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# 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 infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. 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**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C is known as the Birth to Three program in South Dakota and housed in the Department of Education. Recent organizational changes have led to the forming of the Office of Early Childhood Services (ECS) within the Division of Special Education and Early Learning Services. The ECS office is comprised of Part C, Part B 619 and the Head Start Collaboration Office. The administrator of the ECS office also serves as the Part C Coordinator.   
  
The Birth to Three program has contracts with six regional Birth to Three service coordination programs throughout the state. These regional programs provide service coordination for all 66 counties in South Dakota. South Dakota Birth to Three has a strong partnership with school districts as all eligibility and transition evaluations for Birth to Three are conducted by school district personnel. This creates a link for family engagement and communication between families, Birth to Three and the child’s resident school district.  
  
South Dakota Birth to Three utilizes an online data system in which Individualized Family Service Plans are entered. This secure system allows for real time information for providers, service coordinators and state staff. Through this system, South Dakota can verify that regional programs and providers are consistently achieving high levels of compliance with IDEA requirements.  
  
The federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluates states data using the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. The RDA Matrix is individualized and annually each state receives a Determination of Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance or Needs Intervention. The determination is based on combined scoring of two components, 1) Compliance and 2) Results for an overall score. States scoring 80% or greater are Determined to Meet Requirements. States with at least 60% but less than 80% would be Needs Assistance and State’s with less than 60% are Needs Intervention. South Dakota received 100% in the Compliance component and 62.5% in Results for an overall percentage of 81.25%. This resulted in South Dakota's 2021 OSEP Determination of Meets Requirements for Part C of IDEA. Over the past five years with the assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as DaSy, ECTA, NCSI and IDC as well as collaboration with the National BDI Users Group, BDI States and BDI Publisher South Dakota has taken necessary steps to improve child outcome data. South Dakota will continue to work with these groups towards continued improvement for children and families served.  
  
The reader will note, South Dakota Birth to Three program did not shut down or close during the FFY2020 reporting year due to the pandemic. Instead, Birth to Three remained open and its service coordinators and providers continued serving families. South Dakota was able to remain open by offering services virtually or as a hybrid based on the family’s individual needs. While December 1, 2020 child count did decline, 2021 data, which has not been reported yet, indicates increases in referrals and child count. Relationships with OSEP-funded technical assistance centers and guidance from OSEP contributed to the state’s ability to continue to find, identify and serve families. The reader will also note throughout the SPP/APR steps taken by the state team to ensure significant stakeholder input for target setting and SSIP work.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

**General Supervision System**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.**

GENERAL SUPERVISION SYSTEM  
The South Dakota Birth to Three program policies and procedures are based on the federal regulations for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) at 34 CFR Part 303 and state rules at Article 24:14. The following is an overview of the State’s general supervision system:  
  
INFRASTRUCTURE  
The lead agency is the Department of Education. The Birth to Three program has divided the state into six regions which include 66 counties. Every five years, the Birth to Three program puts forth a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide service coordination. This RFP is advertised to the public and interested organizations through the State of South Dakota Bureau of Administration's procurement management office. Upon approval, one-year contracts are approved with recipients submitting financial and budgetary information through quarterly progress reports. Early intervention direct service providers are required to submit certification, licensure, and background checks to ensure they meet the state’s qualified standards. These documents are reviewed by Birth to Three state staff. Early intervention providers sign an annual Provider Agreement to abide by all federal and state laws and regulations which include requirements related to serving children in natural environments, implementation of the state's evidence-based model, confidentiality, conflict of interest, code of ethics/conduct and fiscal responsibilities including record keeping. In addition, the state Birth to Three office provides oversight to school district programs providing Birth to Three services to children who meet specific eligibility requirements.  
  
In the summer of 2015, in conjunction with the State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase II, South Dakota restructured the Birth to Three program state leadership team. In order to better meet the needs of the Birth to Three program and support the systemic changes of the SSIP, a team member was designated to provide statewide technical assistance, a team member was devoted to data analysis and data quality, and another team member to the professional development associated with the evidence-based practices and the training that is ongoing. Each program specialist is, however, cross-trained for each area to ensure full assistance to Birth to Three partners. In the summer of 2019, the Part C program restructured again and brought a fiscal analyist to the team. This person is responsible for the oversight of all provider invoices and conducts focused monitoring and risk assessment of providers.  
  
DATA SYSTEM  
The State Birth to Three program has an online data system that includes data on programmatic and demographic elements and includes all children's IFSP information and data points. The system also facilitates the online billing process for early intervention services. The billing system allows early intervention providers to only bill for what was written by the IFSP team in regard to frequency / intensity and location of early intervention services. Each provider reimbursement request is reviewed by Birth to Three state office staff to ensure state and federal regulations and guidelines are met before payment is approved. All provider reimbursement requests are linked to IFSPs thus providers are unable to bill for services that are not linked to an IFSP.   
  
The data system allows service coordinators to view reports relating to child count verification and SPP/APR indicators. There are several reports that serve as edit checks in order to assist service coordinators in ensuring the data they enter are valid and reliable. Examples of this would be: Child Count Verification; Transition Conference Report; Exit Child List; etc.  
  
MONITORING  
The Birth to Three state office conducts ongoing monitoring activities on all programs and services. The six regional programs are held responsible for implementing the Birth to Three program consistent with federal and state requirements. The state data system is the primary source of monitoring data. State staff are able to review compliance and reports on most SPP/APR indicators through the data system. In some instances, state staff conduct additional drill-down and inquiry to obtain information on reasons for potential delay or other factors important to consider in monitoring for requirements.   
  
When instance of noncompliance is identified, the state works with the entity to ensure and verify correction of the noncompliance according to the two federal requirement prongs of correction (OSEP 09-02). Depending upon the state’s verification results the state issues a PreFinding Correction letter noting the corrected noncompliance but not issuing a finding. If correction is not verified, then a Finding Letter that requires verfication of correction in both prongs according to federal requirements within one year. A corrective action plan (CAP) may be required depending on the scope and level of noncompliance. A CAP for compliance issues or an improvement plan for results performance slippage is developed involving the regional service coordinators and others (e.g. early intervention providers, school districts, etc.). State Birth to Three staff approve the corrective action plan or improvement plan and provide technical assistance, assuring all improvement activities are completed in accordance with federal requirements.  
  
The state may determine to conduct an onsite focused monitoring based on findings, data slippage, parent information, past data reports etc. An onsite focused monitoring involves reviewing specific children’s files, interviewing service coordinators, early intervention providers, parents, etc. Findings resulting from the onsite focused monitoring are issued as necessary.   
  
Verification of correction of any noncompliance finding is made in accordance with the required 2 prongs of correction in OSEP 09-02.  
  
If a regional program does not meet the corrective action plan within one year, the state uses the additional incentives and/or sanctions as identified in writing to the agency. The content of the letter would include the following information:  
1. Failure to voluntarily correct an identified deficiency constitutes a failure to administer the program in compliance with federal law.  
2. The action the Part C Program / State Department of Education intends to take in order to enforce compliance with the state and federal law.  
3. The right to a hearing prior to Part C exercise of its enforcement; and  
4. The consequences of the Part C enforcement action on continued and future state and federal funding.  
  
DISPUTE RESOLUTION  
Public and parent concerns may be submitted to the state office at any time. Program contact information and a 1-800 number is available on the Birth to Three website and public awareness materials. Dispute resolution processes consistent with federal and state regulation are available including state administrative complaint resolution, a due process hearing, and mediation.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

The South Dakota Birth to Three program provides ongoing comprehensive technical assistance (TA) that includes the provision of specific technical assistance to regional service coordination programs and direct service providers. State staff are available and provide daily real-time TA via telephone calls, emails, virtual meetings, and onsite visits as requested.   
  
Scheduled service coordinator and direct service provider virtual meetings are offered to provide TA on specific topics including improvement strategies for data quality, SPP/APR indicator training, child outcomes, outreach with other state partners and collaboration with family/community support entities. These calls are pre-scheduled and include not only Part C state staff but also representation from the state’s Medicaid office responsible for reimbursements, Part B 619 Coordinator, and the Head Start Collaboration Office Coordinator.   
  
The South Dakota Part C program, historically, relies heavily on technology to provide ongoing support to service coordinators and providers. Examples of this would include a state listserv which is used to send information to service coordinators, school districts, SICC members and early intervention providers statewide. The listserv is used to provide pertinent program information about policy and procedure updates, rules and regulations, program needs/shortages, and training opportunities.   
  
Service coordinators quarterly submit additional professional development activities and case load data with TA responsing as needed. All providers are added to the listserv along with SPED directors from all public-school districts. As new providers are signed on, their names are added to the list to ensure access to this source of communication.   
  
Service coordinator contact information is shared among all state Birth to Three personnel, giving ease of access among providers and coordinators to share best practices and collaborate on issues.  
  
The state staff have developed and provided regional staff a self-monitoring checklist that covers the SPP/APR indicators and other federal/state rules and regulations. This is recommended to be used by regional staff to determine the status of their implementation of Part C requirements to guide their on-going supervision and continuous improvement. Regional programs can request technical assistance from state staff as needed to address any issues identified. The state team also uses the results of the annual APR performance including the results from the annual parent surveys to help plan technical assistance activities.  
  
