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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 is housed within the Department of Education within the Division of Educational Services and Support. This division is comprised of SPED Part B, Title, Child and Adult Nutrition (CANS) and SPED Part C.

The Birth to Three program has contracts with six regional Birth to Three programs throughout the state. These regional programs provide the service coordination for all 66 counties in South Dakota. South Dakota Birth to Three has a strong partnership with school districts as all 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 2019 OSEP Determination of Meets Requirements for Part C of IDEA. Over the past four 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.

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.

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 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 and code of ethics. 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 will be ongoing. Each program specialist is, however, cross-trained for each area to ensure full assistance to Birth to Three partners.

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 IFSPs. The system also facilitates the 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/location of early intervention services. Each provider reimbursement request, submitted via the online system, 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. Providers are unable to bill for services that are not linked to an IFSP.

The State Birth to Three online IFSP data system also 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.

Noncompliance identified result in a finding of noncompliance. The state then works with the entity to ensure and verify correction of the noncompliance according to the two federal requirement prongs of correction (OSEP 09-02). In some instances, based on data slippage, parent information, past data reports etc., an onsite focused monitoring by Birth to Three state staff occurs.

Focused monitoring involves reviewing specific children’s files, interviewing service coordinators, early intervention providers, parents, etc. Findings resulting from the focused monitoring are issued as necessary. A corrective action plan for compliance issues or an improvement plan for data 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. Verification of correction of any noncompliance 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 Division of Educational Services and Support (DESS) / 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 DESS exercise of its enforcement; and
4. The consequences of the DESS 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, due process hearing, mediation and resolution.

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 and emails and onsite visits as requested.

Scheduled service coordinator and direct service provider calls 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.

Technology is used to provide ongoing support as well. This includes 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.

Regional quarterly submission of service coordinator professional development activities and case load data with TA response as needed.

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 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 ongoing 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.

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 face to face training is held for all Birth to Three service coordinators on a statewide and/or regional basis.
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. Medicaid, Department of Social Services Child Protection Division 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, 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 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 provides 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.

2 Part C
Stakeholder Involvement:
The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on 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. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

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

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 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 2017 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 2017 APR in 2019, is available.

The South Dakota Birth to Three State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is located on the state’s Department of Education website at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/. Program APRs from the last several years are also 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 C8 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.

South Dakota Birth to Three also reports to the public most recent Child Exit, Child Count and State Determinations. These are all found on the state’s Department of Education website at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/, under Public Reporting.

Public Notices are posted in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/, 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.

South Dakota Parent Connection (state PTI) also announces the publication of these reports to parents in their newsletters “weConnect” and “Circuit”.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions
None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR
Intro - OSEP Response

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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner</th>
<th>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.
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

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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 FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). 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 FFY2018.

If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX
Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

1 - OSEP Response

1 - Required Actions
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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>96.80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.96%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

Prepopulated Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>07/10/2019</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>07/10/2019</td>
<td>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings</th>
<th>Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>99.92%</td>
<td>97.00%</td>
<td>99.76%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

2 - OSEP Response

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 South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislative and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>FFY 2013</th>
<th>FFY 2014</th>
<th>FFY 2015</th>
<th>FFY 2016</th>
<th>FFY 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>50.48%</td>
<td>51.39%</td>
<td>36.10%</td>
<td>51.32%</td>
<td>52.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>85.37%</td>
<td>84.89%</td>
<td>78.46%</td>
<td>79.62%</td>
<td>80.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>54.97%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>73.43%</td>
<td>75.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>69.51%</td>
<td>67.49%</td>
<td>64.05%</td>
<td>59.54%</td>
<td>61.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>57.26%</td>
<td>56.74%</td>
<td>48.45%</td>
<td>88.78%</td>
<td>93.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>84.63%</td>
<td>87.35%</td>
<td>80.20%</td>
<td>82.95%</td>
<td>83.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 2018</th>
<th>FFY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A1</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
<td>51.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>FFY 2018 Data</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2&gt;</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
<td>85.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1&gt;</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2&gt;</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1&gt;</td>
<td>57.76%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2&gt;</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

751

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>21.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>64.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

South Dakota continues to focus on the quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in four outcome areas: Child Outcome A: Summary Statement 1 and 2, Child Outcome B: Summary Statement 2 and Child Outcome C Summary Statement 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator Child Outcome A was noted as the outcome with a meaningful difference (see attachment). The state team sought assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center and private consultant with expertise in child outcome data and the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) evaluation tool used by South Dakota to measure child outcomes.

It was determined the observed decline in summary statement 1 is related to an increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers. This could mean that there was a decrease in the child’s standard score between entry and exit or that their standard score remained the same between entry and exit. State staff considered multiple hypotheses to explain the observed slippage including changes to data collection fidelity and subgroup differences including regional areas, Medicaid usage, race/ethnicity and Exit reason. None of these hypotheses were supported by the analysis. Another hypothesis to explain this decline is that parents better understand the meaning of the interview questions on the BDI-2 after participation in the evidence-based practice. Parents participating in the evidence-based practice receive coaching to increase their ability to communicate with others about their child’s development. This increased skill in communicating about child development could improve the accuracy of the parent’s report of their child’s development at exit. This increased accuracy of parent report could lead to a lower standard score at time 2 because the parents are able to understand and describe their child’s behavior. This was further supported when SICC members reviewed the SPP/ APR. South Dakota SICC members include school district SPED staff with knowledge of the evaluation process and the BDI-2 tool. SICC members stated dependent upon who the adult is providing the information during the evaluation (i.e. child care provider, Head Start, parent etc), ability could be determined differently because of the social interaction that adult witnesses. The state is currently conducting follow-up quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine this hypothesis further.

The observed decline in Summary State 2 relates to the increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers as noted in Summary Statement 1. The state notes category e is too high for Indicators A and C and will continue to analyze data.

South Dakota will continue to work with national TA Center ECTA, national BDI user group moderated by ECTA and a private consulate to analyze the slippage noted in FFY2018.
Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

South Dakota continues to focus on the quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in four outcome areas: Child Outcome A: Summery Statement 1 and 2, Child Outcome B: Summary Statement 2 and Child Outcome C Summery Statement 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator Child Outcome A was noted as the outcome with a meaningful difference (see attachment). The state team sought assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center and private consultant with expertise in child outcome data and the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) evaluation tool used by South Dakota to measure child outcomes.

It was determined the observed decline in summary statement 1 is related to an increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers. This could mean that there was a decrease in the child’s standard score between entry and exit or that their standard score remained the same between entry and exit. State staff considered multiple hypotheses to explain the observed slippage including changes to data collection fidelity and subgroup differences including regional areas, Medicaid usage, race/ethnicity and Exit reason. None of these hypotheses were supported by the analysis. Another hypothesis to explain this decline is that parents better understand the meaning of the interview questions on the BDI-2 after participation in the evidence-based practice. Parents participating in the evidence-based practice receive coaching to increase their ability to communicate with others about their child’s development. This increased skill in communicating about child development could improve the accuracy of the parent’s report of their child’s development at exit. This increased accuracy of parent report could lead to a lower standard score at time 2 because the parents are able to understand and describe their child’s behavior. This was further supported when SIICC members reviewed the SPP/APR. South Dakota SIICC members include school district SPED staff with knowledge of the evaluation process and the BDI-2 tool. SIICC member stated dependent upon who the adult is providing the information during the evaluation (i.e. child care provider, Head Start, parent etc), ability could be determined differently because of the social interaction that adult witnesses.

The state is currently conducting follow-up quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine this hypothesis further.

The observed decline in Summary State 2 relates to the increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers as noted in Summary Statement 1. The state notes category e is too high for Indicators A and C and will continue to analyze data.

South Dakota will continue to work with national TA Center ECTA, national BDI user group moderated by ECTA and a private consulate to analyze the slippage noted in FFY2018.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 1 | 0.13% |
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 138 | 18.38% |
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 177 | 23.57% |
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 238 | 31.69% |
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 197 | 26.23% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>75.95%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>74.91%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>61.04%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>57.92%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

South Dakota continues to focus on the quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in four outcome areas: Child Outcome A: Summery Statement 1 and 2, Child Outcome B: Summary Statement 2 and Child Outcome C Summery Statement 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator Child Outcome A was noted as the outcome with a meaningful difference (see attachment). The state team sought
It was determined the observed decline in summary statement 1 is related to an increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers. This could mean that there was a decrease in the child’s standard score between entry and exit or that their standard score remained the same between entry and exit. State staff considered multiple hypotheses to explain the observed slippage including changes to data collection fidelity and subgroup differences including regional areas, Medicaid usage, race/ethnicity and Exit reason. None of these hypotheses were supported by the analysis. Another hypothesis to explain this decline is that parents better understand the meaning of the interview questions on the BDI-2 after participation in the evidence-based practice. Parents participating in the evidence-based practice receive coaching to increase their ability to communicate with others about their child’s development. This increased skill in communicating about child development could improve the accuracy of the parent’s report of their child’s development at exit. This increased accuracy of parent report could lead to a lower standard score at time 2 because the parents are able to understand and describe their child’s behavior. This was further supported when SICC members reviewed the SPP/APR. South Dakota SICC members include school district SPED staff with knowledge of the evaluation process and the BDI tool. SICC member stated dependent upon who the adult is providing the information during the evaluation (i.e. child care provider, Head Start, parent etc), ability could be determined differently because of the social interaction that adult witnesses. The state is currently conducting follow-up quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine this hypothesis further.

The observed decline in Summary State 2 relates to the increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers as noted in Summary Statement 1. The state notes category e is too high for Indicators A and C and will continue to analyze data.

South Dakota will continue to work with national TA Center ECTA, national BDI user group moderated by ECTA and a private consultant to analyze the slippage noted in FFY2018.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>28.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>51.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>93.20%</td>
<td>57.76%</td>
<td>90.93%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>83.41%</td>
<td>85.00%</td>
<td>80.29%</td>
<td>Did Not Meet Target</td>
<td>Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

South Dakota continues to focus on the quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in four outcome areas: Child Outcome A: Summery Statement 1 and 2, Child Outcome B: Summary Statement 2 and Child Outcome C Summery Statement 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator Child Outcome A was noted as the outcome with a meaningful difference (see attachment). The state team sought assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center and private consultant with expertise in child outcome data and the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) evaluation tool used by South Dakota to measure child outcomes.

It was determined the observed decline in summary statement 1 is related to an increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers. This could mean that there was a decrease in the child’s standard score between entry and exit or
that their standard score remained the same between entry and exit. State staff considered multiple hypotheses to explain the observed slippage including changes to data collection fidelity and subgroup differences including regional areas, Medicaid usage, race/ethnicity and Exit reason. None of these hypotheses were supported by the analysis. Another hypothesis to explain this decline is that parents better understand the meaning of the interview questions on the BDI-2 after participation in the evidence-based practice. Parents participating in the evidence-based practice receive coaching to increase their ability to communicate with others about their child’s development. This increased skill in communicating about child development could improve the accuracy of the parent’s report of their child’s development at exit. This increased accuracy of parent report could lead to a lower standard score at time 2 because the parents are able to understand and describe their child’s behavior. This was further supported when SICC members reviewed the SPP/APR. South Dakota SICC members include school district SPED staff with knowledge of the evaluation process and the BDI-2 tool. SICC member stated dependent upon who the adult is providing the information during the evaluation (i.e. child care provider, Head Start, parent etc), ability could be determined differently because of the social interaction that adult witnesses. The state is currently conducting follow-up quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine this hypothesis further.

The observed decline in Summary State 2 relates to the increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers as noted in Summary Statement 1. The state notes category e is too high for Indicators A and C and will continue to analyze data. South Dakota will continue to work with national TA Center ECTA, national BDI user group moderated by ECTA and a private consulate to analyze the slippage noted in FFY2018.

Will your separate report be just the at-risk infants and toddlers or aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C?

XXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targets</td>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A1 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target A2 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B1 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B2 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C1 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C2 ≥</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 AR</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

XXX

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part C

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

#### Not including at-risk infants and toddlers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX
### Part C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</td>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>Percentage of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable
XXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</th>
<th>Numerator</th>
<th>Denominator</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable
XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable
XXX

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>1,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was sampling used?  
NO
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?

Yes / No

If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.

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

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, school districts are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine a child's 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 outcomes areas.

During FFY2018, July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, 1148 children exited the Birth to Three program of which 751 children had qualifying entry and exit BDI-2 scores. Entry scores for the 751 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 751 exiting children computes to a 65.42% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. This completion rate is a 2.31% increase from FFY2017 completion rate of 63.11%. South Dakota will continue to monitor and provide technical assistance to increase the completion percentage for indicator C3.

Additional data analysis of FFY2018 exit data indicates of the 397 children who exited the Birth to Three program but did not receive a qualifying exit score, 285 or 71.79% were in the Birth to Three program less than 6 months. In fact, if the 285 children exiting before 6 months are subtracted from the denominator of the exit data, the completion rate increases to 87.02%.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

3 - OSEP Response

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.

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled 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.

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

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 2006</td>
<td>Targ et &gt;=</td>
<td>93.90%</td>
<td>93.90%</td>
<td>93.90%</td>
<td>93.90%</td>
<td>94.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 93.90%</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>96.83%</td>
<td>99.67%</td>
<td>99.19%</td>
<td>98.97%</td>
<td>98.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2006</td>
<td>Targ et &gt;=</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>89.40%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 89.40%</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>97.74%</td>
<td>98.68%</td>
<td>98.92%</td>
<td>98.27%</td>
<td>98.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2006</td>
<td>Targ et &gt;=</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.30%</td>
<td>89.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 89.30%</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>96.38%</td>
<td>98.68%</td>
<td>98.38%</td>
<td>98.96%</td>
<td>99.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target A &gt;=</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target B &gt;=</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target C &gt;=</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Percent of families reporting that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)</td>
<td>98.78%</td>
<td>94.10%</td>
<td>99.44%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Percent of families reporting that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)</td>
<td>98.79%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>98.60%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percent of families reporting that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)</td>
<td>99.09%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>99.16%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

XXX

Part C
Was sampling used?  
NO

If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?  

