less than 10.00% on the 2022-2023 school year parent survey. In addition, one LEA in the state comprised of nearly 100% American Indian students also had a response rate of less than 10.00% on the 2022-2023 school year parent survey. The SEA contacted the three LEAs in the fall of 2023 to address how their low response rate affects representativeness of race/ethnicity, both for the LEA and the SEA. The SEA required the three LEAs to submit documentation on what steps the LEAs will take to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity on the 2023-2024 parent survey using a reflection form. The SEA is monitoring the demographics of the survey responses of the three LEAs by doing real-time pulls of their survey response data three times throughout the 2023-2024 school year. The real-time data is provided to the LEAs to support their efforts to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity. The SEA will also monitor the response rates in all LEAs with a higher population of American Indian students. These targeted activities, to ensure representativeness of race/ethnicity, will continue in future school years.

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

The overall response rate increased from 25.48% in FFY 2021 to 26.26% in FFY 2022. The SEA implemented a variety of strategies in the fall of 2023 to address the representativeness of race/ethnicity in survey response rates. The SEA printed and distributed paper surveys to every LEA, as well as provided an online survey link and QR code. The SEA translated and printed parent surveys in 10 additional languages as requested by LEAs. The SEA offered a webinar to LEAs on how to analyze their response rate data for demographic representativeness, as well as which methods are most effective at increasing overall response rates. The webinar was recorded and made available to LEA staff on demand. The SEA created and distributed resources for LEAs via the SEA website, including an overview of Indicator 8 to increase LEA awareness of the purpose behind the parent survey, as well as a PowerPoint presentation on how to increase parent involvement and response rate. The SEA also works with SDPC to announce and promote the parent survey to all parents, including parents who may prefer not to work directly with their district on survey completion or who may be dissatisfied and less responsive. This advertisement through SDPC helps ensure that all parents are aware of their opportunity to respond to the survey. These strategies will continue in future school years.

In March 2024, the SEA will do a real-time data pull of the survey response data of all LEAs in the state. The SEA will identify and notify LEAs with response rates lower than the state requirement of 10%. The SEA will examine the demographics of race/ethnicity, grade level, and disability category of LEA respondents, and the SEA will identify LEAs that need to improve demographic representativeness. LEAs with a high proportion of American Indian students will be reviewed and contacted if needed to ensure increased LEA response rates and SEA representativeness for race/ethnicity. The SEA also developed a flyer that districts can share with parents, particularly in the spring, to catch parents' attention to complete the survey before May 31. These targeted strategies to increase response rate will continue in future school years. The SEA will increase the required LEA response rate from 10.00% to 20.00% for the 2024-2025 school year parent survey, which will trigger action at the LEA level.

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

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

First, the SEA analyzed the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. The SEA's response rate is 26.26%, which is high for a survey of this nature.

Second, the representativeness of the responses was examined. No differences were found by grade level or disability category. One difference was found in the respondent composition by race/ethnicity, indicating overrepresentation in the White group. However, the actual responses of the White group compared to all other race/ethnicity groups showed no differences in the overall parent involvement percentage. Further, parents from a wide variety of LEAs from across the state responded to the survey.

Third, a comparison can be made with the responses of parents who responded early in the school year to those who responded late in the school year. The idea being that perhaps school districts who distribute later in the school year or those parents who do not immediately respond are different in some meaningful way than those who respond early in the school year. When examining results within districts, there are no differences between parents who respond early in the school year compared to those who respond later in the school year.

Based on the above three analysis of response rate, no nonresponse bias was identified.

The SEA promotes response from a broad cross section of parents of students with disabilities by identifying LEAs with a response rate below 10.00%. These LEAs are required to submit documentation on how they will increase response rates from parents. The SEA will increase the required LEA response rate from 10.00% to 20.00% for the 2024-2025 school year parent survey, which will trigger action at the LEA level. The SEA works with SDPC to announce and promote the parent survey to all parents, including parents who may prefer not to work directly with their district on survey completion, or who may be dissatisfied and less responsive. The SEA also provides training to LEAs to promote responses from a broad cross section of parents of students with disabilities.

| 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 |

| Survey Question | Yes / No |
|---------------------------------------|----------|
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. | |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The FFY 2022 data are from a response group that was representative of disability category and grade level but was not representative of race/ethnicity. The SEA is taking the below actions to address representativeness of race/ethnicity in the response group:

Since the White race/ethnicity group was over-represented in response data, the SEA contacted all LEAs via a letter in the fall of 2023 that stressed the importance of demographic representativeness, noting specifically that each LEA must monitor the representativeness of race/ethnicity in their survey responses. The SEA presented a webinar for LEAs on how to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity. The SEA also translated the 2023-2024 school year parent survey to 10 additional languages beyond the current English and Spanish versions, making the survey more accessible to parents outside of the White race/ethnicity group. The SEA notified LEAs of the available translated surveys, the LEA requests the number and type of translated surveys needed, and the SEA prints and mails the surveys to the LEAs. These statewide activities, to ensure representativeness of race/ethnicity, will continue in future school years.

The two largest LEAs in the state serve a significant number of minority students with disabilities. Both LEAs had response rates less than 10.00% on the 2022-2023 school year parent survey. In addition, one LEA in the state comprised of nearly 100% American Indian students also had a response rate of less than 10.00% on the 2022-2023 school year parent survey. The SEA contacted the three LEAs in the fall of 2023 to address how their low response rate affects representativeness of race/ethnicity, both for the LEA and the SEA. The SEA required the three LEAs to submit documentation on what steps the LEAs will take to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity on the 2023-2024 parent survey using a reflection form. The SEA is monitoring the demographics of the survey responses of the three LEAs by doing real-time pulls of their survey response data three times throughout the 2023-2024 school year. The real-time data is provided to the LEAs to support their efforts to increase representativeness of race/ethnicity. The SEA will also monitor the response rates in all LEAs with a higher population of American Indian students. These targeted activities, to ensure representativeness of race/ethnicity, will continue in future school years.

8 - OSEP Response

8 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are from a response group that is representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionality

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures. 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 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 0.00% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 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.

106

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 0 | 43 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

Disproportionate representation is defined as a Weighted Risk Ratio of 3.00 and above (over-representation). If a racial/ethnic group is flagged for numerical disproportionate representation, the policies and procedures of that LEA are reviewed to determine if the disproportionate representation is due to inappropriate identification. For Indicator 9, all 149 LEAs are included in the analysis. Of these 149 LEAs, 43 met the minimum n requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, seven risk ratios could be calculated – one for each racial/ethnic group). Please note that many LEAs have fewer than 10 students with a disability of a particular racial/ethnicity. Thus, very small numbers prevent the SEA from calculating reliable and meaningful risk ratios for every racial/ethnic group in every LEA.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 section 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), (e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures). In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2022 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2023).

Instructions

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

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

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

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

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

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

10 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

NO

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2020 | 0.00% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

FFY 2022 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.

132

| Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories | Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification | Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 0 | 17 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?

YES

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

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

For Indicator 10, all of the 149 LEAs are included in the analysis. Of these 149 LEAs, 17 met the minimum N requirements at least one time for a Final Risk Ratio to be calculated (for each LEA, in theory, 42 risk ratios could be calculated— one for each racial/ethnic group times the six primary disability categories). Please note that many LEAs in SD have fewer than ten students with a disability of a particular racial/ethnicity; when this is disaggregated further by type of primary disability, the numbers get extremely small.

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

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

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| 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 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 99.89% | 99.94% | 99.85% | 99.67% | 99.91% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 5,377 | 5,344 | 99.91% | 100% | 99.39% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

33

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

The SEA did not attain 100% compliance, however, achieving 99.39% reflects a commendably high level of adherence. Twelve LEAs were unable to complete a total of 33 evaluations within the established 25 school day timeline, however, 99.39% does not suggest a systemic issue.

This delay, when considered against the backdrop of teacher shortages and the overwhelming number of school closures due to prolonged winter blizzards, showcases a collaborative effort by LEA staff to ensure the timely completion of child find responsibilities.

As stated above, 12 of the 149 LEAs (a total of 33 evaluations) did not meet the 100% target. One of the 12 LEAs accounted for 12 of the individual noncompliant files due to poor scheduling. The other 11 districts only had one or two noncompliant files. The reason for failure to meet this timeline was rooted in procedural errors. Notably, all LEAs identified in FFY 2022 were in full compliance in FFY 2021.