There was no shut down of state offices during the COVID-19 Pandemic. State Part C staff continue working virtually and in July 2020 returned to state offices full time. The state office continues to communicate regularly with coordinators, providers, and families. Along with scheduled virtual meetings, if circumstances arise, the state will produce a pre-recorded TA session that is sent via a secure link to service coordinators, providers and school district staff with pertinent information and guidance and state office contact for questions. The Part C director, in role as Administrator of the Office of Early Childhood Services, takes part in monthly Department of Education management meetings which ensures alignment of program to other initiatives taking place in the state’s education system. The Part C director also joins weekly statewide meetings being held between the state DOE leadership and school district superintendents. Being present during these calls allows for prompt, efficient responses to any Part C questions that districts incur.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

The South Dakota Birth to Three program’s Professional Development system has a number of components including:  
1. All providers who work in the program must meet qualified personnel standards as required by federal and state regulations.  
2. All new service coordinators receive several days of one-on-one trainings along with comprehensive online module training on evidence-based practices.   
3. All new service coordinators receive peer coaching to reach fidelity in implementing evidence-based practice.   
4. All new service providers receive one-on-one reimbursement training.  
5. Annual training is held for all Birth to Three service coordinators on a statewide and/or regional basis in a face-to-face or virtual setting.   
6. Monthly service coordinator calls are held with Birth to Three state staff and include updates on policies and procedures, and presentations on relevant topics by Parent Connection (State PTI) and other state agency partners (i.e. Department of Health, Medicaid, Department of Social Services Child Protection Division, Head Start, Part B 619 etc.). Topics have included implementation of routines-based home visiting, Routines Based Interview (RBI) implementation and fidelity, functional outcomes, child development, parent rights, hearing services, vision services, outcome writing, state and federal rules, interpreter services, transition planning, social emotional support for families during difficult times, etc.  
7. Statewide and regional public trainings are offered on topics such as early literacy, family engagement, evidence-based practices, early childhood guidelines and a Birth to Three program overview. These trainings are open to service coordinators and direct service providers.  
8. Periodic training events are also held as needed for service providers related to use of private insurance, Medicaid reimbursement, and tele-therapy.  
9. An online platform is used continuously to support the ongoing professional development needs of service coordinators and direct service providers. This comprehensive learning opportunity provides a support system and promotes participation in ongoing professional development regardless of physical location. Within this online tool, modules have been developed to meet the specific needs of the early interventionist in implementing identified evidence-based practices and measuring child and family outcomes. Using this platform, the South Dakota Birth to Three program is building and implementing a continuum of learning opportunities for our early interventionists regardless of their role in the Birth to Three program. Established as a private learning community, participants can also access research, a video library, discussion boards and blogs. Resources are available for new and seasoned early interventionists. This online tool is facilitated by Birth to Three state professional development staff. The online platform provides cost-effective training opportunities for the SSIP. It also proves a reliable tool to present current and accurate information to all early interventionists.  
10. Periodic training opportunities are provided in collaboration with other state and community agencies including the Center for Disabilities, Part B, Parent Connection, Head Start, Medicaid, MIECHV, Child Care Services and Human Services.  
  
Due to the use of technology in training, there was no lost learning time due to the COVID-19 Pandemic. Professional development activities were able to be carried out in the virtual learning environments.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances. To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the ICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the ICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.  
  
Members of the stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health/Early Hearing Detection Intervention (EHDI), South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.   
  
The SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY2020-FFY2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings, several small group working sessions for clusters of indicators and other communications. These meetings occurred over several months and concluded with the January 2022 SICC meeting.  
  
To ensure stakeholders broad representation, the state sought members representing a variety of factors and then surveyed the stakeholder asking questions on demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, civic or community organization affiliation. This additional data indicated that stakeholders represented the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identified themselves or their household as 9% Native American, 4.5% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4.5% Native Hawaiian, 4.5% Asian, 4.5% 2 or more races and 64% white. Self-reported employment, both present and past increased the representation to include childcare provider, tribal school district, Indian Health Services, school board member, elementary educator, foster parents, residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, social worker, residential counselor and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families led to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, and recommendations.   
  
Beginning in August 2020, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2020 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members were orientated the Part C SPP/APR Package, the final OMB approved package for FFY2020 – 2025 by a content expert from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). Stakeholders were notified of proposed changes to general instructions (including target setting), new stakeholder language and proposed changes to the Part C measurement table.   
  
The SICC met again in December 2020 at which time state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, recent COVID-19 data, and preliminary data for the FFY2019 SPP/APR. Additional awareness was provided to stakeholders surrounding those indicators which targets would need to be set in the coming SPP/APR package. It was at this time small working groups were established. Each small work group was established to focus on specific results indicators and convened for several virtual meetings to review and analyze state and regional data specific to each indicator. These small teams considered data quality, performance history and trends, the State Systemic Improvement Plan, and other data sources that could influence future targets. Work group members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, national data, resources, growth and financial implications.   
  
These small workgroups met multiple times over the course of the 2021 year. During the November 2021 in person SICC meeting proposed targets from each small workgroup were brought forward and shared with the full SICC stakeholder group. Spokespersons from each workgroup presented the discussions, data analysis, methodology and proposed targets. At the conclusion of each presentation, the SICC chair welcomed questions and comments from the full stakeholder group. Following parliamentary procedures members made motions to accept targets as presented or bring forward alternative recommendations. Information on each groups makeup, overview of their analysis and method used to determine targets are described in further detail within each results indicator.

**Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

6

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, 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.**

South Dakota has historically had strong parent representation and engagement on the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Existing membership has 5 parent members representing 20% of the council. In addition to these members, one council members has an older child who received Part C services. Since its inception, the SICC membership has included a representative from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTI). Current membership also includes a Department of Health representative who oversees the MIECHV home visiting program for the state. Two SICC members represent Head Start/Early Head Start, one of which is with a tribal program. These last members mentioned, while not parents, have strong connections with families throughout the state.   
  
All SICC members have been active participants in SPP/APR and SSIP activities. Along with the regularly scheduled SICC meetings, small workgroups met multiple times over the course of the 2021 year. These small workgroups were comprised of SICC members from the larger stakeholders with each containing at least 33% parent representation. Each small workgroup focused on one or several results indicatosr and were assisted by a content expert from ECTA and DaSy, OSEP sponsored technical assistance centers. State Part C staff role during these meetings were to prepare and provide data, answer workgroup member questions and record the discussions taking place. Each work group was tasked with:  
1) review of federal requirements for setting targets;  
2) review of specific result indicator language and calculations;  
3) analyzing of data (i.e. current, historical and projected data) at both the state and federal level;  
4) exploration and discussion of current state factors (i.e. possible provider shortages, access and participation of infants and toddlers), and  
5) determining potential targets to bring forward to the full SICC for discussion.  
  
Dynamic discussions took place between parent members and other members during these small work group sessions as data were analyzed and state factors and future needs were explored and discussed. By November 2021 each small work group had met sufficient times to complete their tasks and were prepared to bring forward their agreed upon potential targets for the full SICC to consider. When presenting to the full SICC, two members from each small workgroup (including some parents) provided details about their work process, factors that were considered, discussions that took place and calculations used to determine targets. Each work group presented their proposed targets upon which time the SICC chair opened the floor for discussion to SICC members. At the conclusion of discussions, motions were made and voted on with a final target package presented to state team members. The presentations made and minutes from the November 2021 meeting can be found on the South Dakota Boards and Commission site at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57.   
  
At the conclusion of the year-long process, parent members expressed their gratitude for the manner in which the state undertook the process of setting targets. Parents expressed their appreciation for the time the state took to help them understand the factors surrounding each indicator and the in-depth data they reviewed. Parents indicated along with their increased understanding of the early intervention program, they had a much greater appreciation for the data that is collected and all that is involved behind the scenes to ensure infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families receive appropriate services.

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

**Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

Increasing the capacity of all Part C parents/families to improve the outcomes of their infants or toddlers with disabilities and their families is the goal of the South Dakota Part C program. South Dakota provides opportunities for parents to serve on small work groups or the SICC. The most influential and impactful way South Dakota is increasing all parents / families capacity is through implementation of evidence based practices. South Dakota, with stakeholder input, purposefully selected evidence-based practices when implemented as intended, increase parent/families competence and confidence working with their infant and toddler with disabilities. As evidence in the progress of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, South Dakota is making great strides in building all families capacity. Providers implementing the EBP witness families increased involved, awareness and knowledge. Providers utilizing the EBP speak to families better understanding their infant and toddlers development and are building on early intervention sessions by incorporating activities in their daily routines.   
  
South Dakota holds strongly to the belief family engagement and the parent-child relationship and interactions is one of the most powerful predictors to improve outcomes. The reader will note throughout the State Systemic Improvement Plan the state has described multiple activities implemented with the result of increasing parent/family capacity and improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

South Dakota Part C embarked on target setting process from September of 2020 through January 2022. Beginning in September 2020, the state presented during a regularly scheduled SICC meeting the new Part C SPP/APR package that would be for FFY2020 – 2025. Information was shared by OSEP sponsored technical assistance content expert about proposed changes to the general instructions, stakeholder language, proposed changes to the measurement table, and Indicator C4 language changes. The state announced they were seeking volunteers to serve on three workgroups, the first focusing on indicators C2, C5 and C6, a second on C3 and a third on C4. It was requested that interested individuals contact the Part C director and indicate which workgroup(s)on which they were interested. . During the December 2020 SICC meeting small workgroups were announced and a schedule put in place for each work group. These small workgroups met multiple times from January through October 2021 with their final recommendations brought forward at the November 2021 SICC meeting. At this meeting SICC made final recommendations to the state for proposed targets.   
  
During the January 2022 SICC meeting the state presented the FFY2020 SPP/APR including the FFY2020 data and corresponding targets. At this time the SICC made any additional adjustments to targets and the state proceeded with its submission.   
  
To ensure public input, South Dakota Part C follows state open meeting laws. SICC meeting agendas, containing meeting date/times, location, information for joining in person or telephonic or virtually and directions for special accommodations are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commission website and in the public area of the Department of Education building a minimum of 72 hours prior to the meeting date (not including weekend or holidays). SICC agendas contain a Public Comment agenda line item. During this time the SICC chair pauses the meeting to take any comments from members or public who may be joining. Any comments are recorded in the meeting minutes and posted on the Boards and Commission website.   
  
South Dakota Birth to Three website provides multiple opportunities for the public to interact with a state Part C team member and also follow the SICC. Through a 1-800 number and email link the public has direct linkage to a state Part C team member. A directly link to the South Dakota Boards and Commission website is also available where the public can view any SICC meeting agenda, minutes and presentation.

**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.**

South Dakota Birth to Three posts all SICC meeting work which includes target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies and evaluation to the South Dakota Boards and Commission website located https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57 no more than 10 days from the meeting date. A link to this site is available on the South Dakota Department of Education / Part C page where the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is posted https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ no more than 120 days from submission. Program SPP/APRs from the last five years are posted on this site under “Public Reporting”.   
  