If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.

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

Was a collection tool used?  
YES

If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?  
NO

If your collection tool has changed, upload it here  
XXX

The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.  
YES

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.

In FFY2018, a total of 1,116 surveys were distributed to Part C families; 359 were returned for a response rate of 32.17%.

The validity and reliability of the survey is ensured by having a carefully crafted survey that is understandable, measures the indicator, and is based on a representative group of parents. To ensure representativeness, each parent receives a hand-delivered survey during their transition conference from their service coordinator. For those families who exit the program prior to the transition conference their surveys are mailed to them. In all circumstances a self-addressed stamped envelope is provided with the survey, addressed to the state office. All surveys are keyed and analyzed by a third party with the results provided at the state level and for each of the six regional Birth to Three programs.

The representativeness of the survey responses was assessed by examining the demographic characteristics of the children by the parents who responded to the survey to the demographic characteristics of children in South Dakota's Part C system.

Of parents who returned a survey:

• 12.53% indicated their child is American Indian/Alaska Native and 11.98% of Part C children were American Indian/Alaska Native;
• 2.23% indicated their child is Asian and 1.30% of Part C children are Asian;
• 1.11% indicated their child is Black or African American and 2.44% of Part C children are Black or African American;
• 3.62% indicated their child is Hispanic and 6.28% of Part C children are Hispanic;
• 3.96% indicated their child is multi-racial and 4.81% of Part C children are Hispanic;
• 1.08% indicated their child is Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 0.41% of Part C children are Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander;
• 74.93% indicated their child is white and 72.78% of Part C children are white; and
• 1.39% of parents did not indicate their child’s ethnicity.

This comparison indicates that the results are representative of Part C children as there is not significant difference in the reporting data for the demographics.

South Dakota Birth to Three is working with regional programs and the SICC to develop strategies to continue to increase the percentage of family surveys returned, with special attention to minority families.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

4 - OSEP Response

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 compared to national data. (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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) 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 and compare the results to the target and to national data. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>0.82%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY Target</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>1.67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

Prepopulated Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>07/10/2019</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race</td>
<td>06/20/2019</td>
<td>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</td>
<td>12,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs</th>
<th>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>12,109</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
XXX

Compare your results to the national data
In FFY2018, South Dakota served 1.40% of the state population of infants and toddlers birth to one, compared to the national average of 1.25%.

According to IDEA 2018 data of children under the age of one receiving services by eligibility, South Dakota ranks 9th out of the 18 states in Category B Eligibility criteria. South Dakota ranks 2nd out of the 11 states with Education Lead Agency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

5 - OSEP Response

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 compared to national data. (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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) 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 and compare the results to the target and to national data. 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2.81%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2013</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target &gt;=</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets:**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

**Prepopulated Data**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups</td>
<td>07/10/2019</td>
<td>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</td>
<td>1,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race</td>
<td>06/20/2019</td>
<td>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</td>
<td>37,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs</th>
<th>Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>37,020</td>
<td>3.29%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Compare your results to the national data
In FFY2018, South Dakota served 3.31% of the state population of infants and toddlers birth to three, compared to the national average of 3.48%.

According to IDEA 2018 data of children under the age of three receiving services by eligibility, South Dakota ranks 11th out of the 18 states in Category B Eligibility criteria. South Dakota ranks 3rd out of the 11 states with Education Lead Agency.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**6 - OSEP Response**

**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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>97.30%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>99.44%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable
 XXX

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.

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

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.
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 FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C7, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). 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 FFY2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX
Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions
**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 SEA and the 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 the 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FFY 2018</th>
<th>FFY 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2018 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

If no, please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services</th>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

#### 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.

5

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

State database

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

XXX

**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 FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). 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 FFY2018.

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

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</td>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</td>
<td>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</td>
<td>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions
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 SEA and the 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 number of 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 the 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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 Special Education Director of the LEA and the SEA. 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

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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 FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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 FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting period 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 FFY2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*

XXX

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

XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**8B - OSEP Response**

**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 SEA and the 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 = [\( \frac{\text{# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}}{\text{# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C}} \)] times 100.

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

C. Percent = [\( \frac{\text{# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}}{\text{# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B}} \)] 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 the 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 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>94.60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>99.38%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2018 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

If no, please explain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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</th>
<th>Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>Met Target</td>
<td>No Slippage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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.

5

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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 FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). 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 FFY2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Identified</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year</th>
<th>Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected</th>
<th>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

XXX

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

XXX

FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017
Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not YetVerified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected
Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*
XXX
Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected
XXX

Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected
Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected
XXX

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions
None
Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions
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 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**
Percent = \( \frac{3.1(a)}{3.1} \) 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

- Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

- 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

- Provide an explanation below.

**Prepopulated Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/11/2019</td>
<td>3.1 Number of resolution sessions</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints</td>
<td>11/11/2019</td>
<td>3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The
diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>3.1 Number of resolutions sessions</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements</th>
<th>3.1 Number of resolutions sessions</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target (low)</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target (high)</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

### 9 - OSEP Response

### 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 EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

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.

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

Provide an explanation below

Prepopulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/11/2019</td>
<td>2.1 Mediations held</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/11/2019</td>
<td>2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests</td>
<td>11/11/2019</td>
<td>2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 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 also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota’s State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

The SICC meet again in November 2019 to address OSEP direction to extend the indicator targets to include FFY2019. This meeting, led by SICC Chair and a content expert from Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, specifically focused on setting the SPP/APR targets for FFY2019. During this meeting SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, trends, national data, the State Systemic Improvement Plan and other data sources. SICC members discussed and considered facts specific to South Dakota including but not limited to provider availability, population sparsity in rural geographic locations, resources, growth and financial implications.

The SICC provided the state team with recommended targets for FFY2019 for results Indicators C2, C3, C4, C5 and C6.

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, 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, 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 State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas and meeting minutes are posted on the Department of Education website and the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public.

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.

The SPP/APR was developed by the Part C Birth to Three state staff with input from stakeholders and assistance from the IDEA Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy).

### Historical Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target&gt;=</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Number of mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>2018 (low)</th>
<th>2018 (high)</th>
<th>2019 (low)</th>
<th>2019 (high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints</th>
<th>2.1 Number of mediations held</th>
<th>FFY 2017 Data</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target (low)</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Target (high)</th>
<th>FFY 2018 Data</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Slippage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

### 10 - OSEP Response

### 10 - Required Actions
Certification
Instructions
Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify
I certify that I am the 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:
01/30/20  2:33:53 PM
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Introduction

The South Dakota Department of Education (DOE) is the designated State Lead Agency for the Birth to Three program. South Dakota, geographically, is the 5th least densely populated state with the majority of its population residing within a few counties. These counties are located along the western and eastern boarders of South Dakota, with approximately 347 miles separating them. Birth to Three provides early intervention services in all 66 counties in South Dakota through agreements with over 400 direct service providers who are independently employed or employed by school districts, local clinics or other health care partners. Service coordination is provided through contracts with seven regional programs.

Phase III Year 4 of the South Dakota Birth to Three State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) process builds on the work of Phase I, Phase II and Phase III Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3, focusing on continued infrastructure development for accountability and capacity and sustainability building for training on the implementation of evidence-based practices by the state early intervention providers to contribute to the achievement of 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 in each of the years FFY 2014-2019.*

South Dakota has embraced the SSIP process and, due to the ongoing support and active participation of Stakeholders, has experienced success in many of the implementation strategies included in the plan. The SSIP Stakeholder group has remained largely the same from Phase I except for the addition of all state ICC members. Throughout Phase I, II and Phase III Year 1, Year 2, Year 3 and Year 4, additional small and targeted groups of Stakeholders were convened as necessary to address specific activities. These smaller Stakeholder groups provided invaluable insight and direction for the Birth to Three program on specific areas of focus. In Phase III Year 4, with Stakeholder advice, the state continued to focus on implementation of the routines-based home visiting evidence-based practice (EBP), *Getting Ready* with direct service providers and *Routines Based Interview (RBI)* with service coordinators.

Throughout Phase III Year 4 technical assistance was provided by ECTA, DaSy, NCSI and WestEd national technical assistance (TA) centers and private consultants as well as calls with South Dakota’s OSEP contact. The state leadership team participated in multiple webinars and teleconferences provided by national TA centers and OSEP leadership. South Dakota Part C state leadership were members of the NCSI Knowledge and Skills Learning Collaborative and NCSI RDA Accountability Learning Collaborative where collaboration with other state Part C programs and content experts were available. Members of the state leadership team also attended national conferences including: NSCI Cross State Collaborative meeting, Atlanta, GA (May 2019) and the OSEP Leadership Conference in Washington DC (July 2019). During the OSEP Leadership Conference the state team co-presented with University of Nebraska Lincoln team on the implementation of evidence-based practices in our states.
Phase III Year 4 Summary

Phase III Year 4 of the SSIP was implemented with the continued active assistance of an extensive Stakeholder group and ongoing technical assistance (TA) from national OSEP funded centers DaSy, ECTA, NCSI and WestEd. During Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP, South Dakota conducted broad in-depth analysis of South Dakota’s early intervention program infrastructure and data that resulted in the selection of the SiMR. To determine the coherent improvement strategies that would contribute to the achievement of the SiMR, Birth to Three, with Stakeholder involvement, conducted a root cause analysis to identify contributing factors to the state’s current performance on the SiMR and to identify areas to address to improve performance on the identified SiMR. The root cause analysis determined four areas of need including:

- **Data Quality** – Need for increased reliability statewide in the use of the Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2) evaluation tool, and the collection and recording of BDI-2 scores in the database.
- **Accountability** – Need for an enhanced monitoring protocol that evaluates and facilitates improvement in the delivery of evidence-based practices and its effect on child outcomes.
- **Professional Development** - Lack of cohesive system to adequately train all stakeholders (service coordinators, providers, families and community partners) in the understanding and implementation of the early intervention processes and DEC Recommended Practices.
- **Recommended Practices** – Need for statewide change in the service delivery model with an emphasis on engagement of families, caregivers and community partners.

The four areas of need were identified as the Strands of Action in the well-developed and defined Theory of Action (Attachment A).

South Dakota Birth to Three did not report improvement in the SiMR for FFY2014 or FFY2015, however, FFY2016 data submitted in SPP/APR Indicator C3B showed significant improvement that is likely to be, in part, the result of an increase in data quality due to completion rate and changes in business rules that better align to the state’s eligibility guidelines. FFY2017 saw a 2.5% increase in C3B data, however in FFY2018 a slight dip in C3B data was noted. This slight dip, when calculated using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator indicated no meaningful difference. These data suggest the performance of child outcomes are being positively impacted by the multiple implementation efforts in each of the Theory of Action strands. The following table demonstrates Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1 performance over time.

### INDICATOR 3B, SUMMARY STATEMENT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>57.94%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>73.43%</td>
<td>75.95%</td>
<td>74.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Dakota has fully embraced the SSIP process and embarked on a large undertaking to redefine early intervention in South Dakota and create a dynamic early intervention program that is sustainable long-term. Stakeholders firmly held to the research indicating that if families are more engaged in their child’s early intervention, it leads to improved child and family outcomes which would improve the SiMR.
South Dakota Stakeholders identified that two evidence-based practices (EBP) were needed, one to address the assessment process and one to address intervention. *Routines Based Interview (RBI)* was selected as the EBP to address family assessment and is implemented by service coordinators. The second EBP is the *Getting Ready* model from the Nebraska Center for Research on Children, University of Nebraska Lincoln, is implemented by direct service providers during early intervention sessions.

The following report and attachments will provide the reader with an overview of the work in Phase III Year 4 where the state focused on continued implementation of the professional development plans to reach statewide implementation. This report will also provide information on how the state, now in Phase III Year 4 began to address sustaining fidelity of practices over time with those providers who met initial fidelity in the Phase III Year 2 of the implementation.

Accompanying this narrative is a series of attachments containing the updated Implementation Plans and Evaluation Tracking documents. Each attachment is directly aligned to the *Theory of Action* and contains updates and progress with specific details on each activity of Phase III Year 4. The Implementation Plans attachments contain updated Activities, Resources, Status, and Projected Timelines and identified Next Steps. Updates to the respective columns are notes with a tag “Phase III Year 4 NEW” or “Phase III Year 4 Update”.

South Dakota utilizes these plans to track progress and to report to Interagency Coordination Council and other Stakeholder groups. For tracking purposes, South Dakota has noted in the Status column of each activity the progress utilizing the following scale:

- **Development** (in process of being developed);
- **Implementation** (new practices put into practice; may include multiple stages);
- **Scaling Up** (wide spread use of practice/activity but not statewide);
- **Full Implementation** (practice/activities are implemented as intended);
- **Pending** (activity delayed; progression dependent on another factor); and
- **Discontinued** (activity is no longer relevant or part of the SSIP process).

The reader will note, as the work progressed, some of the activities associated with various Implementation strategies were changed. These changes, which are discussed in the narrative, were made in response to information gained from Stakeholders or through the evaluation process. Evaluation data has at times, taken South Dakota back to revisit earlier stages and consider implementation drivers and organization supports to the new practices. Additional changes were necessary due to limited resources or capacity limitations within the state office.