Range of days beyond the timeline:

- 1 evaluation exceeded by 35 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 16 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 14 days
- 3 evaluations exceeded by 12 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 11 days
- 2 evaluations exceeded by 9 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 8 days
- 2 evaluations exceeded by 7 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 6 days
- 3 evaluations exceeded by 5 days
- 3 evaluations exceeded by 4 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 3 days
- 3 evaluation exceeded by 2 days
- 10 evaluations exceeded by 1 day

Indicate the evaluation timeline used:

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

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

The SEA has established the initial evaluation timeline of 25 school days from the date the LEA received parental signed permission.

However, this timeline may be extended if mutually agreed upon by the school administration and parents, as stipulated under Administrative Rules of South Dakota (ARSD) 24:05:25:03-Preplacement Evaluation.

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

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

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

Utilization of SEA Database: LEAs are required to use the SEA database for recording and annually reporting initial evaluations conducted within the LEA. Within the SEA database, LEAs have the option to utilize the SEA developed spreadsheet accessible at link: <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx> to record initial evaluations conducted throughout the school year and subsequently upload this information to the SEA database. It is imperative that all LEAs directly enter or upload student data into the SEA database and complete the sign-off process by August 1 of the reporting year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEAs that miss the timeline receive a CAP for failure to implement the regulatory requirements. The CAP requires the LEA to train staff on policies and procedures, specifically regarding Indicator 11 documentation and the 25 school day timeline calculations. The SEA verified training occurred through the LEAs submission of training agendas, staff sign-in sheets, and documentation of policies and procedures used during the training to include how the 25 school day timeline is calculated.

Each LEA is required to submit timely and accurate reports for the subsequent reporting year. Verification by the SEA confirmed the LEAs held out of compliance in FFY 2021 implemented the regulatory requirements based on a review of FFY 2022 data submitted electronically.

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

The SEA verified the correction of all five individual files across the five LEAs through the LEAs' submission of the evaluation report and PPWN for each file showing the evaluation was completed and eligibility determined. The LEAs submitted additional data to demonstrate continued compliance with regulatory requirements. The SEA verified that all five LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 11 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The SEA verified the correction of all five individual files across the five LEAs through the LEAs' submission of the evaluation report and PPWN for each file showing the evaluation was completed and eligibility determined. The LEAs submitted additional data to demonstrate continued compliance with regulatory requirements. The SEA verified that all five LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 11 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters.

11 - OSEP Response

11 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|------------------------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 97.72% | 96.65% | Not Valid and Reliable | 99.23% | 97.79% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|---|-----|
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 642 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 150 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 489 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 0 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 1 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| Measure | Numerator (c) | Denominator (a-b-d-e-f) | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 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. | 489 | 491 | 97.79% | 100% | 99.59% | 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

2

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

The SEA did not meet 100% compliance, however, 99.59% of students referred to Part C before age three who were found eligible for Part B and had an IEP developed and implemented prior to the 3rd birthday reflects a high level of adherence. This data, despite not reaching 100% compliance, doesn't signal a systemic issue but emphasizes the substantial efforts made by local education agencies (LEAs) to ensure timely transitions.

In FFY 2022, 149 LEAs were monitored during the reporting period and a total of 2 individual files in 2 LEAs were found noncompliant. Of the two LEAs, one was in 100% compliance for FFY 2021 and one received a corrective action plan (CAP) for FFY 2021.

The reasons the LEAs failed to meet the 100% target were procedural shortcomings due to poor scheduling and staff turnover.

Outlined below is the range of days evaluations exceeded the established timeline:

- 1 evaluation exceeded by 28 days
- 1 evaluation exceeded by 4 days

Over the past year, there have been meaningful efforts by the SEA to provide technical assistance to LEA staff and improve procedures related to Indicator 12 compliance. This has been achieved through Early Childhood special education workshops, webinars, and on-site reviews aimed at identifying and addressing procedural discrepancies. Despite challenges such as staffing shortages and winter weather-related LEA closures, only two instances of noncompliance in two LEAs (one each) were found. This is a positive sign that LEAs are working diligently to ensure timely compliance with Indicator 12 requirements.

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 DOE Part C office. The Part C Data Manager enters all exit code data into the Part C data system. LEAs are required to use the SEA database for recording and annually reporting transition evaluations conducted within the LEA. Within the SEA database, LEAs have the option to utilize a SEA developed spreadsheet (accessible at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/SPP.aspx>) to record transition evaluations conducted throughout the reporting year and subsequently upload this information to the SEA database.

The Part B 619 Coordinator conducts an analysis of the Part C exit data and LEA submitted data. This involves verifying that all students align with Part C records, addressing data quality issues, confirming compliance, and offering technical assistance to LEAs.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 11 | 10 | 0 | 1 |

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

LEAs that miss the early childhood transition timeline receive a CAP that requires the LEA to train their staff on policies and procedures, which includes documenting Indicator 12 and ensuring the LEA meets the early childhood transition timeline. The SEA verified each LEA that was cited for noncompliance had completed training on early childhood transition timelines by requiring each LEA to submit a training agenda, a sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training. Every LEA is required to submit a timely and accurate report for the following reporting year. Of the seven LEAs (total of 11 files) found out of compliance in FFY 2021, the SEA validated that six LEAs were correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements by reviewing FFY 2022 data submitted through the SEA database. Of the seven LEAs issued a CAP in FFY 2021, one LEA was issued a second year CAP for not implementing the specific regulatory requirements as validated through the LEA submitting FFY 2022 data through the SEA database.

The LEA found out of compliance for two consecutive years, FFY 2021 and FFY 2022, is required to provide quarterly submissions of Indicator 12 student data through the SEA electronic database. The LEA is required to provide training to staff on Indicator 12 policies and procedures. The LEA submits to the SEA a training agenda, a sign-in sheet of LEA staff attending the training, and documentation of the policies and procedures used during the training. The LEA is required to submit a compliant Indicator 12 by September 1 of the reporting year.

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

The SEA verified the correction of all eleven individual files across the seven LEAs through the LEAs' submission of the evaluation report and PPWN for each file showing the evaluation was completed and eligibility determined. The LEAs submitted additional data to demonstrate continued compliance with regulatory requirements. The SEA verified six of the seven LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 12 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters. The one LEA who was identified as not implementing regulatory requirements for a second year, was issued a new corrective action plan with additional requirements to include quarterly monitoring. The SEA also verified the one individual file identified in year two was corrected through LEA's submission of the eligibility determination and PPWN.

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

The SEA issued the one LEA where continued noncompliance was identified a "second year corrective action plan." The LEA is required to submit a desk audit to verify the individual file has been corrected, receive training, submit policies and procedures, and to submit quarterly data verifying compliance.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

The SEA verified the correction of all eleven individual files across the seven LEAs through the LEAs' submission of the evaluation report and PPWN for each file showing the evaluation was completed and eligibility determined. The LEAs submitted additional data to demonstrate continued compliance with regulatory requirements. The SEA verified six of the seven LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 12 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters. The one LEA who was identified as not implementing regulatory requirements for a second year, was issued a new corrective action plan with additional requirements to include quarterly monitoring. The SEA also verified the one individual file identified in year two was corrected through LEA's submission of the eligibility determination and PPWN.

12 - OSEP Response

12 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2021: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

Data Source

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

Measurement

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

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

Instructions

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

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

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic 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) 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), 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 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 93.71% | 83.97% | 87.18% | 66.41% | 79.39% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------------|----------|
| 107 | 170 | 79.39% | 100% | 62.94% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

In FFY 2022, 29 LEAs with 170 individual files were included in the review of Indicator 13 through the five-year accountability review cycle. Through the review, 63 files from 18 LEAs did not meet one or more of the Indicator 13 requirements. In FFY 2021, there were 228 individual files reviewed with 47 individual files with noncompliance. Although fewer files were reviewed in FFY 2022, there was an increase of 16 individual files with noncompliance identified which resulted in a decrease in compliance that caused slippage.

Based on the data, the slippage is due in part to the increase of 16 noncompliant student files compared to FFY 2021. There were three main areas on the Indicator 13 checklist which contributed to the slippage. The top area identified was not obtaining consent to invite the agency before the LEA sent the meeting notice. Through the reviews, it was found that consent was being obtained before the meeting, but not before sending the meeting notice. Other issues that contributed to slippage included missing or not documenting appropriate measurable postsecondary goals (MSPGs), and files that did not document an appropriate course of study enabling students to meet their postsecondary goals.