The South Dakota Birth to Three program annually reports to the public on performance of each region for Indicators C1 to C10 as compared to state performance. These reports titled Regional Performance are located on the Birth to Three website at http://doe.sd.gov/Birthto3/ under Public Reporting and posted within the required federal timelines.

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each EIS Program 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 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.**

South Dakota Part C reports to the public on the FFY2019 performance of each EIS region for Indicators C1 to C10 as compared to the state performance via South Dakota Department of Education website. These reports titles Regional Performance are located on the Part C page at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ under Public Reporting within the required federal timelines.   
Additionally, public notices are posted in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website where State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and regional reports can be accessed and availability of hard copies of the reports upon request. Newspapers printing the public notices are as follows: Sioux Falls Argus Leader; Aberdeen American News; Huron Plainsman; Pierre Capital Journal; and Rapid City Journal.  
  
Notification is also sent to SICC and Stakeholders, all regional Birth to Three programs, service coordinators, and providers of the availability of these reports on the Birth to Three website https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ and the availability of hard copies upon request.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

## Intro - OSEP Response

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State's SPP/APR documents.

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

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. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State’s timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 322 | 363 | 100.00% | 100% | 99.17% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

***This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.***

38

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

During this reporting period, the criteria for timely receipt of services was missed 38 times due to exceptional family circumstances. Most commonly parents requested later service date due to family or child illness, quarantine/isolation due to COVID-19 or other family commitments.   
  
During this reporting period, the criteria for timely receipt of services was missed three times for reasons other than exceptional family circumstances. Reasons for these delays were attributed to scheduling error, provider illness and late referral by a service coordinator. In each of these instances the State confirmed the infant or toddler, while late, did receive services.

**Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

South Dakota has defined 'timely' as services beginning within 30 days of the child's IFSP start date, with parental consent.

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

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2020 (Oct. 1, 2020 to Dec. 31, 2020).

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

For Indicator C1, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY2020 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 1 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

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

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 96.80% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= | 96.80% | 96.80% | 96.80% | 97.00% | 97.00% |
| Data | 99.83% | 100.00% | 99.92% | 99.76% | 99.63% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.25% | 97.25% | 97.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The following is specific to Indicator C2 Target Setting:   
  
The indicator C2 small stakeholder workgroup represented parents, Head Start/Early Head Start, providers, Departments of Health Home Visiting program, Human Services family support, Education Homeless program, and a member from the state legislature. The group, facilitated by DaSy and ECTA content expert, began meeting August 2021. Stakeholders familiarized themselves with the C2 indicator description and OSEP SPP/APR Universal TA for FFY2020-2025 guidance related to C2. State team members provided stakeholders with C2 performance data relative to targets for the last six years and C2 baseline data using bar and line graphs. Analysis of the data indicated the performance over time has been very stable with the state consistently performing above 95%.   
  
Along with indicator specific data, Stakeholders discussed factors that could potentially influence percent of infants/toddlers with IFSPs receiving early intervention services in the home or community-based setting during the next 5 years. Topics included the lingering influences of COVID-19 and uncertainty of future impact. Stakeholders mentioned experiences from their work areas of family’s reluctance to accept others into their homes, likewise providers expressed similar concerns on entering homes. The pandemic brought about travel restrictions in some portions of the state which prevented providers travel to homes. The state provided information related to the increase in virtual services being accessed and the acceptance of that as a viable method. Families are more receptive of this and providers are becoming very proficient. Noted, providers trained in the state’s evidence-based model expressed high success of the routines-based coaching model in a virtual environment.   
  
Led by a ECTA and DaSy content expert, stakeholders used Trend Analysis and Forecasting approach to begin target setting. As the state has consistently performed well in indicator C2 the forecast and upper and lower confidence were quite narrow with the lower confidence greater than 99% and upper confidence above 100%. Stakeholders unanimously agreed this was not realistic given the factors described above and the individualization of an IFSP. Using the End Goal approach stakeholders determined a target for 2025 and then recommended targets for the earlier years. During the November 2021 SICC meeting two volunteers from this workgroup presented target recommendations. The SICC approved the targets brought forward by the small stakeholder workgroup.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 916 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 917 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 916 | 917 | 99.63% | 97.00% | 99.89% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling of****infants and toddlers with IFSPs****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 page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

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.

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 Process (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.

If the State’s Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or “developmentally delayed children”) or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or “children with diagnosed conditions”)). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

## 3 - Indicator Data

**Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or “at-risk infants and toddlers”) under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The following is specific to Indicator C3 Target Setting:  
  
The indicator C3 small stakeholder workgroup represented parents, Head Start/Early Head Start, providers, Departments of Health Home Visiting program, Division of Insurance, Part B 619, Medicaid, and child welfare agency. The group, supported by TA staff from from DaSy and ECTA, met throughout October 2021. Stakeholders familiarized themselves with C3 indicator description including a through e progress categories, summary statement calculations and the tool South Dakota uses to collect child outcome data, Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2).   
  
State team members provided stakeholders with C3 performance data relative to targets for the last seven years using line graphs to compare historical data relative to targets and the baseline year. Analysis of the data indicated fluctuation in the data with a leveling out in more recent years. It was noted in each of the three outcome areas at least one if not both summary statements performance percentages were significantly above or below the set targets. Stakeholders determined the focus on data quality as part of the SSIP which included infrastructure changes, data completeness efforts, implementation of routines-based home visiting evidence-based models, collaboration with Part B 619 training evaluators on the BDI-2 tool and the state’s C3 business rules changes implemented FFY2016 made to more closely reflect eligibility were all contributing factors in performance data. With assistance from DaSy and ECTA TA, stakeholders recommended a new baseline year be established that more accurately represented performance data once the business rules were changed and stability of the performance data increased ..   
  
Stakeholders discussed additional factors that could potentially impact future child outcome data. Using bar graphs, the state provided historical child count data. Due to COVID-19 South Dakota child count while rebounding is not at the same level as pre-COVID. Stakeholders discussed the declining birth rate and how fewer numbers in the Part C program had potential to impact completion rates and in turn data quality. Another factor noted by Part B 619 member, South Dakota had a new evaluation tool as of July 1, 2021. South Dakota Part C and Part B 619 have the BDI3 and it is unknown what impact this might have on child outcome data for both Part C and Part B 619.   
  
Using the new recommended baseline year of 2019, DaSy and ECTA TA staff and the state team presented trend forecasting and averaging to assist stakeholder in making target recommendations for FFY2020-2025. During the November 2021 SICC meeting, two volunteers from this workgroup, one a parent, presented the recommendations for a new baseline year and targets. The SICC approved the new baseline year and targets brought forward by the small stakeholder workgroup.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| **A1** | 2019 | Target>= | 50.48% | 50.48% | 50.48% | 51.00% | 51.00% |
| **A1** | 42.80% | Data | 36.10% | 51.32% | 52.34% | 37.83% | 42.80% |
| **A2** | 2019 | Target>= | 85.37% | 85.37% | 85.37% | 85.50% | 85.50% |
| **A2** | 73.40% | Data | 78.46% | 79.62% | 80.67% | 75.77% | 73.40% |
| **B1** | 2019 | Target>= | 58.82% | 58.82% | 58.82% | 60.00% | 60.00% |
| **B1** | 74.36% | Data | 50.00% | 73.43% | 75.95% | 74.91% | 74.36% |
| **B2** | 2019 | Target>= | 69.51% | 69.51% | 69.51% | 70.00% | 70.00% |
| **B2** | 53.20% | Data | 64.05% | 59.54% | 61.04% | 57.92% | 53.20% |
| **C1** | 2019 | Target>= | 57.26% | 57.26% | 57.26% | 57.76% | 60.00% |
| **C1** | 91.03% | Data | 48.45% | 88.78% | 93.20% | 90.93% | 91.03% |
| **C2** | 2019 | Target>= | 84.63% | 84.63% | 84.63% | 85.00% | 85.00% |
| **C2** | 80.13% | Data | 80.20% | 82.95% | 83.41% | 80.29% | 80.13% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1>= | 41.00% | 41.50% | 42.00% | 42.50% | 43.00% | 43.50% |
| Target A2>= | 72.40% | 72.50% | 72.75% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% |
| Target B1>= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% | 77.00% |
| Target B2>= | 54.76% | 53.40% | 53.60% | 53.80% | 54.00% | 54.20% |
| Target C1>= | 91.20% | 91.25% | 91.50% | 91.75% | 92.00% | 92.25% |
| Target C2>= | 81.80% | 81.90% | 82.00% | 82.10% | 82.20% | 82.30% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

588

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 4 | 0.68% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 137 | 23.30% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 21 | 3.57% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 77 | 13.10% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 349 | 59.35% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 3 years of age or exited the program | 98 | 239 | 42.80% | 41.00% | 41.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 426 | 588 | 73.40% | 72.40% | 72.45% | 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 Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 113 | 19.22% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 153 | 26.02% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 186 | 31.63% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 136 | 23.13% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 3 years of age or exited the program | 339 | 452 | 74.36% | 75.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 322 | 588 | 53.20% | 54.76% | 54.76% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 27 | 4.59% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 80 | 13.61% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 200 | 34.01% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 281 | 47.79% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 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 3 years of age or exited the program | 280 | 307 | 91.03% | 91.20% | 91.21% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 481 | 588 | 80.13% | 81.80% | 81.80% | Met target | No Slippage |

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program**.

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting 618 data | 896 |
| The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program. | 182 |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

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

NO

**Provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.”**

South Dakota’s business rules define comparable to same-aged peers using a Standard Score of 78. South Dakota rules include five developmental areas and 13 sub-domains. A child's Standard Score on the Personal-Social Domain is used to answer Indicator 3A. The Cognitive and Communication Domains are used to indicate a child's progress in Indicator 3B and the Adaptive and Motor Domains indicate a child's progress for Indicator 3C.

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine a infant or toddlers eligibility for Part C services. The Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) is the tool utilized by Part B 619 and Part C programs for reporting child outcomes. Children are evaluated using this consistent method which enhances the validity of the data. The entry scores are determined by the standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child. An "exit" BDI-2 assessment is given to children who have been in the Birth to Three program for at least 6 months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs and secondly for the Part C program to determine child's developmental status.  
  