The attachments also include a complete Evaluation Tracking tool adapted from WestEd NCSI Implementation Evaluation Matrix with assistance from WestEd TA. This document provides accessibility for readers to understand and correlate Improvement Plan activities with the Evaluation process. This format connects each SSIP Activity directly to the Evaluation Question and the Outcomes. It also contains the Data Collection Plan, Results and Summary and identified Next Steps. The format affords the state leadership team a consistent means to inform and update Stakeholders of SSIP progress towards the SiMR. The reader will note, Phase III Year 3 and Year 2 data are included to show progression of activities in Phase III Year 4.

South Dakota has fully embraced the SSIP process and has made great strides in the activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategies. As outlined in our original TOA and in this report, significant activity
continues to be focused on implementing EBPs in a deliberate way to ensure statewide implementation and sustainability using data to inform our scaleup. During Phase III Year 4, South Dakota has seen a significant impact on relationships with parents, parent competence and confidence and children’s development as noted in the attachments and throughout this report. As South Dakota moves closer to full statewide implementation, the state will have more comprehensive data that will allow additional analyses of the relationship between EPB and progress towards the SiMR.

Throughout Phase III Year 4 the state leadership team met frequently with Stakeholders as discussed throughout the report. To maximize the valuable insight, expertise, feedback and differing perspectives of the Stakeholders, the state leadership team met with the large ICC group as well as smaller identified work teams. The large Stakeholder group meets quarterly, in conjunction with scheduled ICC meetings, via virtual platform. On September 11, 2019 an all-day face-to-face meeting took place in Pierre, South Dakota. During this meeting Stakeholders had a robust discussion, led by outside TA, on the State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Plan (SPP/APR) data including SiMR data. During this time the issue came up of possibly including Family Outcomes as a target for improvement. Stakeholders began exploring the development of a possible additional tool to gather data for Indicator C4, Family Outcomes. This large Stakeholder group membership has remained stable for the majority of members, thus, their insight into a new tool would provide the state with insight from their respective representations. Work on this will continue in the summer of 2020. The large Stakeholder group met virtually in December 2019, to establish FFY2019 targets. It was during this meeting Stakeholders established the target for Indicator C3 Summary Statement 1, which is the state’s SSIP SiMR. The target established for FFY2019 is 60.00%.

Along with the large Stakeholder group, the state brought together smaller Stakeholder teams to work on individual activities, these groups met as needed for the duration of the specific activity. The frequency of their meetings depended upon the work at hand with the majority of meetings being conducted virtually. The two most frequent small Stakeholder groups were those focusing on the Getting Ready and the Routines Based Interview (RBI) EBP. These groups met largely on a virtual platform, however, face-to-face meetings occurred in various locations across the state as needed.

At the conclusion of Phase III Year 4 of the existing SSIP, the state team felt the need to bring together a group of individuals from across the state who were familiar not only with the Birth to Three program but also the work that has taken place in implementing a statewide evidence-based model focusing on Family Engagement. The state was seeking assistance in evaluating the progress made, challenges faced, and considerations for the coming years as the state increases implementation across the state. Two outside contractors, with extensive experience in early intervention and the SSIP process, were engaged to facilitate the meeting. This facilitation allowed Stakeholders the ability to speak freely and for state team members to listen to the conversation, joining in only when clarification was requested. The day-long meeting, held in early March 2020, was structured to elicit the Stakeholders’ input about their experiences with, their perceptions of, and their recommendations for (a) the EBPs, Getting Ready and RBI; (b) the professional development training, coaching, follow-up, and scale-up of these practices, and (c) planning for sustaining the practices and the professional development over time. More information about the Stakeholders and their work is described throughout this report.
Phase III Year 4: Infrastructure/Coherent Improvement Strategy Updates, Implementation Status for Evidence-based Practices, Stakeholder Engagement Activities, Additional Data to Support Progress Toward the SiMR, Scale-up Planning, Sustainability Planning

The following sections outline the continued progress South Dakota Birth to Three has made during the past year in implementing the four Implementation Plans developed in Phase II. Throughout Phase III Year 4, South Dakota examined implementation drivers and system components to assure quality and success in scaling up. Feedback loops were used to quickly resolve barriers and identify additional supports needed in the implementation. Progress on the four Implementation Plans is presented fully on the individual Implementation Plans in attached appendices.

Implementation Plan: Data Quality

The following Coherent Improvement Strategies related to Data Quality were identified by Stakeholders:

- **South Dakota will establish a process to obtain and report exit BDI-2 scores for children exiting the Birth to Three programs regardless of reasons for exit.**
- **South Dakota will provide BDI-2 training, in collaboration with the Part B 619, to evaluators.**

South Dakota state leadership continues to focus attention on data quality during Phase III Year 3. A coherent improvement strategy identified by Stakeholders was collaboration between Part C and Part B 619 to provide training on the evaluation tool, BDI-2. The BDI-2 tool is used by Part C and Part B 619 to measure child progress. Adapting the work of the Florida early intervention program, South Dakota developed an online training tool that was made available October 2018 to school district staff across the state. This training, accessed via a personally identified login, contains approximately 15 contact hours of training on the appropriate use of the BDI evaluation tool. The training tool consists of review models, activities to check knowledge and a final assessment. Being offered as a graduate credit from a South Dakota postsecondary institution, participants must complete the training with an 80% accuracy to receive credit. Participants who successfully complete the components with an 80% or higher also receive a certificate of completion from the South Dakota Department of Education who receives the scores for all participants.

This combined effort of Part B 619 and Part C, in conjunction with new service coordinator training and annual training related to data collection for Indicator C3, Child Outcomes, has led to an increased understanding of the importance and relevance of the child outcomes progress data by BDI-2 evaluators and service coordinators. During FFY2018 South Dakota saw a 14% increase in the number of usable exit evaluations statewide. The FFY2018 SPP/APR completion rate computes to a 65.72% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. This completion rate is a 2.31% increase from FFY2017. Note, according to federal regulations, child outcomes data on children who are served less than six months are not considered when measuring progress on this indicator. When this is considered in the completion rate formula, South Dakota’s completion rate is 87.02%. The state will continue to work with regional programs to meet the 65% target, including assisting programs in developing sustainable strategies to insure heightened completion rates for each reporting year.
During Phase III Year 4 the state issued updated provider agreements to all providers with an effective date of January 1, 2020. The updated agreements were expanded to include items that had become pressing issues at either the state or federal level. Such items included: conflict of interest, confidentiality, personal conduct, and professional development requirements. Along with the required assurances, the state included a section requiring entities who employ multiple providers to list those providers' names, disciplines and Medicaid information. This activity served two-fold, 1) all providers are now aware of the professional development guidelines related to the implementation of the evidence-based practice and by signing the agreement agreed to participate in such PD, and 2) the state now had an updated list of all early interventionists serving Part C children. This completed list assists the state in accuracy of providers who still need to complete all or portions of the professional development activities.

The State notes that, with the release of the BDI-3 in fall of 2020, decisions on existing activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy will need to be re-evaluated. The state is working with national ECTA/DaSy-sponsored BDI States User Group as information is gathered. The state recognizes timelines, training, administration tools and data access must be coordinated with Part B 619 and may necessitate possible changes to the Steps to Implement the Activities.

South Dakota has noted in past SSIP submissions that the linkage of child outcome data to K-12 data is a priority for Part C. During Phase III Year 4, South Dakota Part B 619 made great strides towards completion of high-quality IDEA data connecting Birth to Three, to Part B 619, through school age. During the next reporting year Part C, in collaboration with Part B, will work on ways to disseminate data which will answer key questions such as: 1) evaluating the value added of early intervention, and 2) informing decision-making for strategies for improving outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Data Quality Implementation Plan and Evaluation Tracking can be found in Attachment B1 and B2.

**Implementation Plan: Professional Development and Recommended Practices**

The South Dakota Birth to Three Theory of Action, has two additional Stakeholders Identified Action Strands, Professional Development and Recommended Practices. The Coherent Improvement Strategies for these strands are:

- **(Recommended Practice) South Dakota will present a consistent statewide message about early intervention service delivery and evidence-based practices.**

- **(Recommended Practice): South Dakota will provide training and resources to service coordinators and providers on appropriate use of family assessment and embedded routines engaging families in the early intervention process.**

- **(Professional Development) South Dakota will design and implement training/TA to service coordinators and providers to increase their knowledge and skills and use of appropriate recommended early intervention practices.**

- **(Professional Development) South Dakota will provide support and technical assistance to all partners**
These four Coherent Improvement Strategies complement each other, and the flow of activities lead from one Action Strand to another. It became logical during work sessions in Phase III Year 2 to align activities and workflow across strands. Therefore, the reader will find that activities from the Professional Development Action Strand and the Recommended Practices Strand have been combined to be more efficient in their implementation and to provide better evaluation opportunities. For purposes of this report, South Dakota will speak to the activities surrounding these Coherent Improvement Strategies and the ensuing evaluation collectively. Professional Development & Recommended Practices Implementation Plan and Evaluation Tracking can be found in Attachment C1 and C2.

South Dakota embarked on a significant initiative to redefine early intervention in South Dakota and create a dynamic early intervention system that is sustainable long-term. Throughout this work, Stakeholders firmly held to the research that if families are more engaged in their child’s early intervention, it leads to improved child outcomes, thus an improved SiMR. From these deliberations, it was determined that two EBPs were needed, one to address the assessment process and one to address intervention. Stakeholders have remained committed to EBPs being implemented statewide to maximize the opportunities for all families to benefit from high quality evidence-based practices by the end of the SSIP process.

Assessment EBP: Routines Based Interview (RBI)

In Phase II, with Stakeholder feedback, the state selected the evidence-based practice Routines Based Interview (RBI). This EBP met the identified family assessment needs advocated for by Stakeholders. All service coordinators were initially trained in the RBI during Phase III Year 1; new service coordinators are trained within the first 30 days of their hire.

During Phase III Year 4, the state developed and began implementing an online, in-depth training of the RBI principles and practices. Building on the strengths of the existing peer coaching model, this training, paired with the coaching, is used to train new service coordinators and as a refresher for those participating in the process. This is used to evaluate the extent to which individuals trained in the EBPs continue to implement those practices with fidelity over time. The learning material also contains a video library of practitioners conducting RBI’s specific to the South Dakota initiative. The ease of access afforded by the online platform lends itself to service coordinators accessing that resource as needed to refresh and maintain skills.

Using this online learning tool in conjunction with peer coaching, the state team embarked on a sustained fidelity review process of implementation of the RBI tool. Of the service coordinators who participated in the process, forty percent (40%) scored at or above the sustained fidelity criteria, 2% were unable to complete the process due to emergencies, and 58% did not meet the criteria. For those who did not meet the criteria, the state team is working with the assigned peer coaches to develop an independent learning plan to be implemented over the next year. The goal of the state team is for each service coordinator to be confident and successful in implementing the evidence-based model to impact the results of infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The key is to look for ways to help these service coordinators be successful, to again implement the EBPs with fidelity, and to maintain that fidelity over time.

During Phase III Year 2 and 3, based on Stakeholder input, the state implemented 27 three-hour, face-to-face,
RBI Boot Camps for direct service providers with approximately 477 individuals attending. During Phase III Year 3, the state evaluated the continued practice of the face-to-face RBI Boot Camps and determined, due to cost and staffing capacity, it was not feasible for the state to continue in the same manner. It was decided to move the boot camp content to an online platform. The content of the online model mirrors that of the previous face-to-face training and contains video of a South Dakota service coordinator conducting an RBI. Learning objectives for the Boot Camp are identified as:

1. Understanding of factors that influence SD Birth to Three priorities and service delivery;
2. Knowledge of information gathered by service coordinators as they engage families in the Routines Based Interview process;
3. Ability to contribute to the IFSP process by writing functional outcomes; and
4. Awareness of the EBP professional development training designed for SD Birth to Three direct service providers.

During Phase III Year 4 the course was offered on 3 different occasions. Participants represented private providers, school district personnel, health care professionals, and new service coordinators. The state hopes to offer this more often over the coming year with additional instructor support from contracted help.

**Intervention Evidence-Based Practice: Getting Ready**

During Phase III Year 2, South Dakota selected the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools Getting Ready’s EBP for home visiting. The EBP, Getting Ready, provides a framework for use when interacting with families during early intervention sessions to help guide their exchanges, building on culturally relevant family and child strengths. It is not a curriculum or a packaged, stand-alone program, but rather an ecologically sound, intentional approach for infusing meaningful parent engagement into all aspects of the natural early childhood environment.

The EBP, Getting Ready, has research on the content of the professional development and the delivery of the professional development, with considerations of processes, participant characteristics, and relationships. Having both research on the practice, and also on how to train professionals in the process to implement the practice, strengthens the ability to replicate statewide for sustainability. The Getting Ready EBP strengthens relationships between providers and families, and helps providers build parent competencies for interacting with their children—skills necessary for South Dakota direct service providers to cultivate family and caregiver engagement as noted in the Theory of Action.

Getting Ready also encompasses ongoing coaching from a peer coach to support providers’ use of research-based strategies that promote responsive and effective parent-child interactions. In addition, coaches help providers learn to engage with families in targeted, collaborative problem-solving to set goals and support children’s development.

Taking the research from the Getting Ready EBP, research and participation in a National TA learning Collaborative, and TA offered by OSEP sponsored TA centers, throughout Phase III Year 2, South Dakota developed a comprehensive professional development system for direct service providers referred to as Bright Beginnings. This comprehensive professional development is based on the following:

- Enhancing direct services providers’ ability 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;  
- Supporting direct service providers’ ability to promote families’ understanding of, and ability to positively support, young children’s physical, social, emotional, cognitive, and language development; and  
- Promoting direct service providers’ awareness of strategies they can utilize to help families provide language and literacy rich learning experiences for their children.