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.

The SEA utilizes a five-year accountability review cycle which includes collection and review of Indicator 13 data. During the on-site review, RDA coaches, TSLP, and the SEA staff review individual files using the regulatory requirements in the Indicator 13 checklist, which can be located at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/I13-checklist.pdf>.

A representative sample of files is reviewed which includes all disability categories represented in the LEA and at least two files per case manager. During the on-site review technical assistance is provided during a one-on-one teacher file review with each case manager and the remaining files are reviewed as desk audits.

| 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)

Stakeholders provided the SEA feedback on how to assist LEAs to improve transition planning. Stakeholders identified that information shared at the administrator level is not always being disseminated at the teacher level. Additionally, there is a disconnect in teacher preparation programs and high school special education teachers may not have received training aligned with Indicator 13 and transition planning during their preparation program. Stakeholders suggested the SEA continue providing transition IEP workshops, provide technical assistance through TSLP, share information on the transition listserv, and continue collaboration with Vocational Rehabilitation Services and teacher preparation programs.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021

| Findings of Noncompliance Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year | Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 47 | 47 | 0 | 0 |

FFY 2021 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

In FFY 2021, the SEA identified 47 individual files of noncompliance based on the Indicator 13 regulatory requirements. The SEA issued CAPS to the 12 LEAs for the 47 individual files of noncompliance. The CAP included the noncompliance identified, associated regulatory requirements, required corrections within the individual files, and documentation required to show compliance to ensure the LEA is implementing the regulatory requirements. The SEA verified compliance through the LEAs’ submission of the updated individual files, documentation the LEAs completed training on the transition procedures, submission of updated policies and procedures, and by reviewing additional files to demonstrate continued compliance within the one-year correction period.

The SEA verified that all 12 LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 13 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters.

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

In FFY 2021, there were 47 individual files of noncompliance. When noncompliance is identified in an individual file, the LEA is issued a CAP. The CAP includes the noncompliance identified, associated regulatory requirements, required corrections within the individual files, and documentation required to show compliance. The LEA is required to correct the individual file as soon as possible and submit an additional file within one year of the date the report was issued showing continued compliance.

Depending on the issue of noncompliance, such as inviting an agency to a transition meeting prior to receiving consent, the LEA may not be able to correct the individual file and therefore must complete training, review and revise the LEA policies and procedures, if appropriate, and submit additional individual files to show compliance.

The SEA verified the correction of all 47 individual files across 12 LEAs through the LEAs’ submission of an updated transition evaluation report, consent to invite an outside agency, an updated transition IEP, a meeting notice or a student invite, or a parental prior written notice depending on the noncompliance noted. The LEAs submitted additional files to demonstrate continued compliance with regulatory requirements. The SEA verified that all 12 LEAs completed the corrective actions and implemented the regulatory requirements for Indicator 13 with 100% compliance and issued closure letters.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021

| Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified | Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2021 APR | Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected | Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

In FFY 2021, the SEA identified 47 individual files of noncompliance for 12 LEAs. The SEA issued CAPs to 12 LEAs and subsequently verified correction and continued compliance with regulatory requirements as described in the Indicator 13 submission.

13 - OSEP Response

13 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2022, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01. In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022, although its FFY 2022 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2022.

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

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

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

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

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

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

Instructions

Sampling of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See [General Instructions](#) on page 3 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Collect data by September 2023 on students who left school during 2021-2022, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2021-2022 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

I. Definitions

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

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

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

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

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

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

II. Data Reporting

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

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

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

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

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

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

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2022 response rate to the FFY 2021 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

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

III. Reporting on the Measures/Indicators

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

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

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

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

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

If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

14 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

| Measure | Baseline | FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|---------|----------|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| A | 2020 | Target >= | 15.50% | 15.50% | 15.50% | 11.04% | 11.50% |
| A | 11.04% | Data | 27.35% | 16.93% | 22.96% | 11.04% | 13.06% |
| B | 2020 | Target >= | 68.50% | 68.50% | 68.50% | 61.96% | 63.00% |
| B | 61.96% | Data | 65.81% | 70.61% | 66.35% | 61.96% | 74.91% |
| C | 2020 | Target >= | 81.50% | 82.00% | 82.00% | 77.30% | 78.00% |
| C | 77.30% | Data | 78.63% | 82.11% | 80.82% | 77.30% | 82.13% |

FFY 2021 Targets

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholder input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 14 will be maintained for FFY 2022. Stakeholders provided suggestions for increasing the response rate. Strategies included continued sharing of resources across agencies and sharing information on the transition listserv and during Transition Round Up webinars. The SEA will review the survey to ensure the language is user friendly and the questions are worded in a manner to yield the intended responses. The survey will also be formatted to be compatible and accessible on handheld devices.

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| | |
|--|--------|
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 830 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 340 |
| Response Rate | 40.96% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 58 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 179 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 8 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 32 |

| 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|--|----------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------|---------------|------------|-------------|
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 58 | 340 | 13.06% | 12.50% | 17.06% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 237 | 340 | 74.91% | 64.50% | 69.71% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 277 | 340 | 82.13% | 79.00% | 81.47% | Met target | No Slippage |

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

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

Response Rate

| FFY | 2021 | 2022 |
|---------------|--------|--------|
| Response Rate | 37.26% | 40.96% |

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

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

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

The SEA used the National Post-School Outcomes (NPSO) Response Rate Calculator to calculate the response representativeness in the following areas: 1) Race/Ethnicity, 2) Disability, and 3) Geographic Region to determine if the respondent group of students was similar to the total population of leavers for 2021-2022 school year. According to the NPSO Response Rate Calculator, a difference between the Respondent Group and the Target Leaver group of +/- 3% is significant. Negative differences indicate an under-representation of the group, and a positive difference indicates over-representation. SD's data is representative of all but one category: geographic regions of the state.

When analyzing representativeness for race/ethnicity, the White group was most highly represented, but within the range for representativeness. All race/ethnicity categories were within +/- 3% discrepancy range and representative of the overall group.

White: 554 leavers (66.11% leaver representation) with 215 respondents (63.24% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of -2.87%

American Indian or Alaska Native: 130 leavers (15.51% leaver representation) with 57 respondents (16.76% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of 1.25%

Hispanic/Latino: 58 leavers (6.92% leaver representation) with 28 respondents (8.24% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of 1.31%

Black or African American: 38 leavers (4.53% leaver representation) with 17 respondents (5% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of .47%

Low incident race/ethnicity groups of Asian, Native Hawaiian /other Pacific Islander, and unknown: 15 leavers (1.79% leaver representation) with 4 respondents (1.18% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of -0.61%

Two or more races represented: 35 leavers (4.18% leaver representation) with 19 respondents (5.59% respondent representation) showing a difference in response rate of 1.41%

When analyzing representativeness by disability category, students with cognitive disability were most highly represented and specific learning disability most underrepresented, but both were within the range for representativeness. All disability categories were within +/- 3% discrepancy range and representative of the overall group.

Specific Learning Disability: 370 leavers (44.15% leaver representation) with 144 respondents (42.35% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -1.80%.

Other Health Impaired: 295 leavers (35.20% leaver representation) with 124 respondents (36.47% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of 1.27%

Cognitive (Intellectual) disability: 98 leavers (11.69% leaver representation) with 47 respondents (13.82% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of 2.13%

Autism Spectrum Disorder: 86 leavers (10.25% leaver representation) with 37 respondents (10.88% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of .63%

Emotional disability: 75 leavers (8.95% leaver representation) with 25 respondents (7.35% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -1.60%

In response to stakeholder feedback, the SEA also analyzed data for the seven geographic regions of the state. The two largest LEAs are in the southeast and the southwest regions of the state which corresponds with the NPSO calculator for the largest populated areas in SD. Four geographic regions were within +/- 3% discrepancy range in response rate which is an improvement from FFY 2021 with only two geographic regions showing under-representation and one with over-representation.