Entry and exit BDI-2 scores are stored in the BDI-2 database. From this database, state Part C staff retrieve scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period. Part C state staff collaborate with evaluators and the Part B 619 coordinator to ensure all appropriate testing was completed and scores reported. BDI-2 entry and exit scores are then compared for those exiting children and formulated according to the state’s BDI-2 business rules to determine the child’s progress in the three outcome areas.  
  
During FFY2020, July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021, 896 children exited the Birth to Three program of which 588 children had qualifying entry and exit BDI-2 scores. Entry scores for the 588 exiting children were compared to their exit scores using the defined state business rules. Resulting data were entered into the EMaps Indicator C3 table and reported accordingly. The 588 exiting children computes to a 65.63% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. This completion rate is a 6.50% increase from FFY2019 completion rate of 59.13%.   
  
Additional data analysis of FFY2020 exit data indicates of the 308 children who exited the Birth to Three program but did not receive a qualifying exit score, 182 or 59.09% were in the Birth to Three program less than 6 months. If the 182 children exiting before 6 months are subtracted from the denominator of the exit data, the completion rate increases to 82.35%.

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

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children’s needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling of****families participating in Part C****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 page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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 families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year’s response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), 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 families that received Part C services.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

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 infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, 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 families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 93.90% | 93.90% | 94.00% | 94.10% | 94.10% |
| A | 93.90% | Data | 99.19% | 98.97% | 98.78% | 99.44% | 98.95% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 89.40% | 89.40% | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| B | 89.40% | Data | 98.92% | 98.27% | 98.79% | 98.60% | 96.50% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 89.30% | 89.30% | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.00% |
| C | 89.30% | Data | 98.38% | 98.96% | 99.09% | 99.16% | 98.25% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A>= | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.20% | 94.30% | 94.40% | 94.50% |
| Target B>= | 90.00% | 90.20% | 90.40% | 90.60% | 90.80% | 91.00% |
| Target C>= | 90.00% | 90.10% | 90.20% | 90.30% | 90.40% | 90.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The following is specific to Indicator C4 Target Setting:   
  
The indicator C4 small stakeholder workgroup represented parents, PTI center, providers, local education agencies, and program prep. The group, supported by TA staff from from DaSy and ECTA, met multiple times between December 2020 and September 2021. Led by content experts from ECTA and DaSy C4 stakeholders began their work by analyzing the state existing survey tool, method of distribution and frequency of tool distributed.   
  
State team members provided stakeholders with C4 performance data relative to targets and baseline for the past 10 years. Data was presented using line and bar graphs of state and regional early intervention programs. A comparison of state to six years of national performance data was included and response data based on race and ethnicity compared to program demographics.   
  
Analysis showed that overtime response rate had decreased across the state and COVID-19 factors significantly contributed to the decline. Stakeholders recommended the state pursue providing the collection tool electronically to families to assist in increasing response rate. Analysis of responses indicated state performance to be stable and the state performing in the upper 90 percentile. Stakeholders recommended the state adopt the ECO Family Outcome Survey – Revised tool for collecting family responses to increase the quality of data collected. Response data based on race indicated responses were representative of children in the program, however, stakeholders believed by implementing an electronic method for collecting data this could potentially improve response rates even more.   
  
With these strategies in place, stakeholders began analyzing data to address targets for FFY2020-2025. Using Trend Analysis and Forecasting stakeholders noted a very stable trend line with narrow margins between upper and lower confidence levels. Stakeholders discussed the difficulty in setting targets given as of July 1, 2021 the state would be using a new survey tool and method of distributing the tool. Stakeholders used the Start with the End Goal approach and set targets for Indicator C4. During the November 2021 SICC meeting, two volunteers from this workgroup, one a parent, presented the work and target recommendations. The SICC approved the targets brought forward by the small stakeholder workgroup.

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 854 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C | 247 |
| Survey Response Rate | 28.92% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 242 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 247 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 240 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 245 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 244 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 246 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 98.95% | 94.10% | 97.98% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 96.50% | 90.00% | 97.96% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 98.25% | 90.00% | 99.19% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool? | NO |
| The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. | YES |

**Survey Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Survey Response Rate | 29.96% | 28.92% |

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

Historically, a state developed collection tool distributed by hand or mail has been used to gather indicator C4 data. In recent years, South Dakota Part C has experienced a small decline in response rate that became more prevalent during COVID-19. Beginning in February 2021, State team met with a small stakeholder workgroup representing parents, providers, PTI center, school districts, program prep and childcare services. Led by DaSy content expert stakeholders analyzed state and federal data. Additional factors that effected the state ability to collect C4 data from families was discussed, including COVID-19 and the impact on service coordinators ability to meet with families due to travel restrictions in certain parts of the state and families reluctance to have outsiders in their home. Mail delivery and the delays incurred were also discussed as hindering service coordinators ability to reach families in a timely manner.   
  
Stakeholders recommended the state use a new tool to gather C4 data and a new method to distribute the survey to families. It was recommended South Dakota use an electronic version of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised. Given the increased comfort and increased access to technology the State believes stakeholder recommendation to move to an electronic collection tool will increase response rate over time. The State also believe the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised tool will provide better analysis of families responses of early intervention services. Recommendations from stakeholders were presented to the full SICC in April 2021 and were approved.   
  
Beginning July 1, 2021, South Dakota began using the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised to collect indicator C4 data, and it was made available for distribution electronically, with hard copy available if requested. Each service coordinator receives a survey link that is unique to them and contains an electronic version of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised and other demographic information. In turn those links are forwarded to families via text, email or hard copy, based on the families preference. Responses remain anonymous; however, coding allows the state to identify early intervention regions. To ensure data quality, the link provided is set so each parent can only complete one survey.   
  
South Dakota will continue to encourage a higher percentage of parents of infants and toddlers of all race/ethnicities to completed the survey. Results of this will be provided in the FFY2021 submission.   
   
Stakeholders will be updated on progress during regularly scheduled SICC meetings.

**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 families that received Part C services.**

The statewide response rate for this year’s family outcomes survey is 28.92%. White families had the highest response rates (32%), followed by Multi-racial (23%), American Indian or Alaska Native (21%), Hispanic (21%), African American or Black (17%), Asian (15%) and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0%). White family response rates are above the statewide percent while Multi-racial, American Indian or Alaska Native, Hispanic, African American or Black, Asian and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander are below the statewide percent.   
  
The steps the state will take to promote response from a broad cross-section of families are:  
1. Utilization of a new C4 tool. South Dakota began using the ECO Family Outcome survey 7/1/2021.  
2. New delivery method. The state began using an electronic delivery method to reach families with the new ECO Family Outcome tool. This can be sent to families through multiple electronic methods.   
3. In addition, South Dakota will continue to analyze data and collect regional program input as to why the response rate of parents of infants and toddlers with response rates below the state average is low.   
4. The state will work with stakeholders to identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of all parents – particularly parents of infants and toddlers with response rates below the state average.   
5. The state will continue to encourage parents of infants and toddlers of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey.

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program.** **States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.**

South Dakota collects data for indicator C4 by surveying families who exit the Part C program in the reporting period. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the percentage of surveys received by race and ethnicity (within each subgroup) by the percentage of families who exited the Part C program in the reporting period by race and ethnicity. The data show the following: white families had the highest percentage exiting the program (73%), followed by Native American Indian or Alaska Native (15%), Hispanic (8%), More than one race (7%), African American or Black (3%), Asian (2%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).   
  
White families had the highest representation in surveys received (86%), followed by American Indian or Alaska Native (11%), Hispanic (6%), More than one race (5%), African American or Black (2%), Asian (1%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).   
  
The ECTA response rate and representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show that African American or Black (-1% difference), American Indian or Alaska Native (-4% difference), Asian (-1% difference), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0% difference), More than one race (-2% difference), and Hispanic (-2% difference) families were all representative. White families had a higher response rate (13% difference) which indicates more likely to respond.

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The metric varied due to using a statistical formula (i.e., proportional testing) to determine if two percentages are considered different from each other. The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population (i.e., Child Exit). The results show that African American or Black (-1% difference), American Indian or Alaska Native (-4% difference), Asian (-1% difference), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0% difference), More than one race (-2% difference), and Hispanic (-2% difference) families were all representative. White families were more likely to respond (13% difference), however there were no significant differences in the positivity on the survey itself between parents of White children and parents of African American or Black children, American Indian infants and toddlers or Asian.

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

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2020 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , 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 families responding are representative of the population.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

State responded in FFY2019 and FFY2020 submissions regarding representativeness.

## 4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 4 - Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the E*DFacts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations.The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 0.82% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 0.82% | 0.82% | 0.85% | 0.86% | 0.88% |
| Data | 1.26% | 1.63% | 1.76% | 1.40% | 1.27% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 0.88% | 0.88% | 0.89% | 0.89% | 0.89% | 0.90% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The following is specific to Indicator C5 Target Setting:  
  
The indicator C5 small stakeholder workgroup represented parents, Head Start/Early Head Start, providers, Department of Health Home Visiting program, Human Services developmental disabilities/family support, Education homeless program, a member from the state legislature and the state PTI center. The group, assisted by content experts from DaSy and ECTA, met throughout August 2021. Stakeholders familiarized themselves with the indicator C5 description and analyzed C5 performance data relative to targets and baseline year for the past 6 years using bar and line graphs.   
  
The State team presented stakeholders with additional data including child count data from the past 10 years, both December 1 and cumulative. These data were presented in bar graphs and to help stakeholders look beyond the statewide data a geomap was presented to view the variation across counties. Three years of referral data were presented on a graph depicting the referral sources. The state noted child count and referral numbers were rebounding, however, the state is not to the same level as pre-COVID.  
  
Stakeholders analyzed the presented data and additional factors with potential to influence the state’s percent of infants/toddlers birth to one with IFSPs during FFY2020 – 2025. Examples of items discussed included a decrease in birth rate and the predicted continue decline; the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on families regarding safety and allowing others in the home; decline in number of families eligible for state income-based programs, historically key referral sources for Part C, due to minimum wage increases.   
  