The content of *Bright Beginnings* is influenced by the Division of Early Childhood (DEC) recommended practices selected by Stakeholders, UNL *Getting Ready EBP* training protocol, early intervention research (i.e. Rush and Sheldon, Robin McWilliams), guidance from national TA centers, NCSI Cross State Learning Collaborative, and the South Dakota Early Learning Guidelines to name a few. South Dakota *Bright Beginnings* is a comprehensive professional development (PD) system designed to promote direct service providers’ understanding of core knowledge identified within three DEC RP domains: Families, Instruction, and Interaction. Ten DEC recommended practices were identified by Stakeholders as the foundation for the *Bright Beginnings* PD. State leadership expanded those 10 DEC practices to include the Core Knowledge direct service providers would gain in the *Bright Beginnings* training.

South Dakota’s delivery on Bright Beginnings has been conducted both online and in face-to-face settings. This structure was influenced by the evaluation and feedback given by a small group of direct service providers who were early adopters of the EBP and have served as Stakeholders for the state initiatives. The online components build awareness and increase knowledge of the importance of early intervention and how direct service providers can enhance their ability to implement routines-based home visits by utilizing evidence-based strategies adopted by the SD Birth to Three program. The face-to-face module brings direct service providers together to hear and then view a demonstration of the *Getting Ready EBP*.

The state is currently rethinking the delivery models of the existing professional development system. Feedback from participants related to the professional development content have been very positive. Surveys from participants indicate extreme satisfaction with the content and the ability to apply the practices learned with families. Feedback from surveys indicate concern from participants in attending the face-to-face module, consisting of two half-days, due to the interruption in work. The state has taken this feedback into consideration and is currently restructuring the format and moving the content to entirely online. Beginning with the cohort starting in April 2020, the entire PD will be done virtually.

South Dakota realized early in Phase III Year 3 the state’s only professional development staff member’s time was quickly reaching capacity and would need additional assistance in meeting the responsibilities of being the *Bright Beginnings* instructor, providing peer coaching, and overseeing the other peer coaches. An infrastructure adjustment was needed to respond to this. To increase capacity for meeting initial training needs and ensuring sustainability, the state added to the *Bright Beginnings* instructor pool. These additional instructors are direct service providers who have been trained in the EBP and have been practicing the model for over a year. The state continues to evaluate the existing instructor pool and during the next year will be looking for opportunities to collaborate with educational resources in the state to perhaps outsource the now established curriculum portion of the professional development.

The peer-to-peer coaching model is a critical component of the *Bright Beginnings* professional development
and a principal of the *Getting Ready* EBP. To ensure capacity-building and sustained performance of South Dakota Birth to Three evidence-based practices, coaching needed to be a readily available to trainees within the comprehensive plan. The final component of the *Bright Beginnings* professional development model is the peer coaching component. During this time direct service providers interact with peer coaches who have met the initial fidelity criteria in the *Getting Ready* EPB. These peer coaches provide support to providers’ ability to promote families’ understanding of, and ability to positively support, young children’s physical, social, emotional, cognitive and language development using the *Getting Ready* EBP. The feedback from participants, related to peer coaching, has been overwhelmingly positive.

---

*Quote from Provider:* “Your detailed feedback on the final video was very helpful. The huge investment of your time in this entire process is quite evident and very much appreciated. Your guidance and coaching sessions led to increased confidence in implementing the Bright Beginnings plan.”

---

The coaching pool for the state is built from those providers who have received the state Certificate of Recognition and who have successfully completed a coaching seminar. Peer coaches are assigned two to three providers who they will work with through the reliability review process. Matching of coaches to trainees includes multiple steps. Through feedback from pilot participants it was learned that coaches and trainees do not have to be from the same discipline. In fact, pilot members informed the state they appreciated having another discipline present as they gained greater knowledge beyond their specific area of expertise. The coaching component is done virtually through a secure online learning platform. Coaches review trainees practice videos and provide feedback and support through regularly scheduled coaching sessions. Review of the fidelity video is done by the peer coach using the *Bright Beginnings* established criteria.

Through data analysis, the state evaluated the peer coaching system and determined implementing a “Master Coach” level would lead to sustainability of ensuring fidelity of the EBP and begin the development of professional learning communities. Master Coaches provide support to the first level of peer coaches and provide a second level of quality assurance in the initial fidelity review process. During Phase III Year 4, the state continued to build upon this model. With additional instructors for the online portion of the professional development, the state expert was able to dedicate resources to building capacity in this area. It is evident this portion of the work is critical and must be sustained. Those providers who have served as peer and master coaches are also still serving as direct service providers. In some instances, these individuals have indicated a desire to withdraw from coaching for a period of time. While serving as a peer or
master coach is rewarding, it is time consuming and intense. Therefore, having the ability to recruit and train additional coaches is critical over the coming years.

The state has established a training calendar which allows for two training cohorts each fiscal year. Member selection to each of the professional development cohorts is completed through an application process. Direct service providers must submit an online application providing demographic information along with information such as reason for applying and desired learning outcomes. Using this process, the state can carefully consider the statewide program needs with each cohort. Items the state considers when selecting cohort members include geographic location of the provider, provider discipline, and provider employment (i.e. school district personnel, private or health care provider, etc.). As the state moves towards full state-wide implementation of the EBP, an important factor considered is the number of children the applicant serves or has the capacity to serve.

During Phase III Year 4, two cohorts completed the professional development training. The first consisted of direct service providers who were employed by health care entities or were private providers. The second, Cohort 4, was made up entirely of school district personnel. This distinction was made for Cohort 4 due to a grant secured in partnership between Part C and one of the educational cooperatives in the state. At the time of this writing, an additional 50 direct service providers, representing school district personnel, independent providers and health care providers have completed the Bright Beginnings professional development and met the initial fidelity criteria. In March 2020 Cohort 5 began and Cohort 6 is scheduled to begin August 2020.

Upon successful completion of the Bright Beginnings professional development direct service providers are assessed through the initial fidelity review process using the Getting Ready EBP checklist by their assigned peer and master coach. Those who meet the criteria in implementing the EBP receive a “Certificate of Recognition” from the South Dakota Department of Education. This certificate indicates they are “Recognized” as proficient in the Getting Ready EBP and have met the established criteria.

As described in the Phase III Year 3 report, South Dakota has implemented a Tiered system for assignment of service providers. Positive feedback on the impact on children and families when implementing the EBP, along with informal feedback from families themselves, encouraged the state to enhance efforts to ensure more families can participate in the EBP while practices are being scaled up statewide. The tiered provider system gives priority to providers who are trained in the Getting Ready EBP. Those providers who meet initial fidelity are recognized as Bright Beginnings providers and assigned a Tier 1 status in state tracking system. Providers who are currently participating in the professional development or actively working with a peer coach are assigned Tier 2. Providers who have attended or participated in an RBI Boot Camp are listed as Tier 3. All other providers are Tier 4. This tiered system serves as an incentive for providers to apply for participation in a cohort.

When the IFSP services are determined, service coordinators will first look for providers who are Tier 1, those who have received a Bright Beginnings Certificate of Recognition and then Tier 2, providers who are currently in a Bright Beginnings training cohort. Using this system, the state believes the number of children
receiving services using the EBP will increase and providers will be encouraged to participate in the professional development initiative. As providers successfully complete the trainings they are moved to the higher tier. Over the coming year the state will seek assistance from OSEP TA centers in the evaluation of results data in relation to tiered providers.

As more cohorts have been completed, more data have become available. The state recognizes not all direct service providers are meeting the initial fidelity criteria. During Phase III Year 4, the state communicated with these providers and those who desired to reach fidelity were put on an Independent Plan of Study and currently work closely with the state professional development expert or a peer coach. Those providers who did not wish to continue working toward fidelity of practice were moved to a Tier 3 status.

As it is the state’s goal to support all providers who wish to reach fidelity, the state is taking additional steps to analyze the professional development model. Over the course of the coming year a new database will be created for the purpose of evaluating and monitoring trainees’ effective implementation of the Getting Ready EBP. The data will be obtained from individual trainees’ post-training reliability reviews. Evaluation data will include:

- Demographic data including the providers name, discipline, and service type (i.e. private, school district or educational cooperative.
- Peer and master coaches’ names.
- Rubric ratings for 10 evidence-based home visiting practices and eight strategies to enhance family engagement during and between home visits.
- Overall rating scores for the home visiting practices and family engagement strategies.
- The reliability review determination (i.e. reliability achieved, a professional development plan is needed, or a 2nd reliability review is required).

The database will allow for comparison within and across cohorts. The data will be analyzed at the conclusion of each training cohort to monitor trainees’ adoption of the evidence-based practices. This information will also be utilized for continuous improvements for implementation of the training and coaching that providers receive specific to the Getting Ready EBP. The data will also provide insight to guide sustained fidelity planning and evaluation.

While the state has been heavily invested in the initial fidelity of providers, during Phase III Year 4, the state piloted a review process for measuring the extent to which the practices were implemented with fidelity on a sustained basis. Providers who had reached initial fidelity two years prior took part. The process included completion of the newly state-created, online Getting Ready refresher course. This short three-hour course provided the overview and helpful reminders of the EBP. Once completed, providers were asked to submit a video of an EI session. These videos were reviewed by the state professional development expert using the EBP checklists. The state professional development expert conducted a coaching session with each participant to assist them, as well as to evaluate the process for future sustained fidelity reviews. All participants in the pilot met the sustained fidelity criteria.

Another component of the sustained fidelity review included a family survey specifically focusing on key criteria of the EBP. Families who were currently receiving services from these providers were given a survey and asked to complete it and mail it to the state office. Key results of the survey can be found in Attachment D.

The state carefully analyzed the process and determined a two-year sustained fidelity review would be adequate and has made plans for the next round of sustained fidelity assessment to take plan in summer 2020.
With additional feedback from the focus stakeholder group, which meet March 2020, the state has planned some additional activities going forward. There is a recognition that to support sustained fidelity of practice one-time reviews are not enough for all providers and more consistent connection with their fellow Tier 1 providers needs to be created and nurtured by the state office. With input from these Stakeholders, the state has made plans to initiate some new professional development activities to provide access to relevant resources, ongoing support, and continuing education designed specifically for Tier 1 providers. These include:

- A new Tier1 Provider List Serve will enhance our ability to provide timely access to resources specific to our evidence-based model.
- The state is making plans to conduct periodic informational small group discussion forums. These forums will offer the opportunity for Tier 1 providers to engage in Professional Learning Community conversations focused on topics previously requested by Tier 1 providers, such as early intervention in childcare settings and serving diverse families.
- Credit-bearing continuing education opportunities will also be offered to Tier 1 providers, building on their knowledge and home-visiting skills. During the next reporting period, early literacy and teletherapy training will be offered and supplemented by peer coaching for small groups of Tier 1 providers.

The reader will note the state team has made significant progress in training direct service providers in the EBP and remains dedicated to ensuring fidelity of practice and continues to gather quantitative and qualitative data to support these efforts. Feedback loops were created to ensure there is circular communication between the Bright Beginnings participants and the state leadership team. Surveys are conducted strategically throughout the professional development process to provide timely insight into the providers’ perspective of the EBP and its influence on family engagement and child outcomes.

South Dakota remains fully invested in implementation of the Getting Ready EBP and continues to push towards statewide implementation, however, there are barriers that will influence the speed with which statewide implementation can be obtained. One is resources to support adequate coaching, another is the resistance of some providers in use of the evidence-based practice. This is something the state will continue to address and will become more pertinent as time progresses.

**Implementation Plan: Accountability**

South Dakota Stakeholders identified the following Coherent Improvement Strategy in the Accountability Action Strand:

- *South Dakota will develop and implement a monitoring protocol to identify appropriate IFSP decisions and the use of appropriate recommended EI practices.*

With an established and effective system for statewide monitoring of compliance, during Phase I Stakeholders identified a need to add a process to ensure that evidence-based practices are being provided as intended to the statewide accountability protocol. This includes use of monitoring activities determine 1) if children and families received the EBPs as intended, and 2) if families were engaged in the EBPs. Measurement of these was established as the EBPs have been implemented. Each of the EBPs is based on family engagement and contains fidelity criteria to measure family engagement. Robin McWilliams’s, RBI Implementation Checklist, is being used to determine initial and sustained fidelity of service coordinators in implementing the RBI with families. UNL Getting Ready Checklist is used to determine direct service providers’ reliability in implementing
the Getting Ready EBP. Data from these activities provides valuable monitoring data to contribute to accountability results.

As described in the Professional Development section, the state will continue using fidelity measures in both the RBI and Getting Ready evidence-based practices and will continue to analyze data collected through these processes.

During Phase III Year 4, South Dakota developed a tool for service coordinators to use in efforts to self-monitor themselves. This tool encompasses both the compliance items required of service coordinators and also includes the RBI checklist of functional child and family outcomes. Service coordinators have received initial training on this tool. In conjunction with this tool, over the coming year with assistance from national TA, the state will create a formal monitoring protocol that will include both evidence-based practices and the services for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The work in year 5 will include developing tools to review IFSP decision-making processes such as the relationship of evaluation and family assessment information to the development of IFSP outcomes and the relationship between IFSP outcomes and service decision made by the IFSP team. The state team has begun this process by scanning initial IFSPs for those relationships and contacting service coordinators and providers for case notes and other information to support decisions made. Immediate technical assistance is provided as these reviews continue.

South Dakota recognizes this action strand has taken more time to develop, however, the Accountability Strand activities and timelines are reliant on the implementation of the EBPs.