Four geographic regions with representativeness:

Northwest: 35 leavers (4.17% leaver representation) with 14 respondents (4.12% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -0.05%

North Central: 98 leavers (11.68% leaver representation) with 49 respondents (14.41% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of 2.73%

Central: 53 leavers (6.32% leaver representation) with 20 respondents (5.88% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -0.43%

Southwest: 198 leavers (23.60% leaver representation) with 89 respondents (26.18% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of 2.58%

Two geographic regions with under-representation:

Northeast: 141 leavers (16.81% leaver representation) with 36 respondents (10.59% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -6.22%

South Central: 60 leavers (7.15% leaver representation) with 0 respondents (0% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of -7.15%

One geographic region with over-representation:

Southeast: 254 leavers (30.27% leaver representation) with 132 respondents (38.82% response rate) showing a difference in response rate of 8.55%

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

NO

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

Although the SEA is only required to report on representativeness in race/ethnicity and one other category(disability), based on stakeholder feedback the SEA also included geographic region data in the analysis. The SEA met representativeness in 2 of the 3 areas reported. Based on the geographic region

data, three regions were not representative in response rate. This is an improvement in representativeness from FFY 2021 and the SEA will continue efforts to increase response rate representativeness across geographic regions of the state as well as maintain representativeness in the race/ethnicity and disability categories. To improve representativeness by geographic region, the SEA will contact the LEAs with consistently low response rates in the geographic regions of the state and develop a plan to increase the response rate.

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

The collection method of survey response data is from an online survey and phone calls prefaced with a postcard reminder to all leavers. The SEA will provide a draft copy of the survey to LEAs so they can share it with leavers so they know what they will be asked and explain the purpose of collecting the information. The SEA will work with LEAs to ensure each student's most current email is collected to send the online survey link at the time the student leaves school. In addition, The SEA will encourage LEAs to obtain the leavers' current phone number for an additional contact method if the online survey is not used.

Although the SEA contracts with callers to collect PSO data, in reviewing response data there is a higher rate of response from LEAs where the LEA has opted to conduct the follow up surveys. Students are more likely to participate when familiar with a phone number and caller. LEAs that have indicated in their RDA process that they would like to collect student surveys for the LEA will be contacted and provided the information on collecting survey data. In the under and overrepresented geographic areas, the SEA will encourage LEAs to call their students to help facilitate the highest response rate.

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

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

First, is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. The SEA's response rate is 40.52%, which is an increase of 3.26% from last year's response rate of 37.26% and a high rate of participation for this type of collection. Lower response rates in certain categories such as specific learning disabilities and geographic areas may contribute to nonresponse bias.

Second, is the representativeness of the responses. There are some differences in respondent composition by disability and the geographic regions of the state and the responses to engagement after high school. Students with specific learning disabilities (24%), emotional disability (24%), and autism (22%) have a higher percentage in post-secondary education; and specific learning disabilities (59%) and intellectual (cognitive) disability (49%) have higher percentages in competitive employment.

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

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

| 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? | |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR

SD described the representativeness of the FFY 2022 data and provided actions to address areas identified that were not representative.

14 - OSEP Response

14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2023 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the 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 and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|--|------|
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 3 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 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

Indicator 15 due process hearings and resolution session data was reported to the SDAPCD on January 26th, 2024. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified through requests for mediation, state complaints, and due process hearings as well as current SEA improvement activities. Based upon the information reviewed, the panel recommended the SEA develop an electronic method for parents, LEAs, and third parties to file dispute resolution options. Stakeholders recommended the SEA should continue offering training on dispute resolution options to LEAs and parents, including a family friendly walkthrough of the parent rights handbook. Stakeholders did state that additional training should be provided to parents and agencies that work with children on both the IEP and dispute resolution process.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2005 | |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------|
| Target >= | | | | | |
| Data | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 100.00% | 33.33% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Target >= | | | | |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| 3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 3.1 Number of resolutions sessions | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| 0 | 3 | 33.33% | | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SEA had less than 10 resolutions for FFY 2022, therefore no baselines or targets have been set. The number of requests received was average for SD.

15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

15 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

15 - Required Actions

Indicator 16: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

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

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

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the 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 mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

16 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Prepopulated Data

| Source | Date | Description | Data |
|---|------------|---|------|
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1 Mediations held | 6 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/15/2023 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 6 |

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

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Indicator 16 mediation data was reported to the SDAPCD on January 26th, 2024. Panel members reviewed information on common issues identified through requests for mediation, state complaints, and due process hearings as well as current SEA improvement activities. Input was sought to determine whether or not the current target should be maintained or adjusted for FFY 2022 and to obtain feedback on improvement strategies. Following consideration of the data and advisory panel discussion, it was determined that the target for Indicator 16 will be maintained for FFY 2022.

Based upon the information reviewed during the panel meeting, it was recommended the SEA develop an electronic method for parents, LEAs, and third parties to file dispute resolution options. Stakeholders recommended the SEA should continue offering training on dispute resolution options to LEAs and parents, including a family friendly walkthrough of the parent rights handbook. Stakeholders did state that additional training should be provided to parents and agencies that work with children on both the IEP and dispute resolution process.

Historical Data

| Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|---------------|---------------|
| 2021 | 90.00% |

| FFY | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
|-----------|--------|---------|---------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | | | | | 90.00% |
| Data | 62.50% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 33.33% | 90.00% |

Targets

| FFY | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|-----|------|------|------|------|
| | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target >= | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% | 91.00% |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|

FFY 2022 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 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|---|---|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 0 | 6 | 6 | 90.00% | 91.00% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The SEA's historical trend for mediation requests is typically under 10. During the FFY 2022 reporting year, the SEA received an average number of requests for mediation.

16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

16 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2022. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

16 - Required Actions

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

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

Measurement

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

Instructions

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

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

Phase I: Analysis:

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

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

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

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

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

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

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2023). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes,

and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2022 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2023, i.e., July 1, 2023-June 30, 2024) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

17 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

All students with disabilities (Target A) and a subset of students with disabilities (i.e., specific learning disability (SLD), other health impairment (OHI), or speech language impairment) (Target B) will increase their 3rd-5th grade reading proficiency rates by 5 percentage points for each group from spring 2021 to spring 2026 as measured by the statewide assessment.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

The subset of the population from this indicator includes 48 schools from 21 LEAs that participated in the SPDG and/or the state MTSS initiative in the 2022-2023 school year.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

NO

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

<https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/TheoryofAction.docx>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

YES

Historical Data

| Part | Baseline Year | Baseline Data |
|------|---------------|---------------|
| A | 2020 | 18.31% |
| B | 2020 | 18.12% |

Targets

| FFY | Current Relationship | 2022 | 2023 | 2024 | 2025 |
|----------|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Target A | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 18.94% | 19.56% | 20.81% | 23.31% |
| Target B | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 18.75% | 19.37% | 20.62% | 23.12% |

FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data

| Part | Number of students in grades 3-5 who scored proficient on regular state reading test. Target A = All students with disabilities. Target B = Students with specific | Number of students in grades 3-5 who participated in the state reading test. Target A = All students with disabilities. Target B = Students with specific | FFY 2021 Data | FFY 2022 Target | FFY 2022 Data | Status | Slippage |
|------|--|---|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------|----------|
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--------|--------|---------------------|----------|
| | learning disability, speech-language impairment, or other health impairment | learning disability, speech-language impairment, or other health impairment | | | | | |
| A | 169 | 955 | 19.63% | 18.94% | 17.70% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B | 133 | 751 | 20.37% | 18.75% | 17.71% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

Provide reasons for A slippage, if applicable

To examine slippage, the SEA first examined proficiency rates by disability group. All disability groups had a decrease in proficiency rates, however, the three disability groups that represent the focus of Target B and represent the largest number of students (SLD, OHI, and speech language impairment) had a greater decrease in their proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023. The SEA examined the all-student proficiency rates and the all-students with disabilities proficiency rates that included all schools in the state, not just the SSIP schools. These two groups (all students and all students with disabilities) also experienced a decrease in their proficiency rates. The all-student reading proficiency rate for grades three, four, and five decreased from 48.8% in FFY 2021 to 47.3% in FFY 2022 (decrease of 1.5 percentage points); the all-students with disabilities rate decreased from 20.8% in FFY 2021 to 19.9% in FFY 2022 (decrease of 0.9 percentage points). Lastly, proficiency rates of all LEAs in the state were examined, and slightly more than half of LEAs experienced a decrease in their all-student proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023, and about a half experienced a decrease in their students with disabilities proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023. Therefore, although there was slippage in the targeted schools and students for Indicator 17, their performance followed a similar trend to all students in the state.