Led by the content experts from ECTA and DaSy, stakeholders used Trend Analysis and Forecasting for the FFY2020-2025 targets. It was noted that while the state has performed well in this indicator, the Birth to 1 count has been more sporadic which resulted in significant gaps between the lower and upper confidence bounds . Stakeholders unanimously agreed the fluctuation was significant enough to use caution and used the Start with the End Goal to recommended targets. During the November 2021 SICC meeting, two volunteers from the workgroup presented the work and target recommendations. The SICC approved of the targets brought forward.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 114 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 11,810 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 114 | 11,810 | 1.27% | 0.88% | 0.97% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)) and Census (for the denominator).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

**Instructions**

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

Describe the results of the calculations . The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State’s reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 6 - Indicator Data

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 2.81% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target >= | 2.81% | 2.81% | 2.82% | 2.83% | 2.85% |
| Data | 3.17% | 3.25% | 3.29% | 3.31% | 3.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 2.56% | 2.81% | 2.83% | 2.83% | 2.84% | 2.85% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The following is specific to Indicator C6 Target Setting:  
  
The indicator C6 small stakeholder workgroup represented parents, Head Start/Early Head Start, providers, Department of Health Home Visiting program, Human Services family support, Education homeless program, a member from the state legislature and the state PTI center. The group, assisted by content experts from DaSy and ECTA, met throughout August 2021. Stakeholders familiarized themselves with the indicator C6 description and analyzed C6 performance data relative to targets and baseline year for the past 6 years using bar and line graphs.   
  
State team presented stakeholders with additional data including child count data from the past 10 years, both December 1 and cumulative. These data were presented in bar graphs and to help stakeholders look beyond the statewide data a geomap was presented to view the variation across counties. Three years of referral data were presented on a graph depicting the referral sources. The state noted child count and referral numbers were rebounding, however, the state is not to the same level as pre-COVID.  
  
Stakeholders analyzed the presented data and additional factors with potential to influence the state’s percent of infants/toddlers birth to one with IFSPs during FFY2020 – 2025. Examples of items discussed included a decrease in birth rate and the predicted continue decline; the ongoing impact of COVID-19 on families regarding safety and allowing others in the home; decline in number of families eligible for state income-based programs, historically key referral sources for Part C, due to minimum wage increases.   
  
Led by the ECTA and DaSy TA staff, stakeholders analyzed Trend Analysis and Forecasting for the FFY2020-2025 targets. It was noted that the state has performed consistently in this indicator, except for FFY2019, and the state has experienced slight increases since FFY2015. FFY2020 data revealed child count would be much lower given the timing of child count and COVID-19 pandemic. Stakeholders determined given the factors of lower birth rate and linger COVID-19 concerns to Start with the End Goal approach and determined targets with caution. During the November 2021 SICC meeting, two volunteers from this workgroup presented the work and recommendations. The SICC approved of the targets brought forward.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/08/2021 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 917 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020 | 07/08/2021 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 35,837 |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 917 | 35,837 | 3.00% | 2.56% | 2.56% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.*

Targets must be 100%.

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 actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 97.30% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 145 | 227 | 100.00% | 100% | 92.07% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable.**

In South Dakota, accredited local education agency evaluators conduct eligibility evaluations and determine eligibility for children in the Part C program. During the first months of FFY2020, July 1, 2020 to September 30, 2020 school districts throughout the state were operating under COVID-19 protocols and restrictions. Summer months saw a very limited number of districts conducting eligibility evaluations for Part C or Part B. As such, when school resumed late August 2020, evaluators had a back log of evaluations.

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

**This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

64

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

During this reporting period, the 45-day timeline criteria was missed 64 times for exceptional family circumstances. Family reasons included illness, including COVID19 restrictions, family vacations, physician appointments etc.   
  
During this reporting period, the 45-day timeline criteria was missed 18 times for reasons other than exceptional family circumstances. In South Dakota, accredited local education agency (LEA) personnel conduct evaluations to determine eligibility for children in the Part C program. During this reporting period LEAs were operating under COVID-19 protocols restricting in-person meetings which in turn caused delays in Part C eligibility evaluations occurring. Of the 18 times the 45-day criteria were missed, 12 of them are associated with delays due to district restrictions and backlog in evaluations. The remaining delays occurred during service coordinator employment transitions.   
  
The state confirms, while late, all 18 infants or toddlers received an IFSP.

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

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

The State selected the second quarter of FFY2020 (October 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020).

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

For Indicator C7, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY2020 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 20120 through December 31, 2020).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 7 - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (yes/no)**

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 120 | 133 | 98.86% | 100% | 94.74% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The IFSP meeting to discuss transition steps and services timeline target was not met due to miscalculation of timelines by service coordinator and service coordinator employment transitions.

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**   
**This number will be added to the “Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services” field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**

6

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

During this reporting period, the IFSP meeting transition steps and services timeline criteria was missed six time due to exceptional family circumstances. Reasons included illness, including COVID restrictions, parents request for a later date, etc. The state confirms while late, all six toddlers received an IFSP meeting to discuss transition steps and services.   
  
During this reporting period, the IFSP meeting transition steps and services timeline criteria was missed seven times for reasons other than exceptional family circumstances. Of the seven times, the transition steps and services were missed: three due to service coordinator calculation error; four due to miscommunication upon service coordinator employment transitions. The state confirms, while late, all seven toddlers received an IFSP meeting to discuss transition steps and services.

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

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2020 (Oct. 1, 2020 to Dec. 31, 2020).

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

For Indicator C8A, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY2020 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The State identified during FFY2019 (10/1/19 to 12/31/19 ) monitoring activity, one Birth to Three regional program with two instances of noncompliance for indicator C8A. The State verifies that:  
1) the regional program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on subsequent data from 4/1/2020 to 6/30/2020, collected from the state data system. Subsequent data indicated five toddlers in need of an IFSP with transition steps and services. All five toddlers received an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90, but not more than nine months, prior to the toddlers third birthday. The State identified the regional program is 100% compliant and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and  
2) of the two instances of noncompliance for indicator C8A, the toddlers, although late, did receive an IFSP with transition steps and services.   
  
Having verified correction, the state opted to issue a pre-finding correction. The state did request the region conduct a root cause analysis to determine causes for noncompliance and develop policy and/or procedures to ensure ongoing compliance with indicator C8A.

## 8A - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA**

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 133 | 133 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

0

**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

N/A

**Describe the method used to collect these data.**

In South Dakota, all children are potentially eligible for Part B. One-hundred and ten days prior to child turning three years old the state data system automatically generates an email to notify the SEA and the Special Education Director of the LEA. In addition, service coordinators send the LEA a notification prior to the child turning three years of age.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

NO

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

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2020 (Oct. 1, 2020 to Dec. 31, 2020).

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2020 (October 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2020.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday;

B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and

C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

**Instructions**

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child’s record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child’s record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to “opt-out” of the referral. Under the State’s opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State’s Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response table 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, methods to ensure correction, 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 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 94.60% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.86% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

**Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)**

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 120 | 133 | 98.86% | 100% | 94.74% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

The transition conference timeline target was not met due to miscalculation of timelines by service coordinator and service coordinator employment transitions.

**Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference**

**This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.**

0

**Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances**

**This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.**
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**Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.**

During this reporting period, the IFSP meeting transition steps and services timeline criteria was missed six time due to exceptional family circumstances. Reasons included illness, including COVID restrictions, parents request for a later date, etc. The state confirms, while late, all six toddlers received an IFSP meeting to discuss transition steps and services.   
  
During this reporting period, the IFSP meeting transition steps and services timeline criteria was missed seven times for reasons other than exceptional family circumstances. Of the seven times, the transition steps and services were missed: three due to service coordinator calculation error; four due to miscommunication upon service coordinator employment transitions. The state confirms, while late, all seven toddlers received an IFSP meeting to discuss transition steps and services.

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

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2020 (Oct. 1, 2020 to Dec. 31, 2020).

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

For Indicator C8C, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY2020 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2020 through December 31, 2020).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019**

| **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 2019**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 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 EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 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 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR**

The State identified during FFY2019 (10/1/19 to 12/31/19 ) monitoring activity, one Birth to Three regional program with two instances of noncompliance for indicator C8C. The state verifies that:   
1) the regional program is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements based on subsequent data from 4/1/2020 to 6/30/2020, collected from the state data system. Subsequent data indicated five toddlers in need of a transition conference. All five toddlers received a transition conference at least 90, but not more than nine months, prior to the toddlers third birthday. The State identified the regional program is 100% compliant and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, and  
2) of the two instances of noncompliance for indicator C8C, the toddlers, although late, did receive a transition conference.   
  
Having verified correction, the state opted to issue a pre-finding correction. The state did request the region conduct a root cause analysis to determine causes for noncompliance and develop policy and/or procedures to ensure continued compliance with indicator C8C.

## 8C - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2020 - June 30, 2021). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8C - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

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, the State must develop baseline and targets and report 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 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

**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

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/03/2021 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10 and South Dakota had less than 10.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2020 The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED*Facts* Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. 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 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**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

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/03/2021 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 0 |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10 and South Dakota had less than 10.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2020 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 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: 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 infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

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

***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) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. 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 infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 11. 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 Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which is 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 for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (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 FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2021). 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 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) 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.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

To substantially increase the rate of children’s growth in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, including early language/communication, by the time they exit the program, as defined by the targets established for Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1.

**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)**

NO

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

YES

**Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.**

The state has used the SSIP process as an opportunity to re-define and enhance early intervention in South Dakota. During Phase I of SSIP South Dakota stakeholders and state team members with assistance from OSEP sponsored TA centers developed a Theory of Action focusing on four key areas, Data Quality, Accountability, Professional Development and Recommended Practices. South Dakota utilized this TOA as the blueprint to complete activities designed to enhance early intervention in the state.   
  
From FFY2014-2019 the state embarked on this exciting work to implement improvement strategies towards reaching full implementation of the SSIP. As stakeholders reviewed FFY2020 data, it became evidence the existing TOA had been right on target to guide the state’s efforts to develop and implement improvements. However, given the work that has been done over the past 5 years the TOA needed to be revised to reflect the next steps in the state’s movement towards SSIP full implementation.  
  