The reader will note within Attachments E1 and E2 updated timelines, additional resources and next steps have all been clearly identified in the Implementation Plan and Evaluation Tracking for the Accountability strand.
Plans for Next Year

Phase III Year 4 was a significant year of progress and accomplishment for South Dakota Birth to Three. With continued implementation of the EBP, we began to close the research-to-practice gap. South Dakota Part C understands like all stages, this is a critical stage as we embark on providing initial training for providers while defining monitoring activities to check for sustained fidelity of providers who were trained earlier. The coming year marks the continuation of this work but also development of ongoing professional development and technical assistance for Tier 1 providers to prevent provider drift. Details and timelines are provided in the Implementation Plan tables attached.

The state is also excited to be a key partner in the Statewide Family Engagement Grant. Funding from this grant was used to develop a continued learning opportunity for our Tier 1 providers, specifically to support specific early language and literacy training while using the Getting Ready EBP. Content for this is based on the evidence-based model from the Center for Early Language and Literacy (CELL). This 4-week PD will be available using the same online platform as Bright Beginnings PD and will include a peer coach, who has been trained in the material, leading a professional learning community setting. This is not a mandatory training, rather it will be offered for interested participants. The first offering is scheduled to begin April 2020 with limited spots available. The state wishes to keep the numbers small in effort to evaluate and gain insight into the delivery model and interest. Plans are to offer it again in the fall of 2020.

Based on the success of this model, the state is making plans to develop other learning modules that will promote the use of the Getting Ready EBP and lead to continued sustainability of practice.

Many critical activities will influence the future of South Dakota Birth to Three SSIP implementation over the next year. The timelines have been and continue to be rigorous as we push towards statewide implementation. Barriers that will impede the rate with which EBP will be implemented statewide include funding, staff capacity and early interventionists’ willingness to embrace change. South Dakota will continue to utilize the OSEP funded technical assistance centers on an intensive and continuous basis. The knowledge and expertise available from these centers were all-encompassing and readily available. Being a minimally funded state, South Dakota could not have begun to access this broad knowledge base independently. We are very appreciative of the assistance and guidance provided to the state leadership team and the Stakeholder group. Working with multiple centers, South Dakota experienced a collaborative working relationship from one center to the other. The technical assistance centers that assisted in some manner with the SSIP work include: ECTA, DaSy, and NCSI.

South Dakota looks forwards to continued work in the accountability portion of the SSIP and as results data becomes more available state leadership will continue accessing technical assistance from OSEP funded centers as needed throughout the SSIP process to assist with refining evaluation and interpreting data as the state continues to move toward achievement of the SiMR. Details and timelines are provided in the Evaluation Tracking tables attached.
## SSIP Theory of Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strands of Action</th>
<th>If the State......</th>
<th>Then regionally.....</th>
<th>Then</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Quality</strong></td>
<td>.....establishes a process to obtain and report exit BDI scores for children exiting the Birth to Three programs regardless of reasons for exit. Provides BDI-2 training in collaboration with 619 to evaluators.</td>
<td>.....service coordinators/districts will increase the number of usable BDI-2 exit evaluations. .....evaluators will improve the reliability and validity of BDI-2 administration.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>...infants and toddlers exiting early intervention services will demonstrate increased growth in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language / communication)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td>.....develops and implements a monitoring protocol to identify appropriate IFSP decisions and the use of appropriate recommended EI practices.</td>
<td>.....IFSP teams will increase evidence-based service decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>...statewide data quality will increase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td>.....provides support and TA to all partners to increase their active participation in the SSIP process. .....designs and implements training/TA to increase knowledge and skills and use of appropriate recommended EI practices.</td>
<td>.....Birth to Three partners will increase active involvement in SSIP process including analyzing data and making data informed decisions. .....providers will increase use of recommended practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>...children and families will receive appropriate evidence based practice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Practices</strong></td>
<td>.....presents a consistent statewide message about early intervention service delivery and evidence based practice. .....provides training and resources on appropriate use of family assessment and embedded routines.</td>
<td>.....service coordinators and providers will implement and cultivate family and caregiver engagement and coaching practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>...parents and caregivers will be engaged in child’s routine based intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Coherent Improvement Strategy:** South Dakota will establish a process to obtain and report exit BDI-2 scores for children exiting the Birth to Three programs regardless of reasons for exit.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy:** South Dakota will provide BDI-2 training in collaboration with 619 to evaluators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates.</td>
<td>Work with national contractor to develop database for analyzing child outcomes data.</td>
<td>Funding OTISEd BDI-2 Publisher SD DOE LDS Work Group</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates.</td>
<td>Restructure of state lead agency to create a position dedicated to data analysis and quality.</td>
<td>Infrastructure analysis DOE Leadership Part C Leadership Team National TA</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates.</td>
<td>Annually disaggregate and analyze data to identify and report additional scores that could be included on the completer list. Modify data query as necessary to ensure data quality.</td>
<td>Funding Birth to Three Data System OTISEd BDI-2 Data System</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong> Data disaggregated annually.</td>
<td>Fall 2015 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue to analyze data to ensure exit BDI-2 assessments are being conducted and recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implementation Plan: Data Quality

### Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates.</td>
<td>Develop and implement process to enter BDI-2 exit progress scores not currently captured.</td>
<td>Birth to Three Data Base BDI Data Base K12 Districts Part B 619 Tribal EC Service Coordinators Training Materials</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>May 2015 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue with process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates.</td>
<td>Increase number of assessors able to conduct an exit BDI-2.</td>
<td>Training Materials BDI-2 Protocol BDI-2 Publisher</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase understanding of the importance and relevance of child progress data.</td>
<td>Annually provide programs with regional disaggregated child progress data.</td>
<td>OTISEd Birth to Three Data Base</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>January 2015 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Part C data technical leader continue to meet annually with regional programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
With upcoming BDI3 release the state is working with the publisher to determine the best training options for the state.

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**
Due to continued funding limitations, no additional face-to-face trainings occurred.

### Next Steps

- Continue with process.
- The Part C program in collaboration with Part B 619 is looking at training opportunities when the BDI3 is available.
### Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Increase understanding of the importance and relevance of child progress data. | Incorporate percentage of BDI-2 completion rate in regional determinations. | Birth to Three Data BDI-2 Data | Full Implementation | Spring 2015 Ongoing | • Ongoing TA to ensure continued focus on completion rate.  
• Regular TA provided to assist regions in maintaining and increasing completion data. |
| Increase understanding of the importance and relevance of child progress data. | Provide training to service coordinators, school district personnel and direct service providers on child progress categories a through e. | BDI-2 Data Training Materials  
School Districts  
Regional Birth to Three Programs | Full Implementation  
**Phase III Year 4 Update:**  
The State continues to devote a portion of the annual ICC retreat to discussion of child outcomes including child progress measures a through e, summary statement calculations and overall performance related to state targets. This discussion in December 2019 was used to guide Stakeholder recommendations for FFY19 targets. | January 2015 Ongoing | • Ongoing TA on progress categories a through e during regularly scheduled TA calls, ICC meetings and other Stakeholder meetings. |
| Increase understanding of the importance and relevance of child progress data. | Collaborate with Part B 619 on district level awareness of BDI-2 completion rates. | Data Training Materials  
Part B 619  
Part B School Districts | Full Implementation | Winter 2015 Ongoing | • State leadership continue to take advantage of opportunities where school district SPED personnel are present. |
### Implementation Plan: Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration</td>
<td>Develop introductory and ongoing BDI-2 training.</td>
<td>Part B 619 BDI-2 Publisher BDI-2 State Users Group Training Material Funding Part C State Leadership Team Florida EI</td>
<td>Scaling Up</td>
<td>Fall 2016 Ongoing</td>
<td>- Collaborate with Part B 619 on communication and promotion of the online tool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Phase III Year 4 Update:
The State notes with the release of the BDI-3 in fall of 2020 decisions on timelines, training, administration tools and data access must be coordinated with Part B 619. These decisions will necessitate possible changes to the Steps to Implement the Activities. These changes and updates will be noted in future SSIP submissions.

#### Phase III Year 3 Update:
Using Florida Part C as a template, SD Part B 619 and Part C collaborated to build South Dakota online BDI-2 training. SD Online BDI training was launched 10/2018.

- As of 3/4/2019 14 school district evaluators have completed the training.
- As of 3/14/19 40 additional evaluators are registered to complete the training.
- Upon release of BDI3 review online training and make necessary adjustments.
## Implementation Plan: Data Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration</td>
<td>Implement introductory and ongoing BDI-2 BDI3 training.</td>
<td>Part B 619 Funding Training Materials BDI-3 Evaluators Part C State Leadership Team</td>
<td>Discontinued Pending&lt;br&gt;&lt;b&gt;Phase III Year 4 Update:&lt;/b&gt; With upcoming BDI3 release the state is working with the publisher to determine the best training options for the state. &lt;b&gt;Phase III Year 3 Update:&lt;/b&gt; Two BDI-2 face-to-face trainings took place in 2018. Due to funding constraints and availability of online tool, no additional face-to-face BDI trainings are planned.</td>
<td>Fall 2016 Ongoing Fall 2018 Pending</td>
<td>• Continue to collaborate with Part B 619 and BDI3 publisher on plans for BDI3 trainings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration</td>
<td>Create a training/coaching model to support BDI-2 BDI3 administrators.</td>
<td>Part B 619 Funding Training Materials Part C State Leadership Team</td>
<td>Pending-Discontinued&lt;br&gt;&lt;b&gt;Phase III Year 4 Update:&lt;/b&gt; Resources need to be focused on scaling up of EBPs including peer coaching of direct service providers and service coordinators. The BDI3 activities will focus on collaboration with Part B 619 and publisher and other state BDI users on the implementation and facilitation of the new BDI3. &lt;b&gt;Phase III Year 3 Update:&lt;/b&gt; Due to continued lack of funding and staff capacity activity remains delayed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy

### Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement cadre of BDI-2 trainers and coaches.</td>
<td>Funding Part B 619 Part C State Leadership Cadre members</td>
<td>Pending Discontinued</td>
<td>Fall 2018</td>
<td>Ongoing efforts...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**

- Discontinued: Resources need to be focused on scaling up of EBPs including peer coaching of direct service providers and service coordinators. The BDI3 activities will focus on collaboration with Part B 619 and publisher and other state BDI users on the implementation and facilitation of the new BDI3.

**Phase III Year 2-Update:**

- Activity continues to be delayed, contingent on creation of coaching model.

### Ongoing efforts to ensure data quality using BDI-2 BDI3 tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing participation with ECTA/DaSy BDI State Users Group.</td>
<td>Part B 619 Part C State Leadership ECTA/DaSy BDI-2 State Users Group</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Continue to collaborate with other BDI states on resources that might be duplicated in South Dakota.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**

- Part C remains active in the ECTA/DaSy BDI Users Group.

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**

- Part C remains active in the ECTA BDI-2 Users Group.

### Ongoing efforts to ensure data quality using BDI-2 BDI3 tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitor data quality through continued analysis of child progress data categories.</td>
<td>Birth to Three Data Base OTISEd BDI-2 Data Base</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Data technical leader continues to analyze data quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**

- Data technical leader continues to analyze data quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing efforts to ensure data quality using BDI-2 BDI3 tool</td>
<td>Participation with BDI publisher regarding future BDI updates and revisions.</td>
<td>Part C State Leadership Part B 619 ECTA BDI-2 User Group Riverside</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Spring 2015 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Participate in ECTA/DaSy BDI User Group and individual state conversations with publisher to determine South Dakota implementation of the BDI3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing efforts to ensure data quality using BDI-2 BDI3 tool</td>
<td>Develop and implement with Part B a monitoring system to ensure quality of administration of BDI-2 tool.</td>
<td>Funding Birth to Three Database Online BDI Training Tool</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Summer 2017 Summer 2018 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue to monitor implementation of the fidelity assessment. • Upon release of BDI3 review online training and make necessary adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing efforts to ensure data quality using BDI-2 BDI3 tool</td>
<td>Review existing BDI-2 business rules related to Child Outcomes</td>
<td>Part C Data Manager Funding OTISeD ECTA BDI-2 State Users Group</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>• Continue as established.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
SD Online BDI training continues.
- Registered participates = 73
- Completed course = 39
- In progress = 12