Provide reasons for B slippage, if applicable

The reasons for slippage for Target B are very similar to those for Target A. The SEA conducted the same type of analyses as was done for Target A. To examine slippage, the SEA first examined proficiency rates for the three disability groups identified for Target B: SLD, OHI, and speech language impairment. This analysis showed that all three groups had a decrease in their proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023. This pattern was similar to that for all students, not just the targeted group.

The SEA compared the difference in proficiency for the schools that were part of the SPDG initiative to the schools that were part of the MTSS initiative. In general, the SPDG schools had a greater decrease than the MTSS schools. During the final year of the SPDG, grant FFY 2023, activities focused on scaling up training and support to all LEAs. Since SPDG schools did not receive direct support during this final year, this might have contributed to a decrease in proficiency rates among the SPDG participating school's subgroup. Lastly, LEA proficiency rates were examined, and more than half of LEAs experienced a decrease in their proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023. These two groups (all students and all students with disabilities) also experienced a decrease in their proficiency rates. The all-student reading proficiency rate for grades 3-5 decreased from 48.8% in FFY 2021 to 47.3% in FFY 2022 (decrease of 1.5 percentage points); the all-students with disabilities rate decreased from 20.8% in FFY 2021 to 19.9% in FFY 2022 (decrease of 0.9 percentage points). Lastly, proficiency rates of all LEAs in the state were examined, and slightly more than half of LEAs experienced a decrease in their all-student proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023, and about a half experienced a decrease in their students with disabilities proficiency rates from spring 2022 to spring 2023.

Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.

Data for this indicator is collected through the SD English Language Arts statewide assessment reported on Indicator 3.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Data for this indicator is collected and analyzed in the standardized method required by the SD English Language Arts Statewide Assessment. For the data analysis, the proficiency rates were used.

SSIP stakeholders proposed that the SSIP focus on four groups of students with disabilities: (1) all students with disabilities, (2) students with specific learning disabilities, (3) students with other health impairments, and (4) students with speech language impairments. When selecting these groups, stakeholders took into consideration the large percentage of students in these subgroups that would be positively impacted. The last three groups each have different needs, and as such, the stakeholders thought it important to focus on these three groups separately. Since the template doesn't allow for four targets, the SEA has combined the last three groups into one group for APR reporting purposes. The SEA will continue to track these three groups individually given their differing needs, but will also report them as one on the SPP. The FFY 2022 data showed that students with speech language impairments had a proficiency rate of 47.18% which would be higher than Target B, but students with specific learning disabilities had a proficiency rate of 7.19% and students with other health impairments had a proficiency rate of 8.00% both of which would be below Target B. This data also showed that each group decreased their proficiency rates. Students with speech language impairments had a decrease in proficiency from 49.33% in FFY 2021 to 47.18% in FFY 2022; students with specific learning disabilities from 9.15% to 7.19%; and students with other health impairments from 10.11% to 8.00%.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Benchmark data from the 2022-2023 school year for participating LEAs shows the percentage of all students with disabilities and the subset of students with disabilities (i.e., SLD, OHI, and speech-language impairment) scoring at benchmark from fall 2022 to spring 2023 increased at each grade (K-5).

The percentage of all students with disabilities scoring at benchmark in fall 2022 and spring 2023:

- Grades K-5: increased (29.4% to 39.4%)
- Kindergarten: increased (44.7% to 60.2%)
- Grade 1: increased (24.6% to 41.3%)
- Grade 2: increased (34.3% to 41.6%)
- Grade 3: increased (30.1% to 41.0%)
- Grade 4: increased (28.1% to 33.7%)
- Grade 5: increased (20.7% to 28.2%)

The percentage of students with a specific learning disability, other health impairment, and speech-language impairment scoring at benchmark in fall 2022 and spring 2023:

Grades K-5: increased (31.0% to 42.4%)
Kindergarten: increased (50.6% to 68.4%)
Grade 1: increased (25.8% to 43.3%)
Grade 2: increased (37.2% to 45.5%)
Grade 3: increased (32.2% to 45.9%)
Grade 4: increased (28.2% to 34.9%)
Grade 5: increased (19.7% to 28.2%)

The evaluation measures included in the combined evaluation plan allow the SEA to assess outcomes achieved in each infrastructure improvement strategy. The current evaluation plan can be viewed at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/SSIP-MTSS-EvalPlan-22.pdf>.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Please provide a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

<https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/SSIP-MTSS-EvalPlan-22.pdf>

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.

There was one minor change from the 2022-2023 school year evaluation plan to the 2023-2024 school year evaluation plan. The Family Engagement Surveys were added back to the plan.

If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.

The surveys were removed for one year as the MTSS Evaluation Plan included other family engagement-related data points. Feedback from LEAs indicated the family engagement surveys would have provided valuable information, and LEAs requested the survey be added back to the plan.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:

The four infrastructure improvement strategies are:

- 1) MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making
- 2) Literacy/Instruction
- 3) Coaching
- 4) Family Engagement

Each of the standards of action have improvement strategies within them. The SEA continues to implement activities within each of these standards of action.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

General education and special education teachers in participating LEAs continue to take part in schoolwide data analysis training and grade level student data reviews using the MTSS Data Workbook (<https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/ReadWorkbook.pdf>). Data analysis training provides LEAs with a process and tools to review student benchmark data to determine instructional effectiveness and student needs. Grade level student data reviews provide teams with a process and tools for reviewing ongoing progress monitoring data to adjust intervention supports. LEAs use meeting fidelity checklists to ensure building leadership team meetings and grade level meetings are timely, effective, and on-topic. When teams demonstrate high meeting fidelity over time, less support is provided by state coordinators. LEAs continue to use data to drive instructional planning for core classroom and intervention groups.

Literacy/Instruction

The statewide literacy framework is complete and available to all LEAs. The SDPG focused on providing training and support in the areas of literacy and instruction, instructional coaching, MTSS and data-driven decision-making, family engagement, and leadership and sustainability. The positive outcomes of SDPG participating LEAs led to the SEA developing the statewide literacy framework, and much of the SDPG literacy-related training and support are now included in the statewide literacy framework. LEAs continue to receive training in foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. Foundational literacy training provides a basic understanding of literacy skills (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) along with modeling and practice of evidence-based instructional strategies. Participants leave the training with a copy of the Teaching Reading Sourcebook, visual aids, and the knowledge and skills needed to provide effective instruction in their respective classrooms. and instructional practices using Explicit Instruction tools and resources from Dr. Anita Archer. Explicit Instruction training provides a strong foundation in using evidence-based strategies in lesson design and delivery. Participants receive a copy of the Explicit Instruction text and practice developing and delivering engaging lessons.

LEAs who are new to the initiative receive on-site training by a trained coordinator or coach. The SEA continues to partner with other DOE divisions to provide annual regional training in foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook when LEAs have new staff join their LEA. Regional training is open to all LEAs.

Coaching

Participating LEAs receive coaching support from their respective LEA coaches. Coaches conduct fall walkthroughs to collect data and develop a

coaching plan to provide differentiated coaching cycles to teachers. Coaching cycles include a pre-conference, lesson observation or modeling, and debrief. Coaches continue to receive ongoing training and support through monthly meetings and quarterly training. The meetings and training provide continuous support on collecting coaching data, implementing coaching cycles, and working through challenging conversations and situations.

Family Engagement

Through the state MTSS Initiative, the SEA provides regional training and support to all LEAs in the implementation of family literacy modules. Module one focuses on phonological awareness and phonics skills. Module two focuses on reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. These modules provide a basic understanding of foundational literacy skills and activities that families can do at home to build literacy skills. The SEA provides weekly family literacy tips to LEAs that can be included in newsletters, websites, and social media.

Ongoing infrastructure analysis and improvement efforts continue to focus on alignment across common initiatives, including the South Dakota Literacy Framework, MTSS, SPDG, and SSIP. Intentional planning meetings continue to be held with leadership and key stakeholders from each initiative to discuss ongoing alignment efforts.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

LEAs participated in 21 trainings on data-driven decision-making strategies. Training evaluations were completed by 108 participants, including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators. Of the respondents, 94% indicated that the trainings were useful, 94% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 88% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

These short-term outcomes are related to both the data and professional development area of a systems framework. LEAs who participate in data-driven decision-making have a clear understanding of the importance of collecting and analyzing high-quality data. Providing professional development in the area of MTSS and data-driven decision-making supports student-level, grade level, and systems-level change at the LEA level and is necessary for the sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Literacy/Instruction

Instructional coaches and state trainers provided 22 literacy or instruction trainings to participating LEAs. Training evaluations were completed by 111 participants, including general education teachers, special education teachers, and school administrators. Of the survey respondents, 99% indicated that the trainings were useful, 99% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 96% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

These short-term outcomes are related to the professional development area of a systems framework. Providing foundational literacy and evidence-based instruction professional development supports system change by improving instructional skills for teachers. This leads to a positive impact on student outcomes. Professional development in the areas of literacy and instruction is necessary for both achievement of the SiMR and sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Coaching

Thirteen staff members (i.e., general education teachers, special education teachers, interventionists) from participating LEAs completed a coaching survey. Of the survey respondents, 100% stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with support received from the coach. Coaches at participating LEAs completed 648 coaching activities during the 2022-2023 school year. The topics of the coaching activities include phonics, lesson delivery, and student data.