Stakeholders determined to leave Data Quality and Accountability as Strands of Action. The Professional Development and Recommended Practices were combined into one Strand referred to as Professional Development. The reader will note slight wording changes to the “If” “Then” statements to capture the activities more accurately. Stakeholders identified a new Strand of Action during the November 2021 meeting. Due to COVID-19 and the state’s decline in child count, stakeholders noted the importance of focusing attention on Access to and Participation of all families needing EI services. This new strand was developed to increase connectedness and representativeness of South Dakota families to early intervention services and attract qualified personnel to meet early intervention services statewide. South Dakota’s action strands now are 1) Data Quality, 2) Accountability, 3) Professional Development, and 4) Access and Participation. Throughout the SSIP the state will address in more depth each of these strands, the activities done during this reporting period and planned activities.

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/documents/TOA-0122.pdf

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)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2019 | 74.36% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% | 77.00% |

**FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Numerator | Denominator | **FFY 2019 Data** | **FFY 2020 Target** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 339 | 452 | 74.36% | 75.00% | 75.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.**

South Dakota SiMR is Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1. South Dakota Part C staff analyze the entry and exit BDI-2 scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period. Scores are gathered from the BDI-2 database and formulated according to the state’s BDI-2 business rules to determine the child’s progress in a through e categories. Using the ECO Summary Statement Calculator state staff analyze data and report SiMR data for Indicator C3 Summary Statement 1.

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine a infant or toddlers eligibility for Part C services. The Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) is the tool utilized by Part B 619 and Part C programs for reporting child outcomes. Children are evaluated using this consistent method which enhances the validity of the data. The entry scores are determined by the standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child. An "exit" BDI-2 assessment is given to children who have been in the Birth to Three program for at least 6 months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs and secondly for the Part C program to determine child's developmental status.  
  
Entry and exit BDI-2 scores are stored in the BDI-2 database. From this database, state Part C staff retrieve scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period. Part C state staff collaborate with evaluators and the Part B 619 coordinator to ensure all appropriate testing was completed and scores reported. BDI-2 entry and exit scores are then compared for those exiting children and formulated according to the state’s BDI-2 business rules to determine the child’s progress in the three outcome areas.  
  
South Dakota SiMR is Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1. Using OSEP Summery Statement 1 calculation (c+d (numerator) / a+b+c+d (denominator) times 100), South Dakota had 452 infants and toddlers in progress categories a, b, c and d (denominator) and 339 infants and toddlers in progress categories c and d (numerator). The results of 75% for FFY2020 Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1.

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

NO

**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

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

YES

**If yes, please provide the following information: a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan; a rationale or justification for the changes; and, a link to the State’s current evaluation plan****.**

The state’s evaluation plan has been revised to reflect the changes noted on the Theory of Action (TOA), that was done with stakeholder input. The readers will note South Dakota’s evaluation plan is aligned to each Action Strand within the TOA stating the Improvement strategies for that strand and clearly identifying the activities, short and intermediate outcomes, projected timelines/status, and next steps. South Dakota’s Evaluation plans can be found at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/documents/FFY20-SSIP-Eval.pdf. With stakeholder input, South Dakota’s evaluation plan has been revised to reflect progress the state has made during the last six years in the SSIP, and strategies identified for the FFY2020-2025 reporting years.   
  
Revisions to the evaluation plan include:   
  
Data Quality: South Dakota has made great advances in the Data Quality Activity Strand and are confident in the processes and procedures put in place. The state will continue to implement, monitor, and evaluate data related to Data Quality completeness, data anomalies and evaluator training. Revision to the plan revolves around the evaluation tool South Dakota Part C, and Part B 619 use to measure child outcome. As of July 1, 2021, Part C and Part B 619 have moved from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI2) to the BDI3 as the tool to measure child outcomes. The Data Quality Evaluation Plan has been updated to revised to reflect this change and to reflect gathering and analyzing data related to evaluators completing the online training modules for this new evaluation tool.   
  
Accountability: South Dakota continues to collaborate with OSEP funding TA centers to refine monitoring protocols to measure the quality of the IFSP process. The state’s participation in the Johns Hopkins RBM Academy has presented opportunities for collaboration with not only other state Part C programs but with international programs such and New Zealand and Taiwan. The state has revised the plan to include this work by analyzing potential indicators and corresponding monitoring tools. Once selection is made, the state will identify a monitoring team to be trained and pilot the new tools by spring 2023.   
  
Professional Development: The state will continue to provide relevant and rigorous training for all direct service providers (DSP) and service coordinators in the evidence-based practices. With the use of ARP dollars, the state can expand the number of providers trained and receiving peer coaching in each training cohort. Each training cohort participation will increase by 70%. The state will continue to track the number of participants in each cohort and progress towards statewide implementation. The state will also continue to gather and analyze data related to participant reaching initial and sustain fidelity. Revision to the evaluation plan includes new activities identified by stakeholders as professional development. The state has a well-established professional development protocol for training EBP, including initial and sustained fidelity. The stakeholders did identify the need to expand the state’s PD to include ongoing training opportunities for our Tier 1 providers that expand beyond the initial and sustained fidelity trainings. The state will be tracking the creation, implementation, and participation in topic-related professional development opportunities available to early intervention providers via secure platforms, accessible by smart phones. Additionally, participation in the Johns Hopkins RBM Academy the state is conducting action research to help refine our professional development tools.   
  
Access and Participation: The Access and Participation Strand of Action is new to South Dakota and to the evaluation plan. A preliminary discussion took place during the November 2021 regular ICC meeting and was finalized as a new Action Strand at the January 2022 meeting with specific Improvement Strategies, activities and outcomes. The short and intermediate outcomes of this new action strand will focus on collaboration, creation, and initial implementation of activities with timelines projected over the next two to three years to increase connectedness and representativeness of South Dakota families to EI services. The state is seeking to attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide. As most of this action strand has not begun, the FFY2021 SSIP submission will provide greater details.   
  
The full evaluation plan can be found at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/documents/FFY20-SSIP-Eval.pdf.

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

Below responses are aligned to the Action Strands outlined on the State’s Theory of Action and represent the strategies continued to improve child and family outcomes through routines-based home visiting.   
  
Data Quality  
• Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the completion rate had been affected during the FFY2019 reporting period. The completion rate was 58.91%. Through participation with OSEP sponsored TA   
centers and the state’s evaluation tool publisher, Riverside, a virtual evaluation option was developed along with collaboration effort between the state and an educational cooperative to create   
a protocol for virtual evaluations. These protocols and districts in SD remaining open for the greater part of the school year contributed to a significant increase in the completion rate for   
FFY2020 to 65.63%.   
• SD Part C has a strong relationship with local education agencies and educational cooperatives. LEA personnel complete eligibility evaluations for Part C children. On 7/1/2021, SD Part C and   
Part B 619 adopted the Battelle Development Inventory Third Edition (BDI3) as the evaluation tool to measure progress towards child outcome. This project has online training modules, one   
specific for infants and toddlers from birth to age three. SD Part C in collaboration with Part B 619 is tracking the number of LEA personnel who have completed the training. The state will   
continue to collect, analyze, and report child outcome data monitor.   
  
Accountability  
• The state continues to collaborate with OSEP sponsored TA to develop and implement a monitoring protocol to identify quality IFSP decisions. Given restraints on state agencies due to the   
COVID-19 pandemic, planned enhancements to the state data system were not completed during this reporting period. The planned enhancements include many new data points and   
reporting features. Once the enhancements are completed, these new features will result in ability to monitor appropriateness of services based on the individual family priorities. The state   
will also be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the EBP in relation to services and child outcomes. Over the coming year the state will work with OSEP sponsored TA centers to gather and   
analyze these data more effectively.   
• Through involvement with the Johns Hopkins RBI Academy, the state has collaborated with multiple states and foreign countries. SD is currently reviewing material provided by New Zealand   
related to quality IFSP decisions.   
  
Professional Development  
• The state did not suspend training of DSP in the EBP due to the pandemic. Two training cohorts were completed as planned during this reporting period.   
• Through careful evaluation of participant and stakeholder feedback the state revised and enhanced DSP PD training of the EBP. The professional development, known as Bright Beginnings, included a restructuring of the training calendar and enhancements to the training. Taking effect in January 2022, the revisions and enhancements have resulted for trainees 1) incorporation of more practice of the EBP during the training portion, 2) alignment with traditional college semester courses and 3) condensed time commitment of DSPs. The restructure has increased the number of DSP in each training cohort by 70% and ultimately will shorten the timeframe to reach stateside implementation of EBP to 2024 instead of the original plan for completion in 20xx. The first training cohort with this new structure began January 2022.  
• SD continued to implement a two-tiered coaching system consisting of a Peer and Master Coach. Master coaches provide support to peer coaches and are 2nd reviewer of fidelity video.   
• South Dakota has an estimated 500 DSP and uses a Tiered provider model for delivery of EI services. Given the professional development restructuring Tier levels have been redefined. Tier 1 remain those DSP who are fully trained who have reached initial fidelity. Tier 2 identify DSP who have completed the online training and are seeking initial fidelity (Tier 2 provider have 1 year to complete initial fidelity). Tier 3 DSP recognizes those currently participating in the online Bright Beginnings training. Tier 4 providers are all others. The state continues to make progress in moving providers towards the Tier 1 level and this restructuring will better capture the state’s progress towards statewide implementation.   
• Sustained fidelity reviews occurred during the most recent reporting period for providers who reached fidelity two years prior. Once notified, providers are paired with a state contracted   
content expert who facilitates an on-line refresher of the EBP followed by submission of a practice video with coaching support and a final video for sustained fidelity review. If practice video is   
determined to meet sustained fidelity criteria a second video is not required.   
• Service coordinators new to Part C program take part in an online training in the EBP Routines Based Interview (RBI) facilitate by a veteran service coordinator (SC) who has meet initial and sustained fidelity. Upon completion of online portion new SC have a practice period and then proceed with fidelity review. The veteran SC also serves as coach during this period.   
• The state continued to support the service coordinators RBI Mentoring Group at the local and state level to ensure fidelity of implementing the RBI with families of infants and toddlers.  
• In August of 2021, the SD Birth to Three Service Coordinator Mentor Group embarked on an academy, with Johns Hopkins University and Dr. Robin McWilliams, designed to help early intervention programs set clear and unified goals, get practitioner buy-in to help shift mindsets, identify strong trainers and coaches within the organization, address implementation barriers and challenge adverse attitudes and beliefs among all. This year long academy has been the base for building a strong mentoring program among South Dakota Service Coordinators. They are learning to collect data on routines-based interview practices across the state, aggregate, study and disseminate findings to improve fidelity to the model. Their findings will help not only improve the relevance and rigor or SD Birth to Three’s professional development program, but this group of mentors is also collectively working on sustained fidelity through critical friend analysis and reflexive practices to gain a deeper understanding of why this model is critical to the success of all families in South Dakota.