**At time of reporting number of districts represented was not available.**

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**
The online BDI training tool contains an assessment which participants must meet with 80% accuracy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity to Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources/Methodology/Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop and implement steps to increase completion rates. | Were service coordinators and school district evaluators trained on necessity and use of the BDI-2 Tool?  
• Service Coordinators and school districts trained on the necessity of obtaining BDI-2 exit evaluations. | **Data Source**: Attendance logs, Training logs.  
**Data Collection**: New service coordinator trainings, monthly service coordinator TA Calls; annual Indicator C3 regional data retreats; RBI Boot Camps; quarterly direct service provider TA calls. | **Phase III Year 4 data**  
• 100% new service coordinators trained when hired.  
• 100% service coordinators attended annual C3 data retreats.  
• BDI-2 necessity is included in the online RBI Boot Camps. As of 3/3/2020, 30 direct service providers have accessed the training.  
**Phase III Year 3 Data**  
• 100% new service coordinators trained when hired.  
• 100% service coordinators attended annual C3 data retreats.  
• 20% additional direct service providers (including school district personnel) were trained as of 3/1/2019, resulting in 88% saturation. | • Continue new service coordinator training.  
• Continue annual C3 regional data retreats.  
• Continue quarterly provider TA calls.  
• Develop training for direct service providers new to Birth to Three program. |
| Increase understanding of the importance and relevance of child progress data. | Did children exiting Birth to Three receive a BDI-2 exit evaluation? | **Data Source**: Child exit; SPP/APR C3 data.  
**Data Collection**: Annual submission of child exit to EdenMap; annual submission of SPP/APR. | FFY2018 65.42%  
FFY2017 63.11%  
FFY2016 65.97%  
FFY2015 64.81%  
FFY2014 60.92%  
FFY2013 46.28%  
FFY2018 saw the state increase the completion rate by 2.311%  
19.14% increase since FFY2013 | • Continue with annual data analysis and work with providers and service coordinators to address slippage and continue to increase. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity to Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources/Methodology/Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration. | Did the reliability and validity of BDI-2 administration improve?  
- School district evaluators trained on administration of the BDI-2. | **Data Source:** Attendance logs.  
**Data Collection:** BDI-2 face-to-face training events. | **Phase III Year 4 update:** Online BDI training tool remains available and promoted through communication channels. Since its inception in October 2018:  
- Completed course = 39  
- In progress = 12  
- Registered - 22 | - Collaborate with Part B 619 on the compatibility of the online training with the BDI3 that will be available summer 2020.  
**Phase III Year 3 Update:** Face-to-face training discontinued; online BDI training tool available as of 10/2018. |
| Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration. | Improved reliability and validity of the BDI-2 administration. | **Data Source:** Online BDI training accompanying scoring component.  
**Data Collection:** Scores automatically sent to Part B619 coordinator. Those completing will need to score 80% to receive continuing education credit. | **Phase III Year 4 data**  
15 evaluators trained and met fidelity criteria.  
12 providers are in progress  
22 are registered to begin | - Collaborate with Part B 619 to promote availability of online training.  
- Continue to track provider participation and achievement of fidelity criteria. |
| Develop and Implement training protocol for BDI-2 administration. | Increased statewide data quality. | **Data Source:** Child exit; SPP/APR C3 data.  
**Data Collection:** Annual submission. | FFY2018 completion rate is 65.41%  
FFY2017 completion rate 63.11%  
FFY2016 completion rate 65.97%.  
FFY2015 completion rate 64.81%  
FFY2014 completion rate 60.92%  
FFY2014 completion rate 43.28% | - Continue with annual data analysis and work with providers and service coordinators to address slippage and continue to increase. |
| SiMR Progress | Did increased BDI-2 training substantially increase infants’ and toddlers’ rate of growth in acquiring and using knowledge and skills? | **Data Source:** SPP/APR child outcome data Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1. (SiMR)  
**Data Collection:** BDI-2 child outcome data. | FFY | - Continue to monitor SSIP activities to ensure targets are met.  
- Continue to participate in OSEP sponsored TA. |

**Phase III Year 4: Evaluation Tracking Data Quality**
**Coherent Improvement Strategy (Recommended Practice):** South Dakota will present a consistent statewide message about early intervention service delivery and evidence-based practices.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy (Recommended Practice):** South Dakota will provide training and resources to service coordinators and providers on appropriate use of family assessment and embedded routines engaging families in the early intervention process.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy (Professional Development):** South Dakota will design and implement training/TA to service coordinators and providers to increase their knowledge and skills and use of appropriate recommended early intervention practices.

**Coherent Improvement Strategy (Professional Development):** South Dakota will provide support and technical assistance to all partners to increase their active participation in the SSIP process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine and complete necessary infrastructure activities to support the statewide implementation of evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Restructure of state lead agency and create a position dedicated to professional development.</td>
<td>Part C State Leadership Stakeholders DOE Leadership National TA Center</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Spring 2015 - Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine and complete necessary infrastructure activities to support the statewide implementation of evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Select appropriate online learning community platform for providing professional development for evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Part C State Leadership K12 Data System Online Learning Platform</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Summer 2015 - Fall 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:** The online platform has been changed from Blackboard Learn to Schoology and TORSH.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine and complete necessary infrastructure activities to support the statewide implementation of evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Develop and promulgate (implement) rule adding new criteria for Special Instruction within birth through age two.</td>
<td>Stakeholders DOE Leadership Part B Legislators Funding</td>
<td><strong>Pending</strong></td>
<td>Spring 2016 – Summer 2017</td>
<td>• State will re-evaluate funding for the 2020-2021 budget year to support reimbursement for this new group of providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Research and select evidence-based practices for family assessment.</td>
<td>Funding Part C Program Director Stakeholders National TA Center</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Winter 2015 – Summer 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Select a cadre of South Dakota Birth to Three representatives to attend SISKIN Institute Routines Based Interview (RBI) training.</td>
<td>Funding Program Specialist Service Coordinator Regional EI Program</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>July 2015 – January 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Develop an RBI training plan for service coordinators to include face-to-face, online learning community, webinars, conference calls, literature, mentoring, observation and coaching.</td>
<td>Funding Regional Programs Distance Learning Technology National TA UNL</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>August 2015 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue to analyze data and fidelity of implementation and adjust PD accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Develop RBI training materials to support training plan activities.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team RBI Trainers</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>October 2015 – Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue to evaluate materials and adapt as necessary to meet on-going training needs and/or enhance fidelity of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Implementation of Routines Based Interview training.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Stakeholders Consultant Service Coordinators</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>October 2015 - Ongoing</td>
<td>• Develop online RBI training to support fidelity of practice for current service coordinators and to train new service coordinators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
- Training materials were developed by PD technical leader and RBI certified trainers.
- State implemented a face-to-face RBI refresher training for previously trained service coordinators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Phase III Year 3 NEW</td>
<td>Develop online RBI training to support fidelity of practice for current service coordinators and to train new service coordinators.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Stakeholders Service Coordinators Technology</td>
<td>Development Full Implementation</td>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 Update:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An online RBI training was created to support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• new service coordinators in implementing the RBI and reaching criteria for initial fidelity of practice, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• existing service coordinators in meeting criteria for sustained fidelity of practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III Year 3 Update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The state is developing online training content and protocol for service coordinators to support fidelity of practice in using the RBI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Revise regional contracts to include RBI language and timelines. Define skill set needed for success in RBI.</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RBI language has been added to the service coordination contracts since 2016-2017.</td>
<td>March 2016</td>
<td>• Continue with practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Develop and implement coaching cadre of RBI experts within existing service coordinator pool.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Stakeholders Service Coordinators</td>
<td>Development Scaling Up</td>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>• Ongoing implementation of peer-to-peer RBI coaching and fidelity review process. • Continue to identify and train new peer coaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 Update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Three service coordinators were identified based on performance and were trained to be peer coaches for RBI coaching and the fidelity review process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase III Year 3 Update:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The state content expert is developing protocol for peer-to-peer RBI coaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Launch of <em>Routines Based Interview</em> (<em>RBI</em>) with Birth to Three families.</td>
<td>Funding Regional EI Program Part C State Leadership Team</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>October 2016—Winter 2020 Fall 2019</td>
<td>• Continue implementation of <em>RBI</em> with all Birth to Three families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Develop and Implement Face-to-Face <em>RBI</em> Boot Camps.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Service Coordinators Districts Direct Service Providers</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>May 2017 – Ongoing July 2018</td>
<td>• Develop online <em>RBI</em> Boot Camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Phase III Year 3 NEW Develop and Implement online <em>RBI</em> Boot Camp</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Districts Direct Service Providers Technology</td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Fall 2018 – Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue with implementation of online <em>RBI</em> Boot Camp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Implement <em>Family Guided Routines Based Intervention (FGRBI)</em> Early Adopter training.</td>
<td>Funding K12 Data Center Blackboard Learn Training Locations Technology FGRBI Content Experts School Districts Stakeholders</td>
<td>Discontinued</td>
<td>Summer 2015 - July 2017</td>
<td>• No additional steps needed as this step has been discontinued and is no longer applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Research and select evidence-based practices for engaging families in early intervention services.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Stakeholders Content experts National TA Contractor Early Adopters NCSI CoP DEC Rec Practices</td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Winter 2015 – Summer 2017</td>
<td>• Continue with implementation of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Brand EBP for marketing of comprehensive professional development system.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership Team Stakeholders Consultant DOE Marketing</td>
<td>Fully Implemented</td>
<td>Summer 2017</td>
<td>• Continue with use of brand for marketing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original EBP model selected, *FGRBI*, consisted of seven early adopters. Training in the FGRBI model was completed May 2017. ** These early adopters have become small stakeholder group and assisted with the selection of the UNL *Getting Ready* EBP.

South Dakota selected the University of Nebraska Lincoln (UNL) EBP *Getting Ready* as the states routines based home visiting model.

*Getting Ready* is referred to as South Dakota *Bright Beginnings*. *Bright Beginnings* encompasses all PD activities and peer to peer coaching and fidelity review.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Develop and implement communication plan for school district personnel and private providers regarding early intervention evidence-based practices RBI and Getting Ready.</td>
<td>Part C State Leadership Content Experts Funding Stakeholders Contractor UNL</td>
<td><strong>Fully Implemented</strong> Communication to early interventionist on RBI, RBI Boot Camps, UNL Getting Ready and the comprehensive professional development system through listserv, e-mails, conferences, quarterly webinars, monthly service coordinators calls and printed material.</td>
<td>December 2015 <strong>Ongoing</strong> Summer 2017</td>
<td>• Continue to explore opportunities to present to early interventionist, school district personnel, and other partners on the EBPs and comprehensive professional development plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Implementation Plan: Professional Development & Recommended Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Develop curriculum and PD plan for Getting Ready EBP.</td>
<td>Funding State Part C Program Staff Consultant/Content Expert University of Nebraska Lincoln Early Learning Guidelines DEC Recommended Practices Bright Beginnings Coaches (Early Adopters) Stakeholders School Districts Training Locations Technology Bright Beginnings Pilot Cohort</td>
<td>Implementation Full Implementation</td>
<td>December 2016 – September 2017 Summer 2023</td>
<td>Continue to implement PD plan with statewide implementation anticipated by summer 2023.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Phase III Year 4 Update:
Due to funding and staff capacity, full statewide implementation will extend beyond SSIP timeline. The state continues to implement 2 training cohorts each year.

- Tier 1: 79 Providers
- Tier 2: 6 Providers
- Tier 3: Estimate 43%
- Tier 4: Estimate 25%

### Phase III Year 3 Update:
Based on feedback from the stakeholders and evaluation of pilot group fidelity reviews South Dakota Part C state content expert refined training content and delivery (see Attachment D).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Research and select online learning platform for delivery of <em>Bright Beginnings</em> training.</td>
<td>Funding State Part C Program Staff Contractor Technology</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summer 2017</strong> Fall 2019</td>
<td>• Continue to monitor and adjust as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 4 Update:</strong> The state selected one new online platform, TORSH, used for the fidelity review process.</td>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 2 Update:</strong> The state has selected and is using two online platforms, one to deliver online curriculum and coaching. The other is a video platform used for fidelity review process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</td>
<td>Create application and select pilot cohort members. Implement selection process for training cohorts.</td>
<td>Funding State Part C Program Staff Content Expert Technology UNL National TA</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Summer 2017</strong> Ongoing</td>
<td>• Continue implementing as designed. • Select members of cohort 6 and 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 4 Update:</strong> Application and selection for cohort 4 and 5 was completed. Cohort 6 application and selection is planned for July 2020.</td>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 3 Update:</strong> The state has identified an application process and priorities for cohort selection. As of March 1, 2019 the state has completed a Pilot and Cohort 2. Cohort 3 began January 2019. Cohort 4 is planned for July 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines | Phase III Year 3 NEW: Secure additional resources to assist in funding future cohorts. | Funding Part C state leadership BHSS | Implementation Full Implementation Phase III Year 4 State Part C collaborated with two partners to secure funding for cohort peer coaching:  
• The South Dakota Statewide Family Engagement Grant supported coaches for Cohort 3.  
• The South Dakota Development Disabilities Council supported peer coaching expenses for Cohort 4.  
Phase III Year 3 Update State Part C collaborated with the Black Hills Special Services Educational Cooperative to secure grant funding from the South Dakota Developmental Disabilities Council. This funding will support 2 cohorts of direct service providers employed by school districts and/or educational cooperatives. | July - November 2018 | • Peer coaches for Cohort 6 will be supported by the South Dakota Developmental Disabilities grant.  
• Peer coaches for Cohort 7 will be partially supported by the Statewide Family Engagement grant. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines | Develop and Implement PD plan and curriculum for performance based coaching for direct service providers. | Funding Trainers Part C Leadership Team Contractor UNL Pilot Members Bright Beginnings Coaches Technology | **Full Implementation**  
**Phase III Year 4 Update:**  
As of 3/25/2020 seventy-eight direct service providers have completed the Bright Beginnings training and achieved fidelity according to established criteria. These direct service providers are potentially eligible to provide peer coaching based on the Getting Ready EBP to future cohorts.  
**Phase III Year 3 Update:**  
As of 3/1/2019 thirteen direct service providers have completed the Bright Beginnings training and achieved fidelity according to established criteria. These direct service providers are eligible to provide coaching based on the Getting Ready EBP. These thirteen, with oversight by state content expert may conduct fidelity review procedures for future training participants. | April 2018 - Ongoing | • Continue with professional development training calendar for building coaching capacity to support statewide implementation of Getting Ready EPB. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines</strong></td>
<td>Explore collaboration opportunities with other state agencies and DOE programs on family engagement evidence-based practices.</td>
<td>Funding Part C State Leadership HSSCO director DOH Bright Start Home Visiting DSS Child Care Services Part B 619 Tribal Entities School Districts DOE</td>
<td><strong>Pending</strong></td>
<td>January 2016 August 2016- Ongoing</td>
<td>• Part C Director will continue to participate in Family Service Interagency group. • Part C state staff will continue to explore collaboration opportunities with child care to enhance early intervention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
The South Dakota Head Start Association is piloting the University of Nebraska Lincoln Getting Ready model in one of their Early Head Start programs. The Birth to Three program is communicating with the program as this work progresses to explore opportunities to collaborate.