These short-term outcomes are related to the technical assistance area of a systems framework. Instructional coaching provides hands-on, direct support to teachers and supports system change by impacting both the skill level of the teachers and the instructional outcome of the students. Instructional coaching is necessary for both achievement of the SiMR and sustainability of systems improvement efforts.

Family Engagement

A total of three "train-the-trainer" style trainings focused on family literacy were held for participating LEAs. Six participants (including special education teachers and school administrators) responded to training evaluations. Of the survey respondents, 100% indicated that the trainings were useful, 100% stated that their work-related knowledge increased, and 100% stated that the workshops will positively impact students.

During the 2022-2023 school year, the SEA shared access to a Read to Succeed Online Family Literacy training to families of both participating and non-participating LEAs. The asynchronous training modules were accessed by unique participants across the state. As of June 30, 2022, there were 481 unique clicks on the website and 33 unique video views.

These short-term outcomes are related to the professional development area of a systems framework. Family literacy training and resources support system change by impacting the level of understanding and ability to support children in key areas of foundational literacy. Providing asynchronous options online for families to access the training and support increases access to families across the state and is necessary for scale-up.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The SEA has identified the following next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy:

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

Feedback during stakeholder meetings indicated that LEAs would benefit from more opportunities for asynchronous professional development. In response to this feedback, the SEA began development on a series of ten modules related to tiered interventions and data-driven decision-making. These modules will be housed on the DOE learner management system platform and made available to all LEAs. The SEA anticipates that this will increase the number of LEAs that are trained in the area of MTSS and data-driven decision-making and will increase the number of schools that utilize MTSS and data-driven decision-making processes to improve student outcomes.

Literacy/Instruction

A statewide literacy framework is complete and available to all LEAs. The SDPG focused on providing training and support in the areas of literacy and instruction, instructional coaching, MTSS and data-driven decision-making, family engagement, and leadership and sustainability. The positive outcomes of SPDG participating LEAs led to the SEA developing the statewide literacy framework, and much of the SPDG literacy-related training and support are now included in the statewide literacy framework. The SEA is currently working on a training plan to provide training to all LEAs on the literacy framework as well as ongoing training on evidence-based literacy instruction. The training plan will include both asynchronous and face-to-face training. Data collected on the effectiveness of the training and support provided through SSIP, SPDG, and MTSS continue to guide the strategies and evaluation plans for the state literacy framework. The SEA anticipates that an increase in knowledge and skills in literacy and instruction will lead to a greater number of LEAs implementing evidence-based literacy and instructional practices.

Coaching

The SEA will partner with other DOE divisions to provide instructional coaching training. The DOE will offer a summer 2024 coach training featuring texts and resources from Jim Knight. This training will be offered to all instructional coaches and school leaders in the state. The SEA anticipates that an increase in access to instructional coaching for educators will lead to improved instructional practices in LEAs across the state.

Family Engagement

The SEA continues to work across DOE divisions to provide access to family literacy resources. The SEA provides Train the Trainer events to equip LEAs in the family literacy training. Train the Trainer participants leave with copies of all presentation materials, trainer notes, and ample practice in delivering the training content. The DOE will continue to monitor evaluation results and LEA feedback for continued revisions of the training as needed. The SEA anticipates that providing ongoing family literacy training and support to LEAs will increase the ability of LEAs to engage meaningfully with families in improving their child's literacy success.

List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:

Foundational Literacy Training
Explicit Instruction Training
Facilitated Coaching Supports

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.

Foundational Literacy Training

The SEA continues to provide on-site training in foundational literacy to supported LEAs. The SEA continues to partner with other DOE divisions in DOE to offer summer Foundational Literacy training to all LEAs. Both the on-site and summer training provide a basic understanding of foundational literacy using the Teaching Reading Sourcebook. This training is ideal for new teachers, as well as experienced teachers who would like to strengthen their understanding and refine teaching practices. Providing continued training in foundational literacy will strengthen the knowledge and skills of teachers and build a common understanding across LEAs. With improved knowledge and skills, teachers can provide effective instruction which will improve outcomes for all students, including the target subset group (students with SLD, OHI, and speech language impairment).

Previously, the SSIP included LETRS (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) training as one of the evidence-based practices. The SEA adopted AIM Pathways literacy training as part of the state literacy initiative, and LEAs will utilize that training in place of LETRS moving forward. The SEA opted to focus on explicit instruction training to support LEAs moving forward, as this training positively impacts educators in all grade levels and all subject areas.

Explicit Instruction Training

The SEA continues to provide on-site training in explicit instruction to supported LEAs. The SEA began partnering with other DOE divisions in the DOE to offer Explicit Instruction training to all LEAs. This includes virtual training during the fall and spring semesters, and face-to-face training during the summer. Explicit Instruction includes evidence-based instructional practices that are systematic, direct, engaging, and success-oriented. When teachers are equipped with highly effective instructional strategies, their instruction is more engaging and produces improved outcomes for all students, including the target subset group (students with SLD, OHI, and speech language impairment).

Facilitated Coaching Support

The SEA continues to facilitate coaching support in participating LEAs. The SEA continues to partner with other DOE divisions to provide ongoing instructional coach training. Instructional coaches and LEA leadership attend this training to develop strong coaching support in their buildings. When teachers are provided ongoing coaching support, they receive job-embedded professional development and opportunities for ongoing feedback and refinement of instructional strategies. This will lead to improved instruction and improved outcomes for all students, including the target subset group (students with SLD, OHI, and speech language impairment).

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.

Foundational Literacy Training

Participants in the Foundational Literacy Training receive training in foundational literacy skills. Improved understanding of foundational literacy and skills in providing effective instruction will lead to improved teacher knowledge and implementation of effective literacy instruction. The students receiving this high-quality literacy instruction will demonstrate improved outcomes, which will positively impact the SiMR.

Explicit Instruction Training

Participants in the Explicit Instruction training cohort receive training in evidence-based explicit instructional strategies. Highly skilled educators will provide high-quality explicit instruction and support to students. The students receiving this high-quality instruction will demonstrate improved literacy outcomes, which will positively impact the SiMR.

Facilitated Coaching Support

Teachers who receive coaching support are receiving job-embedded professional development in several important areas based on individual teacher need. Topics include foundational reading instruction, classroom/behavior management, assessment and student data, lesson planning/delivery, and student engagement. This level of support will lead to improved instructional strategies in literacy, improved student engagement, positive classroom climate, and improved student literacy outcomes, which will positively impact the SiMR.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

Reading Tiered Fidelity Inventory (R-TFI): The R-TFI is a rubric to monitor the fidelity of implementation for the core features of MTSS for all tiers of support. When reviewing fidelity results, 82% of schools indicated that they are implementing the Tier 1 skills with fidelity (fidelity score of 70% or higher), 63% for Tier 2, and 48% for Tier 3. A trained facilitator leads the school team through a structured process to complete the R-TFI and collect the data. The data is reviewed annually by school teams during summer training and each fall with a group of stakeholders to assess practice change.

LEAs complete the R-TFI annually with the support of a trained R-TFI facilitator. The results are used to assess practice change. All participating LEAs meet in the summer for Return Team Training to review R-TFI results and develop an action plan that drives the implementation work for the following year. The SEA reviews the results for all schools and identifies common strengths and areas of need across all participating LEAs.

Classroom Observation Checklist: 86% of teacher participants observed are implementing the literacy strategy skills with fidelity and 76% are implementing explicit instruction skills with fidelity. Instructional coaches are observed in a percentage of classrooms at each LEA. Instructional coaches meet in the spring to review all observation data collected and identify common areas of need across LEAs.