**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.**

Below responses are aligned to the Action Strands outlined on the state’s Theory of Action and Evaluation Plans.  
  
Data Quality:  
 Regarding the strategies described in the Data Quality Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:  
• South Dakota has a completion rate of 65.63%. This is a 6.5% increase from FFY2019   
• 165 individuals completed the BDI full training as of 1/1/2021.   
• 74% of LEA’s have at least one evaluator complete the training.   
The strategies designed to meet these short-term and intermediate outcomes in turn work towards increasing the percentage of usable child outcome data. This also contributes to scaling up and maintaining the fidelity of evaluators. This will ensure high quality data for child outcomes towards achieving the SiMR and sustaining systems improvement efforts.   
  
Accountability:  
Regarding the strategies described in the Accountability Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:   
• Beginning in August 2021, South Dakota joined a multi-state, international work group, led by Johns Hopkins University staff and Dr. Robin McWilliams. Known as the RBM Academy this group will collaborate on existing policies, practices, data and beliefs from which the state will identify a set of indicators reflecting quality of IFSP processes.   
• The state continues to develop the activities surrounding these implementation strategies. Once identified, the quality indicators of IFSPs processes will assist the state in evaluation of professional development and technical assistance needs. Activities to enhance the quality of IFSP decisions are designed to contribute to improved performance in the SiMR. FFY2021 will provide greater detail as the RBM Academy work ends summer 2022.   
  
Professional Development:  
Regarding the strategies described in the Professional Quality Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period.   
• Two DSP training cohorts were completed.   
• 90% DSP from these cohorts met initial fidelity.   
• The state continues to increase the statewide percent of DSP who met initial fidelity. Using the established a Tiered provider level (as described above). At time of reporting the state measures:   
 o 31.5% Tier 1 = Fully trained and met initial fidelity in implementing EBP  
 o 0.3% Tier 2 = Received full training working towards initial fidelity   
 o 15.5% Tier 3 = Currently in the semester based EBP training  
 o 53% Tier 4 = Need to complete training  
• The state also notes the following specific to dispersion of Tier 1 providers:  
 o 66% of private providers have at least one staff serving Part C children who is a Tier 1 provider  
 o 35% of LEAs have at least one staff member serving Part C children who is a Tier 1 provider  
 o The largest state LEA serves 12.5% of Part C children. Having fully embraced the EBP all staff are designated Tier 1 providers or are currently in the professional development.   
 o 46% of Educational Cooperatives have at least one staff member serving Part C children who is a Tier 1 provider.   
• Of the 25 DSP entities serving the highest Part C children in this reporting period, 24 have at least one Tier 1 provider.   
• Sustained fidelity reviews occurred during the most recent reporting period for providers who reached fidelity two years prior.  
 o 100% of DSP met sustained fidelity; 58% met with first video.   
• Six service coordinators completed RBI training and initial fidelity process.   
 o 100% completed the training and met initial fidelity.   
  
The strategies designed to meet these short-term and intermediate outcomes in turn work towards increasing the number of early intervention providers who are implementing the EBP as intended. This contributes toward meeting the state identified SiMR and scaling up efforts statewide.   
  
Access and Participation:   
The Access and Participation Action Strand and Improvement Strategies were finalized at the January 2022 stakeholder meeting. Items for this will be described below as Next Steps.

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

YES

**Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved*.***

As described in previous SSIP sections, with stakeholder input, the state has revised the Theory of Action adding Access and Participation as a new Action Strand. This new strand was developed to increase connectedness and representativeness of all South Dakota families to early intervention services and attract qualified personnel to meet early intervention services statewide. Stakeholders identified two new Improvement Strategies from which activities, short and intermediate outcomes, projected timelines, and next steps have been identified.   
  
Those Improvement Strategies are:  
1. South Dakota will increase connectedness & representativeness of South Dakota families to EI services.   
2. South Dakota will attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide.   
  
South Dakota Part C serves infants and toddlers and their families that are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers in South Dakota. However, given the impact the COVID-19 pandemic had on Part C child count, stakeholders tasked the state with increasing the opportunities to reach more families. While the state child count has begun to return to pre-covid numbers, the state recognizes new opportunities to engage stakeholders to enhance and revise existing resources. New state activities will also include opportunities to increase collaboration with the state higher education institutions, including tribal colleges, to increase the number of qualified early intervention providers. Focus will be particularly on those who reside in geographic areas of the state where typically providers do not reside.   
  
Stakeholders finalized this Action Strand in January 2022. Given the timing of this report the action steps have not been fully implemented and no short or intermediate outcomes have been achieved during this reporting period. Activities and progress towards short and intermediate outcomes will be reported in the FFY2021 SSIP.

**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 follow steps will be taken for each improvement strategy outlined by Action Strands on the Theory of Action and Evaluation Plans.  
  
Data Quality Improvement Strategies:  
1. South Dakota will monitor for continuous improvement in obtaining, analyzing, and reporting BDI scores for children in Part C.   
2. South Dakota will continue to provide BDI training in collaboration with 619.  
  
Next Steps:  
• Part C will continue to analyze data and ensure quality in collecting analyzing and reporting child outcome data from the BDI data.   
• In collaboration with Part B 619, Part C will continue to train on BDI implementation and data quality protocols.  
  
Accountability Improvement Strategy:  
1. South Dakota will develop and implement a monitoring protocol to address results and compliance.  
  
Next Steps:   
• Part C will determine a set of indicators that will reflect quality of IFSP processes.   
• The state will develop a protocol for collection, analysis, and evaluation of data to reflect quality of IFSP process.   
• The state will select a monitoring team to train and pilot the protocol.   
  
Professional Development Improvement Strategies:   
1. South Dakota will continue to provide relevant and rigorous training under the State’s Bright Beginnings PD program.   
2. South Dakota will continue to design, enhance, and deliver training and TA opportunities as identified for service coordinators, DSP and families.   
  
Next Steps:   
• Rebranding of the professional development and associated evidence-based practices. Confusion over implementation of two models has caused miscommunication among service coordinators and DSP. Given the close correlation between the two models, South Dakota determined it is appropriate to rebrand the professional development to include the entire experience. By branding as one it unites both EBPs and prevents the perception of two stand alone EBPs. The state will now train on the Bright Beginnings Interview (RBI) and the Bright Beginnings Home Visiting (Getting Ready) EBPs.   
• Continue to implement a two-tiered coaching system consisting of a Peer and Master Coach. Master coaches provide support to peer coaches and are 2nd reviewer of fidelity video. This increases coaching capacity throughout the state and peer coaches have a more immediate line of support. To coincide with the restructured training calendar, coaching will occur year-round in a 2-month coaching pod. DSP will have 12 months from successful completion of their online work to sign up for a coaching pod. During this 2-month period, with assistance from their assigned coach and master coach, each DSP will complete the necessary criteria to meet initial fidelity. This new calendar allows for greater flexibilities to accommodate coaches’ personal schedules increasing retention of experienced coaches and attracting of new coaches.   
• Lingering effects of COVID-19 prompted the state to provide opportunities for DSP and service coordinators to access support from counseling professionals. The past 20 months have impacted families across the state in such ways and with such frequency that are unprecedented for families, service coordinators and DSP. In response, the state will create a series of short virtual opportunities that can be accessed from any technology devise. Topics include but not limited to secondary trauma, difficult conversations, and understanding and working within Part C family’s cultures.  
• With increasing number of providers trained in the EBP and reaching Tier 1 status, the state identified a need to create a Tier 1 mentoring group. This community of practice will be led by a fellow Tier 1 provider with support from state professional development specialist. These times will be identified for Tier 1 providers to stay abreast of topics most relevant to their Tier 1 status.   
• The state will begin to collaborate with university professional preparation programs to increase awareness of Part C.   
• Bright Beginnings will be made available for graduate credit through the state regental system.   
  
Access and Participation Improvement Strategies:  
1. South Dakota will increase connectedness and representativeness of South Dakota families to early intervention services.   
2. South Dakota will attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide.   
  
Next Steps:  
• The state will continue participation in the Johns Hopkins RBM Academy completing action research “Attitudes & Beliefs”. This will assist the state in identifying opportunities to enhance and revise existing resources assist all families to engage in the early intervention process.   
• The state will review data regarding distribution of materials with particular attention to diversity of children and families.   
• The South Dakota Part C director has been named the Department of Education liaison for the state HRSA ECCS grant. This grant and its multi-agency advisory group will lend opportunity to increase collaboration with relevant early childhood partners throughout the state and assist in identification and referral of all families, including traditionally underrepresented families.   
• The state will begin to explore a new discipline for the provision of special instruction in Part C. Rule language will be developed to address the new discipline.   
• The state will begin to establish connections to higher education program prep programs to increase candidates for the new discipline, including the option for undergraduate students to complete the state DSP professional development training, Bright Beginnings, while an undergrad.   
• This new discipline creates an avenue to facilitate relationships with tribal colleges located across the state. Collaboration with these entities will cultivate opportunities for Native American graduates to enter the work force as fully trained early intervention providers in the Part C program meeting the new discipline criteria.   
• The state will promulgate rule language to ensure equitable reimbursement for special instruction/developmental specialists.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:**

SD will continue to implement two EBP to improve child and family outcomes through routines-based home visiting to increase family engagement and build families confidence and competent in supporting their child’s acquisition of knowledge and skills including early language/communication.   
Those evidence-based practices include:  
1. Routines Based Interview (RBI), and  
2. Getting Ready (referred to in South Dakota as Bright Beginnings).