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**
Immediate focus is on Part C direct service providers. Due to continued funding and staff capacity limitations there are currently no plans for collaboration of large-scale professional development in this area.

**Phased Year 3 NEW:**
Participate in the Statewide Family Engagement Grant to create early language and literacy training to support progress towards SiMR.

<p>| <strong>Development</strong> | <strong>Phase III Year 4 Update:</strong> Funding from the Statewide Family Engagement grant provided an additional training opportunity for recognized Bright Beginnings direct service providers. This additional training is based on the Center for Early Language and Literacy (CELL) model and will be critical in supporting continued progress towards SiMR. | Summer 2018 – Ongoing | • Select participants and implement training. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create a Birth to Three Early Intervention Message</td>
<td>Create a Birth to Three Mission/Vision statement.</td>
<td>Funding Stakeholders Birth to Three Material National TA</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Fall 2016 Summer 2017</td>
<td>• Continue to utilize and emphasis mission statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Birth to Three Early Intervention Message</td>
<td>Develop Birth to Three program materials for multiple EI partners.</td>
<td>Funding Stakeholders DOE Content Experts National TA</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Fall 2016 - Ongoing</td>
<td>• Review existing material annually to ensure aligns with Birth to Three program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Birth to Three Early Intervention Message</td>
<td>Develop Birth to Three presentations usable by agencies, service coordinators, state staff etc.</td>
<td>Funding Stakeholders National TA</td>
<td>Full Implementation <strong>Phase III Year 4 Update:</strong> An additional powerpoint presentation has been created by state staff for use by Bright Beginnings trained providers to promote the EBP and emphasis the importance of routines based family engagement in early intervention. <strong>Phase III Year 3 Update:</strong> State staff have developed and recorded an overview presentation of the EBP being implemented in Birth to Three. Full state-wide implementation will not be reached until 2021, therefore, it has been determined the presentation will be used only by state staff to ensure accurate and current representation of the practices being used in Birth to Three.</td>
<td>Fall 2016 Fall 2017 January 2020</td>
<td>• Based upon Stakeholder input at a March 2020 event, the state intends to begin development of materials including video clips, infographics and data. Materials will incorporate family and provider experiences related to the impact of the use of evidence based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a Birth to Three Early Intervention Message</td>
<td>Update existing Birth to Three materials e.g.</td>
<td>Funding Stakeholders DOE National TA</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Fall 2016 Winter 2018 Ongoing</td>
<td>• Based upon Stakeholder input at a March 2020 event, the state intends to begin development of materials including video clips, infographics and data. Materials will incorporate family and provider experiences related to the impact of the use of evidence based practices. • Based upon Stakeholder input the state will review and revise as necessary Birth to Three materials with a focus on the use of terms that more accurately depict the evidence practices used in Birth to Three.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
The state created and disseminated a new provider manual. Manual included procedural information along with statements on conflict of interest, ethics and the evidence based practices implemented by Birth to Three.

Provider agreements were updated and distributed. Agreements now align with Part C EBP and expectations on completion of PD fidelity of EBP.

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**
Birth to Three materials have been revised to reflect the EBP selected by the state. Revised materials are available and posted on the website accordingly.
### Create a Birth to Three Early Intervention Message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth to Three state website updates and enhancements.</td>
<td>Funding DOE Stakeholders National TA</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Multiple updates have been made to the existing website.</td>
<td>December 2016 Fall 2017</td>
<td>• Based upon Stakeholder input at a March 2020 event, the state intends to begin development of materials including video clips, infographics and data. Materials will incorporate family and provider experiences related to the impact of the use of evidence based practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</td>
<td>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</td>
<td>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment. | Were early interventionists trained on EPB Routines Based Interview?  
  - Service Coordinators will be trained on state’s EBP Routines Based Interview.  
  - Direct Service Providers will receive training on Routines Based Interview process. | Data Source: Attendance logs, sign-in sheets, training logs.  
Data Collection: New service coordinator trainings; monthly service coordinator TA calls; virtual coaching sessions.  
Data Source: Attendance logs, sign-in sheets, training logs.  
Data Collection: Monthly RBI Boot Camps. | Phase III Year 4 Data:  
2 new service coordinators were hired and received training within first month of employment.  
As of 3/25/2020 30 direct service providers have accessed the RBI training.  
Phase III Year 3 Data:  
1 new service coordinator was hired and received training within first month of employment.  
20% additional direct service providers (including school district personnel) were trained as of 3/1/2019 in the face-to-face or online Boot Camp; resulting in 88% saturation. | • Continue with training plan for new service coordinators.  
• Continue to track provider participation in online RBI Boot Camp. |
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment. | Do early interventionists have an increased awareness of evidence-based intervention?  
  - Service coordinators have an increased awareness of early intervention and EBP Routines Based Interview.  
  - Direct service providers have an increased awareness of early intervention and EBP Routines Based Interview. | Data Source: Self-reported survey.  
Data Collection: Data collection beyond initial implementation has not been collected due to staffing capacity.  
Data Source: Self-reported survey.  
Data Collection: Online surveys following RBI Boot Camp. | Phase III Year 4 Data:  
100% newly hired service coordinators reported increased knowledge of RBI.  
Phase III Year 3 Data:  
The newly hired service coordinator reported increased knowledge of RBI.  
Phase III Year 4 Data:  
Respondents reported:  
100% Better understanding  
100% More knowledgeable  
96% More confident  
100% Aware of PD  
Phase III Year 3 Data:  
Respondents reported:  
100% Better understanding  
100% More knowledgeable  
100% More confident  
98% Aware of PD | • Continue to collect surveys from new service coordinators.  
• Continue to collect responses from direct service providers. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Are early interventionists using Routines Based Interview as intended (with fidelity)?</td>
<td><strong>Data Source</strong>: Self-reported reports; Video submission; RBI Implementation checklist. &lt;br&gt;<strong>Data Collection</strong>: Quarterly report submission; initial fidelity video submission; sustained fidelity video submission.</td>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 4 Data:</strong>&lt;br&gt;100% service coordinators submitted quarterly reports to state office for reporting period 1/1/2019 – 12/31/2019. &lt;br&gt;• 100% of service coordinators are conducting RBI’s with families. &lt;br&gt;• 88% of initial IFSP’s had an RBI conducted &lt;br&gt;• 30% of annual IFSP’s an RBI was conducted. &lt;br&gt;FFY2018 RBI Sustained Fidelity. Of the service coordinators participating in sustained fidelity: &lt;br&gt;42% achieved sustained fidelity &lt;br&gt;2% were unable to complete &lt;br&gt;58% will receive coaching based on an individual learning plan.</td>
<td>• Analyze RBI sustained fidelity process due to the % of service coordinators who did not reach criteria. &lt;br&gt;• Continue to gather quarterly reports. &lt;br&gt;• Complete initial fidelity observation on any new service coordinators using RBI Implementation checklist. &lt;br&gt;• Continue to utilize the online RBI training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills. &lt;br&gt;• Continue to utilize peer coaching training to increase number of peer coaches. &lt;br&gt;• Develop process for monitoring that includes existing data including IFSP to measure adherence to practices and sustained fidelity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase III Year 3 Data: <br>100% of service coordinators submitted quarterly reports to state office for reporting period 1/1/2018 – 12/31/2018. <br>• 100% of service coordinators are conducting RBI’s with families. <br>• 94% of initial IFSPs had an RBI conducted. <br>• 36% of annual IFSP’s an RBI was conducted. <br>Seven RBI trained service coordinators were selected to participate in the sustained fidelity review process. As of 3/1/2019: <br>• 2 have met the established criteria with submission of first video. <br>• 5 will continue to receive additional training and coaching prior to submission of fidelity review video. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Did children and families receive <em>early intervention</em> as intended?</td>
<td>Data Source: IFSPs; RBI Checklist, video submission; Quality IFSP monitoring tool.</td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 Update:</td>
<td>• Develop and implement protocol for collecting data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• IFSP’s will reflect family and child outcomes based on <em>Routines Based Interview</em> and <em>Getting Ready</em> EBPs.</td>
<td>Data Collection: To be determine protocol for data collection.</td>
<td>This has not been fully developed. Due to competing priorities, the state was unable to complete. The state will continue to work on this.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement calendar for submission initial and sustained fidelity video review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up appropriate use of family assessment.</td>
<td>Are families engaged in <em>Routines Based Interview</em>?</td>
<td>Data Source: Initial and sustained fidelity videos; RBI Implementation Checklist</td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 Data:</td>
<td>• Develop and implement online <em>RBI</em> enhancement training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Parents and caregivers will be engaged in their child’s <em>Routines Based Interview</em>.</td>
<td>Data Collection: Initial fidelity review process at completion of training. Sustained fidelity review process.</td>
<td>100% service coordinators submitted quarterly reports to state office for reporting period 1/1/2019 – 12/31/2019.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% of service coordinators are conducting RBI’s with families.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement calendar for submission initial and sustained fidelity video review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 88% of initial IFSP’s had an RBI conducted</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 30% of annual IFSP’s an RBI was conducted.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FFY2018 RBI Sustained Fidelity.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement online <em>RBI</em> enhancement training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Of the service coordinators participating in sustained fidelity:</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42% achieved sustained fidelity</td>
<td>• Develop and implement calendar for submission initial and sustained fidelity video review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% were unable to complete</td>
<td>• Develop and implement online <em>RBI</em> enhancement training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58% will receive coaching based on an individual learning plan.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Phase III Year 3 Data:</strong></td>
<td>• Develop and implement online <em>RBI</em> enhancement training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seven RBI trained service coordinators were selected to participate in the sustained fidelity review process. As of 3/1/2019:</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2 have met the established criteria with submission of first video.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement peer coaching training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 5 will continue to receive additional training and coaching prior to submission of fidelity review video.</td>
<td>• Develop and implement online <em>RBI</em> enhancement training for service coordinators who need to refresh and/or enhance skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</td>
<td>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</td>
<td>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</td>
<td>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines** | Was early interventionist trained on EBP Getting Ready?  
- Direct Service Providers will be trained on the state’s chosen EBP Getting Ready.  
- Service Coordinators will receive training on EBP Getting Ready | **Data Source:** Attendance sheets, training logs, online learning platform data analytics tool.  
**Data Collection:** During and upon completion of learning modules.  
**Data Source:** Attendance sheets,  
**Data Collection:** Participation in 2-day face-to-face training | **Phase III Year 4 Data**  
As of 3/25/2020 87 direct service providers have been trained in the Getting Ready model.  
90% have reached fidelity  
Private Provider Data:  
26% Tier 1  
4% Tier 2  
44% Tier 3  
28% Tier 4  
100% of new service coordinators participated in EBP Getting Ready training.  
**Phase III Year 3 Data:**  
As of 3/1/2019:  
34 additional direct service providers were trained in the EBP Getting Ready.  
96% of service coordinators participated in the face-to-face Getting Ready training. | - Collect Tier data for school district providers.  
- Continue PD scale-up plan.  
- Ongoing collection of training feedback and data analysis.  
- Continue to share information with Stakeholder group |
| **Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines** | Do early interventionists have an increased awareness of EBP Getting Ready?  
- Direct service providers will have increased awareness of early intervention and EBP Getting Ready. | **Data Source:** Getting Ready Fidelity Checklist  
**Phase III Year 3 Update:**  
The state determined to utilize the Getting Ready fidelity checklist provided more reliable evaluation data.  
**Data Collection:** Collected during fidelity review process of the Bright Beginnings professional development. | **Phase III Year 4 Data**  
As of 3/25/2020  
86% of those trained in this reporting year were found reliable in the EBP Getty Ready and using as intended.  
14% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.  
**Phase III Year 3 Data:**  
As of 3/1/2019:  
88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP Getting Ready and using as intended. | - State will continue to analyze data.  
- Present information to Stakeholders. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines | Are early interventionists using EBP *Getting Ready* as intended?  
- Direct service providers will engage families in EBP *Getting Ready*. | **Data Source:** Video submissions; *Getting Ready* Checklist; Home Visiting Plan  
**Data Collection:** Initial fidelity review process at completion of training. Sustained fidelity review process (TBD). | The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP. | • The State intends to gather and analyse data at the item level to identify potential areas of improvement in the training and coaching process.  
• Monitor fidelity review process.  
• Determine fidelity review process for direct service providers who need continued support.  
• Review data with Stakeholders.  
• Complete fidelity review process to obtain sustained fidelity of *Getting Ready* EBP. |
| Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines | Are families engaged in routines based intervention?  
- Parents and caregivers will be engaged in their child’s *Getting Ready* routines based intervention. | **Data Source:** Video submissions; *Getting Ready* Checklist; Home Visiting Plan  
**Data Collection:** Initial fidelity review process at completion of training. | **Phase III Year 4 Data**  
As of 3/25/2020  
86% of those trained in this reporting year were found reliable in the EBP *Getting Ready* and using as intended.  
14% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.  
Sustained Fidelity Check:  
Of those providers who have been implementing the *Getting Ready* model for 2 years:  
100% continued to meet the criteria for fidelity | **Phase III Year 3 Data:**  
As of 3/1/2019:  
• 88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP *Getting Ready* and using as intended.  
• The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.  
• Continue to review and monitor the fidelity review data.  
• Determine independent learning plans for direct service providers who need continued support to reach fidelity. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                           |                               | Sustained fidelity review family survey.       | 14% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP. | • Review data with Stakeholders.  
• Add step to establish timeline for sustained fidelity review.  
• Continue fidelity review process to obtain sustained fidelity of Getting Ready EBP.  
• Continue to use sustained fidelity family survey. |
|                           |                               |                                               | Sustained Fidelity Check:  
Of those providers who have been implementing the Getting Ready model for 2 years:  
100% continued to meet the criteria for fidelity |
|                           |                               |                                               | Family Survey (direct service providers sustained fidelity reviews):  
100% return rate. Parents responded to the following regarding Providers:  
• Listens - 100%  
• Helps me learn - 100%  
• Values My Knowledge - 100%  
• Observes/Demonstrates - 100%  
• Involves Me: 100%  
• I Have Learned: 97% |
|                           |                               |                                               | Phase III Year 3 Data:  
As of 3/1/2019:  
• 88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP Getting Ready and using as intended.  
• The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity To Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources / Methodology / Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Develop and implement a PD system for scaling up use of embedded routines** | Are families and partners aware of the impact of routines-based early intervention home visits and family engagement on children’s learning and development?  
• All early intervention partners, including families and caregivers, will have a greater awareness of how early intervention and family engagement affects children’s outcomes. | **Data Source:**  
- Video submissions;  
- Getting Ready Checklist;  
- Home Visiting Plan;  
- Sustained Fidelity Review Family Surveys.  
**Data Collection:**  
- Initial fidelity review process at completion of training.  
- Sustained fidelity review process (TBD).  
**Phase III Year 4 Update:**  
The state determined information gathered through the fidelity review process provided more reliable data than self-reported surveys. The Getting Ready EPB contains criteria specific to family engagement. | **Phase III Year 4 Data**  
As of 3/25/2020  
86% of those trained in this reporting year were found reliable in the EBP Getting Ready and using as intended.  
14% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.  
Sustained Fidelity Check:  
Of those providers who have been implementing the Getting Ready model for 2 years:  
100% continued to meet the criteria for fidelity  
**Phase III Year 3 Data**  
As of 3/1/2019:  
• 88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP Getting Ready and using as intended.  
• The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP. | • Continue to review and monitor the fidelity review data.  
• Determine fidelity review process for direct service providers who need continued support.  
• Review data with Stakeholders.  
• Add step to establish timeline for sustained fidelity review.  
• Complete fidelity review process to obtain sustained fidelity of Getting Ready EPB. |
| **SiMR Progress** | Did infants and toddlers demonstrate substantially increased growth in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills? | **Data Source:**  
- SPP/APR child outcome data Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1 (SiMR).  
**Data Collection:**  
- BDI-2 child outcome data. | FFY Target Data  
FFY2018 60.00% 74.91%  
FFY2017 58.82% 75.95%  
FFY2016 58.82% 73.43%  
FFY2015 58.82% 50.00%  
FFY2014 58.82% 54.97% | • Continue to monitor SSIP activities to ensure targets are met.  
• Continue to participate in OSEP sponsored TA. |
Dear ____________________________.

