

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 79.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 82.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 81%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 4.07%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 3.9%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 4.8%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size meeting the State's AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.39% for reading and 98.79% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 98.8% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 97.6% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 96% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 96% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 99.43% for reading and 99.54% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.10% for reading and progress from the FFY 2005 data of 99.17% for math. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 98.2% for reading and met its FFY 2006 target of 98.4% for math.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																												
standards. [Results Indicator]																														
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="550 399 1419 646"> <thead> <tr> <th>Grades</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Reading</td> <td></td> <td colspan="2">Math</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>K – 8</td> <td>53.07%</td> <td>56%</td> <td>82%</td> <td>40.05%</td> <td>41.93%</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>9 – 12</td> <td>21.03%</td> <td>20.05%</td> <td>72%</td> <td>11.68%</td> <td>15.43%</td> <td>54%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress in part and slippage in part from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 targets.</p>	Grades	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target		Reading			Math			K – 8	53.07%	56%	82%	40.05%	41.93%	65%	9 – 12	21.03%	20.05%	72%	11.68%	15.43%	54%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
Grades	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target																								
	Reading			Math																										
K – 8	53.07%	56%	82%	40.05%	41.93%	65%																								
9 – 12	21.03%	20.05%	72%	11.68%	15.43%	54%																								
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.6%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 0.6%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 1.80%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 related to this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>In reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2008, the State must describe the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>																												
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 4B was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																													

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																
[Results Indicator]																		
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 349 1419 729"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2005 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2006 Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td>65%</td> <td>65.65%</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td>6.5%</td> <td>6.73%</td> <td>7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</td> <td>3.3%</td> <td>3.15%</td> <td>4.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress for 5A and 5C and slippage for 5B from the FFY 2005 data.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 targets.</p>		FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target	A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	65%	65.65%	64%	B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.5%	6.73%	7%	C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.3%	3.15%	4.3%	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target															
A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	65%	65.65%	64%															
B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	6.5%	6.73%	7%															
C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	3.3%	3.15%	4.3%															
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>Reporting on Indicator 6 was not required for the FFY 2006 APR.</p>																	
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide progress data with the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, and baseline data and targets with the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>																

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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. [Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p align="center">06-07 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</p>	<p align="center">Social Emotional</p>	<p align="center">Knowledge & Skills</p>	<p align="center">Appropriate Behavior</p>	<p>February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</p>	<p align="center">0%</p>	<p align="center">0%</p>	<p align="center">0%</p>		
<p>b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">0%</p>	<p align="center">4.17%</p>	<p align="center">12.5%</p>		
<p>c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.</p>	<p align="center">8.33%</p>	<p align="center">25%</p>	<p align="center">20.83%</p>		
<p>d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">29.17%</p>	<p align="center">41.67%</p>	<p align="center">25%</p>		
<p>e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.</p>	<p align="center">62.5%</p>	<p align="center">29.17%</p>	<p align="center">41.67%</p>		
<p>The State provided improvement activities for this indicator covering the remaining years of the SPP.</p>					
<p>8. 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. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 75.3%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 62.2%. The State met its FFY 2006 target of 62.7%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate</p>	<p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data, its criteria for determining disproportionate representation and the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions. The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.6%. These data represent slippage from the revised FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p>				<p>OSEP's June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification and describe how the State made that determination, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc. The State was also required to provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification and describe how the State made the determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007. The State provided the required information.</p> <p>OSEP noted that the State used the phrase “potential disproportionate representation” to describe those districts with disproportionate representation but without a determination of whether it was the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP interpreted this phrase to mean districts with disproportionate representation that was potentially the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP strongly suggests that this phrasing be revised to accurately report the status of the district.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009 that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised its FFY 2005 data, its criteria for determining disproportionate representation and the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 0.61%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 0%.</p>	<p>OSEP’s June 15, 2007 FFY 2005 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2006 APR, due February 1, 2008, baseline data from FFY 2005 on the percent of districts identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification and describe how the State made that determination, e.g., monitoring data, review of policies, practices and procedures, etc. The State was also required to provide data, in its FFY 2006 APR, on the percent of districts identified in FFY 2006 with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification and describe how the State made the determination, even if the determination occurs in the fall of 2007. The State submitted the required information.</p> <p>OSEP noted that the State used the phrase “potential disproportionate representation” to describe those districts with disproportionate representation but without a determination of whether it was the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP interpreted this phrase to mean districts with disproportionate representation that was potentially the result of inappropriate identification. OSEP strongly suggests that this phrasing be revised to accurately report the status of the district.</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that demonstrate that the State has in effect policies and procedures as required by 34 CFR §300.173 and that the LEAs identified in FFY 2006 as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories that was the result of inappropriate identification are in compliance with the requirements of 34 CFR §§300.111, 300.201 and 300.301 through 300.311.</p>
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.05%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 99.86%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that one of three districts with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005, demonstrated 100% compliance for FFY 2006. For the other two districts, the State reported that for FFY 2006, one demonstrated 97% compliance and the other 96%. The State reported that the noncompliance was not systemic, and that “both districts will have a desk audit conducted during the 07-08 school year, address the noncompliance in a corrective action plan and submit periodic progress throughout the 07-08 data collection period.”</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the timely evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) was partially corrected. The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, that the uncorrected noncompliance was corrected.</p> <p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>12. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the post-secondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 48%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2005 data of 63.9%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that “[a]ll of the FFY 2005 school districts with noncompliance on Indicator 13 completed corrective actions and were in compliance within the one year timeframe.”</p>	<p>The State reported that noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b) was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if appropriate, to ensure they will enable the State to provide data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, demonstrating that the State is in compliance with the requirements in 34 CFR §300.320(b), including reporting correction of the noncompliance identified in the FFY 2006 APR.</p>
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State provided baseline data, targets and improvement activities for this indicator in its SPP and OSEP accepts the SPP for this indicator.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported baseline data for this indicator are 84%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 98.94%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2005 data of 69.26%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p> <p>For the two districts with uncorrected noncompliance, the State reported, under Indicator 11, that that the noncompliance was not systemic and that “both districts will have a desk audit conducted during the 07-08 school year, address the noncompliance in a corrective action plan and submit periodic progress throughout the 07-08 data collection period.”</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 (2006-2007) under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 9, 10, 11, and 13 the State must specifically identify and address the noncompliance identified in this table under those indicators.</p>

South Dakota Part B FFY 2006 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one complaint. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one hearing. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2005 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely due process hearing resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no resolutions sessions were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported that no mediations were held during the reporting period.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2006 reported data for this indicator are 100% for timeliness and 96.6% for accuracy.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2006 target of 100% for timeliness and did not meet its FFY 2006 target of 100% for accuracy.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 1, 2009, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the timely and accurate data requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p>