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.**

With Stakeholder input, the state selected the following two evidence based practices:   
  
1. Routines Based Interview (RBI) for family assessment, implemented by SC. The RBI is conducted with each family found eligible for Part C. Family priorities, identified from the RBI, lead to functional outcomes on the IFSP.   
  
2. Getting Ready, University of Nebraska - Lincoln Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools, is implemented by direct service providers (DSP) during early intervention sessions. This EBP provides a framework to help guide exchanges, building on culturally relevant family and child strengths. It is not a curriculum or a packaged, stand-alone program, but an ecologically sound, intentional approach for infusing meaningful family engagement into all aspects of the natural early childhood environment. Getting Ready EBP strengthens relationships between DSP and families and helps DSP build parent competencies for interacting with their children, skills necessary for DSP to cultivate family and caregiver engagement as noted in the TOA.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices 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.**

The Routines-Based Interview is a semi-structured interview about the family's day-to-day life, focusing on the child's engagement, independence, and social relationships. Its purposes are to create a strong relationship with the family, to obtain a rich and thick description of child and family functioning, to determining the family’s ecology and the family’s needs and writing child-level functional goals and family goals. Service coordinators facilitate the three components of this evidence-based practice with all families of infants and toddlers who are found eligible for Part C program. The first component, the Ecomap, is developed to determine and depict the family’s informal, intermediate, and formal supports. The Routines-Based Interview is the second component through which service coordinators establish positive relationships with families and provides a rich and deep description of child and family functioning. The third component consists of the functional outcomes which are family chosen, child-level and family level.   
  
The Getting Ready model of early childhood intervention (Sheridan, Edwards, & Knoche, 2003) recognizes the transactional nature of young children’s development and the important role parents play in their success. In the Getting Ready model, collaborative partnerships between parents and DSP are encouraged to promote parent’s competence and confidence in maximizing children’s natural learning opportunities and preparing both parents and children for long-term success. Parent-child interactions in everyday experiences, mutual observations and goal-directed problem solving, and young children’s successful development constitute the input, processes, and outcomes of the Getting Ready model.   
  
The combining of these two evidence-based practices results in greater family engagement and increased child and family outcomes. Early intervention, when done as intended result in:   
• Enhanced ability for DSP to implement individualized and culturally sensitive early intervention home visits that emphasize parent child interactions during typical   
 routines in children’s homes and early care settings  
• Greater ability to promote families’ understanding of and ability to positively support, young children’s physical, social, emotional, cognitive and language development/   
• Promote family awareness of strategies to increase language and literacy rich learning experiences for their children.

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

The state collects data for both EBP being implemented and trained on.   
  
1. Routines Based Interview – service coordinators are assessed through the initial fidelity review process using RBI criteria checklist by their assigned peer coach and second reviewer. Those   
 who meet the criteria receive a “Certificate of Recognition” from state office.   
  
During this reporting period six service coordinators took part in the initial fidelity process. 100% of service coordinators met initial fidelity.   
  
As part of the data system enhancement, service coordinators enter RBI information into the online IFSP system. From here state team members can do spot checks to determine if RBI’s are being done consistently. Service Coordinators are also required to make note in the data system if an RBI has been completed for an IFSP.   
  
Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic and changes in state team professional development members, sustained fidelity for service coordinators did not occur during this reporting period. Instead, the state plans to utilize the collaboration with Johns Hopkins University’s RBM Academy to establish protocol for service coordinators sustained fidelity that includes nine month participation in a statewide mentoring group leading to a community of practice group.   
  
2. Getting Ready – DSP are assessed through the initial fidelity review process using the evidence-based practice checklist by their assigned peer and master coach. Those who meet the criteria in implementing the evidence-based practice receive a “Certificate of Recognition” from South Dakota Department of Education. The certificate indicates they are “Recognized” as proficient in the EBP having met the established criteria and are a Tier 1 DSP.   
  
• 90% Direct service providers met initial fidelity during the reporting period.   
  
During the reporting period of the state conducted sustained fidelity reviews for 12 DSP who met initial fidelity 2 years prior. 100% of the providers met sustained fidelity. Over 50% met fidelity with one video submission, the remaining met with additional coaching and a second video submission. Family surveys are also collected as part of the sustained fidelity review process. These surveys are aligned to the EBP fidelity criteria and indicate overwhelming agreement with the impact the EBP has had on their family.   
  
3. The state is finalizing enhancements to existing data system that will have significant reporting capabilities from which to analyze impact of EBP in relation to child outcomes and appropriateness of services. The system the state uses was created by the State’s technology agency. Due to COVID-19 and increased priorities for that state agency, enhancements to the Part C data program have been delayed.

**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 state gathers feedback from DSP throughout the professional development. This reporting period survey responses on the influence this model has had on providers relationships with families include:   
  
Question: Has using this model influenced your partnerships with parents?  
100% indicate yes. Examples of responses:   
• It has helped me look at them as the experts in their child and me as the “learner”  
• It has strengthened my partnership with parents. It forms a comradery in the sense we are a team working on this.   
• We have gained more confidence in each other to allow for more open communication which has opened the door to offer more suggestions and opportunities for the parents to try in their everyday routines.   
  
Question: Based on your experience do you believe that using the Bright Beginnings model has the potential to improve child outcomes?   
100% indicated Yes. Examples of responses:  
• Definitely! Because parents are taking more active role and realizing they don’t have to let the “professional “do the therapy.   
• Definitely! More parent involvement means more meaningful interactions in between visits and greater gains.   
  
Question: What are you observing about parent / child interactions because of utilizing the Bright Beginnings evidence-based model?   
• 100% indicated noted differences in the parent/child interactions. Those differences included: increased confidence; increased engagement with their child; greater awareness of their child’s goals and progress towards; increased comfort level working with their child; interacting with more purpose.

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

South Dakota will continue to implement training on the selected evidence-based practices.   
  
Routines Based Interview: Service coordinator training on the RBI evidence-based practice will continue as new service coordinators come on board. The RBI Mentoring Group participants will begin their sustained fidelity reviews in the coming reporting period.   
  
Getting Ready: With restructuring DSP EBP professional development training and coaching calendars each cohort will accommodate a minimum of 70% more participants. During the FFY2021 reporting period, the state anticipates completing two training cohorts. This would double the current number of DSP providers who have completed the EBP professional development. The state anticipates statewide implementation by 2024.

**Describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission 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.**

As described in the previous sections, the state revised Action Strands within the Theory of Action and added a new Action Strand. The revisions to the existing strands were made as a result of progress the state has made in the through the SSIP process and to reflect next steps related to efficiencies and capacity increases, i.e., training restructured to semester based and year-round peer coaching.   
  
The state identified a new Strand of Action referred to Access and Participation. This strand was added, with stakeholder input, to address the need to ensure all South Dakota families have access to early intervention services as needed. In this strand, South Dakota also will focus activities on addressing ability to attract, recruit and retain qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide.   
  
With stakeholder input, the state has determined to keep the remaining strategies based upon current evaluation data on progress already made. The state will continue to evaluate, report to stakeholders, and adjust as needed.   
  
Please see above sections for more details on each specific improvement strategy.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C program has a strong relationship with stakeholders. Multiple meetings with large and focused stakeholder groups occurred during the reporting period. Those meetings included:  
  
• Quarterly SICC meetings. The SICC was heavily involved in the planning and review of the SSIP plan. Through regularly scheduled SICC meetings and SSIP working sessions members presented the state team with invaluable input towards SSIP progress.   
• Focused stakeholder groups. The state team meets with small stakeholder groups, focused on specific improvement strategies. These small stakeholder groups discuss challenges, successes, and strategies for implementation of the SSIP.   
• Monthly virtual service coordinator meetings. The state team conducts virtual meetings with service coordinators across the state to discuss SSIP activities and implementation of EBP.   
• Virtual DSP meetings. The state team conducts virtual meetings with DSP to discuss SSIP activities.   
• Monthly Regional RBI Mentor meetings. The state professional development leaders meet with regional RBI mentors to discuss challenges and successes of RBI implementation and fidelity of practice.

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

South Dakota greatly values the input stakeholders have provided throughout the SSIP process and continues to seek input for continuous program improvement   
  
Over this reporting year, the Part C program professional development staff met regularly with the service coordinator group as well as the newly formed RBI Mentor group. Both groups meet monthly to provide input and suggestions to the state.   
  
The professional development staff meet regularly with instructors, peer coaches and master coaches to evaluate progress and determine any needs for improvement.   
  
Through pre and post surveys, the state gathers valuable input from DSP and service coordinators who are participating in their respective professional development trainings. Survey responses measure if training was useful and if participants believe it will improve child and family outcomes. Participants also share the impact of implementing the new EBP has on their professional interactions with families.   
  
In June 2021, South Dakota brought together a small workgroup of experienced peer and master coaches to review the existing professional development content and training schedule. Based on information from trainees the existing calendar was not conducive to their professional work/life balance. This two-day meeting resulted in valuable insight into the coach’s perspective of the training and assisted state staff in identifying a new training calendar and additional areas of improvement for providers reaching initial fidelity.   
Throughout the year the state has met with small work groups and large stakeholder groups to discuss the state’s performance. A culmination of these meeting occurred in November 2021. Here stakeholders brought forward recommendations to revise existing and implement new Action Strand and Implementation Strategies to the existing SSIP Theory of Action. This meeting is described in greater detail in the SPP/APR Introduction.   
  
The state firmly believes it is through broad, continuous stakeholder input progress towards the SiMR and statewide implementation of EBP have occurred. Directly involving parent and early intervention providers have improved the state’s ability to continually improve efforts, with no delays in implementation.

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

NO

**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).**

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2019, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
OSEP notes that the State provided the descriptions of the numerator and denominator in the narrative, however did not provide the descriptions in the FFY 2020 data table.

## 11 - Required Actions

The State must provide the required numerator and denominator descriptions within the data table in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

# 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 Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.**

**Select the certifier’s role**

Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Sarah Carter

**Title:**

Part C Director

**Email:**

sarah.carter@state.sd.us

**Phone:**

605-773-4478

**Submitted on:**

04/26/22 1:26:04 PM