SD Birth to Three is interested in learning about your experience in the early intervention program. We appreciate your time and value your comments! You may receive services from more than one provider, but as you complete the survey, please base your comments on your home visiting interactions with: ____________________________.

Please circle the response which best reflects your experience for the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My Birth to Three provider …</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. listens as I talk about what has happened between visits (i.e. changes, what's working, new concerns).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. takes time to understand what is important to our family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. helps me learn specific ways my family can practice new skills with my child during our daily routines by using things in our home.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. values my knowledge of my child’s needs, interests and skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. suggests and demonstrates specific ways I can help my child achieve his/her IFSP outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. observes while I practice with my child and offers support only when needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. helps me understand and feel confident in my ability to encourage my child’s learning and development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. involves me in planning future home visits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. gives me a copy of the Home Visit Plan to refer to between visits.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By participating in Birth to Three home visits with this provider:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. I make an active effort to practice between visits to help with my child make progress toward his/her IFSP outcomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have learned more ways to respond to my child’s changing needs, interests, and emotions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am better at tuning into my child’s needs, interests, strengths, and progress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I am better at involving my child in a specific activity for a longer period of time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I know when to help and when to give my child time to try new skills with limited help from me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I enjoy trying new ways to support my child’s learning and development during family routines.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other comments regarding your experiences with your Bright Beginnings provider:

Any additional comments or suggestions?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. Please return the survey using the postage paid envelope provided. Your responses are confidential and will not be shared with your provider.
**Coherent Improvement Strategy 1:** South Dakota will develop and implement a monitoring protocol to identify appropriate IFSP decisions and the use of appropriate recommended EI practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a monitoring protocol to ensure evidence-based practices are provided as intended <em>(RBI &amp; Getting Ready)</em></td>
<td>Update Birth to Three online IFSP format to reflect <em>Routines Based Interview</em> and functional child and family outcomes.</td>
<td>Funding State BIT National TA Service Coordinators</td>
<td>Full Implementation</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a monitoring protocol to ensure evidence-based practices are provided as intended <em>(RBI &amp; Getting Ready)</em></td>
<td>Determine tool to measure if EBP RBI and Getting Ready are being implemented as intended.</td>
<td>Stakeholders National TA Centers Content Experts RBI Checklist Getting Ready Checklist Funding State Leadership Team Technology Early Adopters</td>
<td>Implementation Full Implementation</td>
<td>September 2016 – Winter Summer 2019</td>
<td>• Continue with the initial and sustained fidelity review protocol as designed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase III Year 4 Update:**
- South Dakota is fully utilizing checklists for the RBI and Getting Ready EBPs.
- A sustained fidelity review protocol has been established for both RBI and the Getting Ready EBP.

**Phase III Year 3 Update:**
South Dakota modified the RBI checklist to include a review of the quality of functional outcomes on IFSP.
## Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop a monitoring protocol to ensure evidence-based practices are provided as intended *(RBI & Getting Ready)* | Review results of performance and adjust professional development as needed including provision of recognition and/or additional professional development. | Content Experts Stakeholders State Leadership Team Funding | Implementation | May 2017 Summer 2019 - Ongoing | • Continue to review performance of RBI and Getting Ready fidelity reviews and make necessary adjustments to PD.  
• The state will define protocol for those service coordinators and direct service providers who do not reach criteria for sustained fidelity.  
• Continue to distribute Certificate of Recognition upon completion of initial fidelity review.  
• Based on Stakeholder input and a focus group meeting in March of 2020 the state will develop and implement additional recommended recognitions for those providers who are successfully implementing the EBPs. |
<p>| Phase III Year 4 Update: Include updated Tier provider #’s | Phase III Year 3 Update: Two measurement tools are in full use and performance results are used to make adaptations to the PD activities as needed. | State has created a Tiered provider designation addressing completion of PD requirements and initial fidelity criteria. Those providers who have met the PD criteria and initial fidelity are given priority when families are being placed for services. | | | |
| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</th>
<th>Steps to Implement the Activities</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Projected Timeline</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a monitoring protocol to ensure evidence-based practices are provided as intended <em>(RBI &amp; Getting Ready)</em></td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 NEW</td>
<td>Stakeholders National TA Centers RBI Checklist Getting Ready Checklist Home Visit Plan Funding State Leadership Team</td>
<td>Development Phase III Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop a plan for monitoring the continued use of EBP. • Develop measurement tool to monitor the continued use of the EBPs. • Pilot the new tools in anticipation of full implementation within the accountability process by 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop family focuses resources to define family engagement.</td>
<td>Describe family engagement from perspective of routines-based home visiting early intervention.</td>
<td>Stakeholders Content Experts National TA Part C Leadership DEC Recommended Practices</td>
<td>Full Implementation Development Phase III Year 4 Update:</td>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
<td>• Finalize family resource. • Have service coordinators distribute to each family at referral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Develop family focuses resources to define family engagement.</em></td>
<td>Determine measurement tool to ensure evidence-based practices are implemented as related to increasing family engagement.</td>
<td>Stakeholders Funding National TA Part C Leadership UNL RBI</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>July 2016 – Fall 2017 Fall 2018</td>
<td>• Continue using established EBP RBI and Getting Ready checklists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phase III Year 3 Update:</em></td>
<td>South Dakota has created material for families describing what to expect from a <em>Getting Ready</em> home visit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phase III Year 4 Update:</em></td>
<td>This item has been determined duplicative to the items above in relation to family engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Develop family focuses resources to define family engagement.</em></td>
<td>Review results of provider activities to facilitate family engagement and provide recognition and/or additional professional development</td>
<td>Content Experts National TA Part C Leadership Stakeholders Funding</td>
<td><strong>Full Implementation</strong></td>
<td>July 2017 Summer 2018 Fall 2018</td>
<td>• Continue to distribute Certificate of Recognition upon completion of initial fidelity review. • Continue to use the fidelity review process to determine if additional PD needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phase III Year 3 Update:</em></td>
<td>Based on data analysis of performance results the tools have been finalized and are in use as designed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phase III Year 4 Update:</em></td>
<td>This item has been determined duplicative to the items above in relation to family engagement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities to Meet the Coherent Improvement Strategy</td>
<td>Steps to Implement the Activities</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Projected Timeline</td>
<td>Next Steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement governance mechanisms to reflect authority of the lead agency to require implementation of the EBPs.</td>
<td>Review and revise contracts and letters of agreements to reflect the authority of the lead agency to participation and full implementation of EBPs.</td>
<td>Part C Leadership National TA DOE Contract DOE Legal</td>
<td>Phase III Year 4 Update: Direct Service Provider letters of agreements and service coordination contracts were modified to include language requiring all early interventionists too:</td>
<td>• Provider letters of agreements will be renewed annually effective 1/1/2021. • Continual annual review of service coordination contracts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- complete the necessary PD and review requirements within specified timelines,
- meet criteria for initial and sustained fidelity,
- fully implement EBP consistently, and
- access and complete the necessary PD provided by Part C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity to Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources/Methodology /Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop a monitoring protocol to ensure evidence-based practices are provided as intended (RBI & Getting Ready). | Did children and families receive RBI and Getting Ready early intervention home visits as intended?  
- Evidence-based practice monitoring protocol developed.  
- Children and families will receive appropriate EBP.  
- Early interventionist will implement RBI as intended.  
- Early Interventionists will implement EBP  
- Getting Ready as intended. | **Data Source**: IFSPs; RBI Checklist; Home Visiting Plan; Getting Ready checklist  
Video submission; Quality IFSP monitoring tool  
**Data Collection**: Initial and sustained fidelity video submissions.  
TBD: Quality IFSP monitoring tool. | **Phase III Year 4 Data**:  
100% service coordinators submitted quarterly reports to state office for reporting period 1/1/2019 – 12/31/2019.  
- 100% of service coordinators are conducting RBI’s with families.  
- 88% of initial IFSP’s had an RBI conducted  
- 30% of annual IFSP’s an RBI was conducted.  
FFY2018 RBI Sustained Fidelity.  
Of the service coordinators participating in sustained fidelity:  
42% achieved sustained fidelity  
2% were unable to complete  
58% will receive coaching based on an individual learning plan. | - Continued participation in NCSI RBA Learning Collaborative to develop tool to capture quality of IFSP process.  
- Develop plan for conducting sustained fidelity reviews for RBI and Getting Ready EBPs.  
- Determine protocol for monitoring Quality IFSP. |

**Phase III Year 3 Data:**  
Seven RBI trained service coordinators were selected to participate in the sustained fidelity review process. As of 3/1/2019:  
- 2 have met the established criteria with submission of first video.  
- 5 will continue to receive additional training and coaching prior to submission of fidelity review video  
As of 3/1/2019:  
- 88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP Getting Ready and using as intended.  
- The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SSIP Activity to Evaluate</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources/Methodology /Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop tool to measure family engagement. | Are families engaged in RBI and Getting Ready EBP routines-based home visiting approach?  
- Family engagement measuring tool developed.  
- Family Engagement information provided to families.  
- Early Interventionist will engage parents and caregivers in EBP RBI.  
- Early interventionist will engage parents and caregivers in EBP Getting Ready. | **Data Source:** Initial and sustained fidelity videos; RBI Checklist; Getting Ready Checklist.  
**Data Collection:** Initial fidelity review process at completion of training.  
TBD: Sustained fidelity review process. | **Phase III Year 4 Data:**  
100% service coordinators submitted quarterly reports to state office for reporting period 1/1/2019 – 12/31/2019.  
- 100% of service coordinators are conducting RBI’s with families.  
- 88% of initial IFSP’s had an RBI conduct  
- 30% of annual IFSP’s an RBI was conducted.  
FFY2018 RBI Sustained Fidelity.  
Of the service coordinators participating in sustained fidelity:  
42% achieved sustained fidelity  
2% were unable to complete  
58% will receive coaching based on an individual learning plan.  
As of 3/25/2020  
86% of those trained in this reporting year were found reliable in the EBP Getty Ready and using as intended.  
14% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP. |  
- Complete initial fidelity observation on all service coordinators using RBI Implementation checklist.  
- Determine protocol for monitoring Quality IFSP. |
### SSIP Activity to Evaluate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Outcomes</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources/Methodology /Schedule</th>
<th>Evaluation of Activity Results/Summary</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As of 3/1/2019:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 88% of those trained in this reporting year were found Reliable in the EBP <em>Getting Ready</em> and using as intended.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The 12% who did not achieve Reliability continue to receive coaching support as they practice using the EBP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SiMR Progress

Did infants and toddlers demonstrate substantially increased growth in acquisition and use of knowledge and skills?

**Data Source**: SPP/APR child outcome data Indicator 3B, Summary Statement 1 (SiMR).

**Data Collection**: BDI-2 child outcome data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFY</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY2018</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>74.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2017</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>75.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2016</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>73.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2015</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2014</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>54.97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Continue to monitor SSIP activities to ensure targets are met.
• Continue to participate in OSEP sponsored TA.