Observation Checklist for High-Quality Professional Development (HQPDP) Training: 100% of the six trainings observed had 80% or more of the essential elements of HQPDP included in the training. This data is collected through a combination of self-assessment and external observations. Trainers review the results annually to identify any common strengths or areas of need.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

The SEA collects data on each of the infrastructure areas through the combined evaluation plan. Data is collected and reported at the LEA and state levels to be used for continuous feedback and improvement. The 2022-2023 school year state-level data dashboard report can be found at <https://doe.sd.gov/sped/documents/MTSSDashboardReport-22-23.pdf>.

MTSS/Data-Driven Decision Making

Of the participants who completed end of training evaluation surveys, 90-94% indicated that their knowledge/skills increased and will change what they do on the job as a result of the training.

From the interviews conducted in spring 2023:

Of the participating interviewees, 100% said they are implementing the skills in the classroom that they learned in the MTSS/Data-Driven Decision-Making trainings, and 90-100% of participants said the project positively impacted the Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions that teachers are using and positively impacted students with disabilities receiving Tier 2/Tier 3 interventions.

Literacy/Instruction

Of the participants who completed end of training evaluation surveys, 99% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased, and 94% said they will change what they do on the job as a result of the training. Based on the Intervention Tracking Forms, eight percent of students receiving a Tier 2 intervention in November no longer needed intervention supports in May; eight percent receiving a Tier 3 intervention moved to a less intensive (Tier 2) intervention in May, and four percent no longer needed intervention supports in May.

Coaching

Of the teachers who completed a coaching evaluation survey, 100% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased and will change what they do on the job as a result of the training.

Based on the interviews, 92% of teacher participants said that coaches are effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools. From the Coaching Survey, 100% of teacher participants said that coaches are effective in helping K-5 teachers improve literacy components at schools.

Family Engagement

Of the participants who completed end of training evaluation surveys, 100% of participants indicated that their knowledge/skills increased, and they will change what they do on the job as a result of the training.

Based on the interviews, 82% of participants said that schools were more welcoming as a result of family engagement efforts through the project.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

Foundational Literacy Training

The DOE is currently working on a training plan to provide training to all LEAs on the literacy framework as well as ongoing training on evidence-based literacy instruction. The training plan will include both asynchronous and in-person training. The SEA anticipates that an increase in teachers' awareness, knowledge, and skills in literacy and instruction will lead to a greater number of LEAs implementing evidence-based literacy and instructional practices and improved student outcomes.

Explicit Instruction Training

The SEA will continue to partner with other DOE divisions to provide training to all LEAs on explicit instruction. These trainings will include both virtual and in-person training opportunities to increase the ability for participants to access the training. The SEA anticipates that an increase in knowledge and skills in evidence-based instructional strategies will lead to a greater number of educators providing evidence-based instruction to students, and ultimately, improved outcomes for students.

Facilitated Coaching Support

The SEA will continue to provide instructional coaching supports to participating LEAs. The SEA will partner with other DOE divisions to develop a statewide coaching framework that will support effective instructional coaching practices across all LEAs. This framework will include training opportunities during the summer and regular instructional coach Community of Practice meetings during the school year. The SEA anticipates that an increase in knowledge and skills of instructional coaches will lead to more educators receiving high quality instructional coaching support, educators providing effective instruction to students, and improved student outcomes.

Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)

NO

If no, describe any changes to the activities, strategies or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes.

In response to stakeholder feedback, the SEA is revising the Theory of Action to align evidence-based practices and key infrastructure activities across the SSIP and MTSS initiatives. The new Theory of Action will include the following four key areas: Team-Based Leadership, Tiered Continuum of Supports, Comprehensive Data Collection System, and Communication and Collaboration.

Participating LEAs will continue to receive support through an assigned coordinator and instructional coach. While this change in the Theory of Action will not directly impact the support provided to LEAs, it will provide the SEA with a unified approach to reviewing data and evaluating common goals and outcomes across SSIP and MTSS.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

Stakeholders reviewed data and progress of the MTSS initiative and also participated in a facilitated feedback process for each component of the MTSS initiative. Stakeholders indicated they would like to see more alignment with the Theory of Action, so the facilitator engaged participants in a process to provide feedback on an updated Theory of Action document.

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

Prior to the meeting, stakeholders were given access to state-level reports disaggregated by initiative in a Google folder. The Google folder also contained copies of the presentation materials and handouts. At the start of the meeting, the facilitator reviewed the role of a stakeholder and shared information to build a common understanding and allow for equitable participation in the meeting. During each meeting, the meeting facilitator led stakeholders in a guided feedback-gathering process to ensure all voices were heard. The facilitators used a variety of small-group and whole-group sharing as well as written feedback tools to gather input from all stakeholders.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Stakeholders indicated they would like to see more alignment with the Theory of Action, so the facilitator engaged participants in a process to provide feedback on an updated Theory of Action document. In response to stakeholder feedback, the SEA is revising the Theory of Action to align evidence-based practices and key infrastructure activities across the SSIP and MTSS initiatives. The new Theory of Action will include the following four key areas: Team-Based Leadership, Tiered Continuum of Supports, Comprehensive Data Collection System, and Communication and Collaboration.

Stakeholders also raised questions about comparing LEAs in the early phases of implementation to LEAs who are sustaining evidence-based practices. The SEA currently disaggregates by cohort year, but to address these concerns will look at ways to disaggregate by implementation phase to better compare LEAs who are at the same phase of implementation.

Stakeholders shared positive outcomes of participating in SSIP initiatives as well as concern about the DOE's ability to support an increased interest in SSIP-related activities. Stakeholders noted that many LEAs are attempting to implement these evidence-based practices and infrastructure improvement strategies on their own and would like to find ways to support and recognize these LEAs. To address these concerns, the SEA is exploring an annual recognition that would recognize effective implementation and positive student outcomes in LEAs for that specific year.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

17 - OSEP Response

17 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role:

Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Linda Turner

Title:

Director of Special Education and Early Learning

Email:

linda.turner@state.sd.us

Phone:

605-773-3327

Submitted on:

04/24/24 2:29:48 PM

Determination Enclosures

RDA Matrix

South Dakota 2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination (1)

| Percentage (%) | Determination |
|----------------|------------------|
| 73.61% | Needs Assistance |

Results and Compliance Overall Scoring

| Section | Total Points Available | Points Earned | Score (%) |
|------------|------------------------|---------------|-----------|
| Results | 20 | 15 | 75.00% |
| Compliance | 18 | 13 | 72.22% |

(1) For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B."

2024 Part B Results Matrix

Reading Assessment Elements

| Reading Assessment Elements | Grade | Performance (%) | Score |
|---|---------|-----------------|-------|
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment (2) | Grade 4 | 99% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment | Grade 8 | 99% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 4 | 31% | 2 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 4 | 95% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 8 | 24% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 8 | 90% | 1 |

Math Assessment Elements

| Math Assessment Elements | Grade | Performance (%) | Score |
|---|---------|-----------------|-------|
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment | Grade 4 | 99% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Participating in Statewide Assessment | Grade 8 | 99% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 4 | 49% | 2 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 4 | 94% | 1 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 8 | 27% | 2 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress | Grade 8 | 89% | 1 |

(2) Statewide assessments include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment.

Exiting Data Elements

| Exiting Data Elements | Performance (%) | Score |
|--|------------------------|--------------|
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out | 28 | 0 |
| Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma** | 64 | 0 |

**When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. §300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

2024 Part B Compliance Matrix

| Part B Compliance Indicator (3) | Performance (%) | Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021 (4) | Score |
|--|------------------------|---|-------|
| Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements. | Not Valid and Reliable | N/A | 0 |
| Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification. | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification. | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation | 99.39% | YES | 2 |
| Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday | 99.59% | NO | 2 |
| Indicator 13: Secondary transition | 62.94% | YES | 0 |
| Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data | 93.77% | | 1 |
| Timely State Complaint Decisions | 100.00% | | 2 |
| Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions | N/A | | N/A |
| Longstanding Noncompliance | | | 2 |
| Programmatic Specific Conditions | None | | |
| Uncorrected identified noncompliance | None | | |

(3) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf

(4) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ for Indicators 4B, 9, and 10, and $\geq 90\%$ and $< 95\%$ for Indicators 11, 12, and 13.

Data Rubric
South Dakota

FFY 2022 APR (1)

Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data

| APR Indicator | Valid and Reliable | Total |
|---------------|--------------------|-------|
| 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3A | 1 | 1 |
| 3B | 1 | 1 |
| 3C | 1 | 1 |
| 3D | 1 | 1 |
| 4A | 0 | 0 |
| 4B | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 1 | 1 |
| 9 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 |
| 11 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | 1 | 1 |
| 13 | 1 | 1 |
| 14 | 1 | 1 |
| 15 | 1 | 1 |
| 16 | 1 | 1 |
| 17 | 1 | 1 |

APR Score Calculation

| | |
|---|----|
| Subtotal | 19 |
| Timely Submission Points - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
| Grand Total - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 24 |

(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.

618 Data (2)

| Table | Timely | Complete Data | Passed Edit Check | Total |
|--|--------|---------------|-------------------|-------|
| Child Count/ Ed Envs Due Date: 8/30/23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Personnel Due Date: 2/21/24 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Discipline Due Date: 2/21/24 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| State Assessment Due Date: 1/10/24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/3/23 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

618 Score Calculation

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Subtotal | 20 |
| Grand Total (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 24.76 |

(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a '0'. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.

Indicator Calculation

| | |
|--|--------|
| A. APR Grand Total | 24 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 24.76 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 48.76 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| Denominator | 52.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) = | 0.9377 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 93.77 |

(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.

APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data

DATE: February 2024 Submission

SPP/APR Data

1) Valid and Reliable Data - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

Part B 618 Data

1) Timely – A State will receive one point if it submits all *EDFacts* files or the entire *EMAPS* survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

| 618 Data Collection | EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey | Due Date |
|---|--|------------|
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 8/30/2023 |
| Part B Personnel | C070, C099, C112 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Discipline | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 2/21/2024 |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | 1/10/2024 |
| Part B Dispute Resolution | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in <i>EMAPS</i> | 11/15/2023 |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in <i>EMAPS</i> | 5/3/2023 |

2) Complete Data – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to *EDFacts* aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in *EMAPS*. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

3) Passed Edit Check – A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

Dispute Resolution

IDEA Part B

South Dakota

School Year: 2022-23

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check "Missing" if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

Section A: Written, Signed Complaints

| | |
|---|----|
| (1) Total number of written signed complaints filed. | 10 |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued. | 6 |
| (1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance | 4 |
| (1.1) (b) Reports within timelines | 6 |
| (1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines | 0 |
| (1.2) Complaints pending. | 0 |
| (1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing. | 0 |
| (1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed. | 4 |

Section B: Mediation Requests

| | |
|--|---|
| (2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes. | 7 |
| (2.1) Mediations held. | 6 |
| (2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints. | 0 |
| (2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints. | 0 |
| (2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints. | 6 |
| (2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints. | 6 |
| (2.2) Mediations pending. | 0 |
| (2.3) Mediations withdrawn or not held. | 1 |

Section C: Due Process Complaints

| | |
|---|----|
| (3) Total number of due process complaints filed. | 10 |
| (3.1) Resolution meetings. | 3 |
| (3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings. | 0 |
| (3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated. | 3 |
| (3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline (include expedited). | 1 |
| (3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline. | 1 |
| (3.3) Due process complaints pending. | 0 |
| (3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing). | 7 |

Section D: Expedited Due Process Complaints (Related to Disciplinary Decision)

| | |
|--|---|
| (4) Total number of expedited due process complaints filed. | 1 |
| (4.1) Expedited resolution meetings. | 1 |
| (4.1) (a) Expedited written settlement agreements. | 0 |
| (4.2) Expedited hearings fully adjudicated. | 0 |
| (4.2) (a) Change of placement ordered | 0 |
| (4.3) Expedited due process complaints pending. | 0 |
| (4.4) Expedited due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed. | 1 |

State Comments:

Errors:

Please note that the data entered result in the following relationships which violate edit checks:

State error comments:

This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:

South Dakota

These data were extracted on the close date:

11/15/2023

How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP's IDEA Website. How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

<https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/>



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

Final Determination Letter

June 21, 2024

Honorable Joseph Graves
Secretary of Education
South Dakota Department of Education
800 Governors Drive
Pierre, SD 57501

Dear Secretary Graves:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) 2024 determination under Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that South Dakota needs assistance in implementing the requirements of Part B of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of South Dakota's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

South Dakota's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in its "2024 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix" (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for each State and Entity and consists of:

- (1) a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
- (2) a Results Matrix that includes scoring on Results Elements;
- (3) a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
- (4) an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
- (5) the State's or Entity's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled "[How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616\(d\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part B](#)" (HTDMD).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making determinations in 2024, as it did for Part B determinations in 2014-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for South Dakota.)

In making Part B determinations in 2024, OSEP continued to use results data related to:

- (1) the participation and performance of CWD on the most recently administered (school year 2021-2022) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), as applicable (For the 2024 determinations, OSEP using results data on the participation and performance of children with disabilities on the NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. OSEP used the available NAEP data for Puerto Rico in making Puerto Rico's 2024 determination as it did for Puerto Rico's 2023 determination. OSEP did not use NAEP data in making the BIE's 2024 determination because the NAEP data available for the BIE were not comparable to the NAEP data available for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; specifically, the most recently administered NAEP for the BIE is 2019, whereas the most recently administered NAEP for the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico is 2022.)
- (2) the percentage of CWD who graduated with a regular high school diploma; and
- (3) the percentage of CWD who dropped out.

For the 2024 IDEA Part B determinations, OSEP also considered participation of CWD on Statewide assessments (which include the regular assessment and the alternate assessment). While the participation rates of CWD on Statewide assessments were a factor in each State or Entity's 2024 Part B Results Matrix, no State or Entity received a Needs Intervention determination in 2024 due solely to this criterion. However, this criterion will be fully incorporated beginning with the 2025 determinations.

You may access the results of OSEP's review of South Dakota's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your South Dakota-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access South Dakota's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in applicable Indicators 1 through 17, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that South Dakota is required to take. The actions that South Dakota is required to take are in the "Required Actions" section of the indicator.

It is important for you to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the "OSEP Response" and/or "Required Actions" sections.

You will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

- (1) South Dakota's RDA Matrix;
- (2) the HTDMD [link](#);

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

- (3) "2024 Data Rubric Part B," which shows how OSEP calculated South Dakota's "Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data" score in the Compliance Matrix; and
- (4) "Dispute Resolution 2022-2023," which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the South Dakota's "Timely State Complaint Decisions" and "Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions" scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, South Dakota's 2024 determination is Needs Assistance. A State's or Entity's 2024 RDA Determination is Needs Assistance if the RDA Percentage is at least 60% but less than 80%. A State or Entity's determination would also be Needs Assistance if its RDA Determination percentage is 80% or above but the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State's or Entity's last three IDEA Part B grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering three criteria related to IDEA Part B determinations as part of the Department's continued efforts to incorporate equity and improve results for CWD. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State and Entity through the "longstanding noncompliance" section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State or Entity that would otherwise receive a score of Meets Requirements would not be able to receive a determination of Meets Requirements if the State or Entity had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is considering as potential additional factors the improvement in proficiency rates of CWD on Statewide assessments. Third, the Department is considering whether and how to continue including in its determinations criteria the participation and proficiency of CWD on the NAEP.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part B Results Matrix and States and Entities will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part B data will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part B SPP/APR Indicators 3, 5, and 6 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States and Entities are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part B data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States and Entities are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States and Entities to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the EDPass or EMAPS system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. States and Entities will be unable to submit the IDEA Section 618 Part B data without taking one of these two actions. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part B data.

As a reminder, South Dakota must report annually to the public, by posting on the State educational agency's (SEA's) website, the performance of each local educational agency (LEA) located in South Dakota on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after South Dakota's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, South Dakota must:

- (1) review LEA performance against targets in the State's SPP/APR;
- (2) determine if each LEA "meets the requirements" of Part B, or "needs assistance," "needs intervention," or "needs substantial intervention" in implementing Part B of the IDEA;
- (3) take appropriate enforcement action; and
- (4) inform each LEA of its determination.

Further, South Dakota must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the SEA's website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

- (1) includes South Dakota's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State or Entity attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
- (2) will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates South Dakota's efforts to improve results for children and youth with disabilities and looks forward to working with South Dakota over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,

Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

cc: South Dakota Director of Special Education

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W., WASHINGTON DC 20202-2600

www.ed.gov

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.