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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 with the Department of Education as the lead agency. The program is housed in the Office of Early Childhood Services within the Division of Special Education (IDEA Part B) and Early Learning. The ECS office is comprised of Part C, Part B 619 and the Head Start Collaboration Office. The administrator of the ECS office also serves as the Part C Coordinator.

The Birth to Three program has contracts with six regional Birth to Three service coordination programs throughout the state. These regional programs provide service coordination for all 66 counties in South Dakota. South Dakota Birth to Three has a strong partnership with school districts as all eligibility and transition evaluations for Birth to Three are conducted by school district personnel. This creates a link for family engagement and communication between families, Birth to Three and the child’s resident school district. Direct services on Individual Family Service Plans (IFSP) are provided by qualified personnel under contract with the lead agency. This includes 148 public school districts, 100+ private entities consisting of health care entities, educational cooperatives and private individuals.

South Dakota Birth to Three has been using a legacy online data system, in which Individualized Family Service Plans are entered, for over a decade. 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. South Dakota is pleased to announce a new vendor has been awarded a contract to create and implement a new comprehensive Birth to Three data system.

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 75% in Results for an overall percentage of 87.5%. This resulted in South Dakota's 2023 OSEP Determination of Meets Requirements for Part C of IDEA. Over the past seven years with the assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as DaSy, ECTA and CIFR as well as collaboration with the National BDI Users Group, BDI States and BDI Publisher South Dakota has focused on improving data surrounding child and family outcomes. South Dakota will continue to work with these groups towards continued improvement in data quality and performance toward improved results for children and families served.

The reader will note, the December 1, 2022, birth to three child count revealed a 13.5% increase from the previous year, and preliminary 2023 data, which has not been reported yet, indicates additional increases with numbers higher than 2019 pre-pandemic rates. The state has continued to experience a significant increase in referrals and children entering the program at older ages and with higher degree of delays. These phenomena could be attributed as remnant of the pandemic when referrals to the Birth to Three program were not occurring with the same frequency.

The reader will also note, throughout the SPP/APR the steps taken by the state team to ensure significant stakeholder input for SSIP work and data analysis of performance in relation to targets and demographic variables as well as improvement strategies. Continued work with stakeholders, OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, DaSy and ECTA, and guidance from OSEP has enable the State to create a culture of data use both at the state and local level. This has contributed to the state’s ability to improve representativeness of C4 Family Outcomes and the continued successful implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

**General Supervision System**

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

SOUTH DAKOTA PART C GENERAL SUPERVISION SYSTEM

POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND PRACTICES RESULTING IN EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION
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.

FISCAL MANAGEMENT
The Birth to Three office structure supports one state team member responsible for oversight of all provider invoices and conducts fiscal monitoring of providers. The Part C Coordinator in collaboration with the lead agency fiscal management office, is responsible for meeting and monitoring all uniform guidance internal controls and IDEA fiscal requirements (i.e. SLOR, PLR, and SOP).

Every five years, the Birth to Three program puts forth a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide service coordination. This RFP is advertised to the public and interested organizations through the State of South Dakota Bureau of Administration's procurement management office. Upon approval, one-year contracts are approved with recipients submitting financial and budgetary information through quarterly progress reports. Early intervention direct service providers are required to submit certification, licensure, and background checks to ensure they meet the state’s qualified standards. These documents are reviewed by Birth to Three state staff. Early intervention providers sign an annual Provider Agreement to abide by all federal and state laws and regulations which include requirements related to serving children in natural environments, implementation of the state's evidence-based model, confidentiality, conflict of interest, code of ethics/conduct and fiscal responsibilities including record keeping. In addition, the state Birth to Three office provides oversight to school district programs providing Birth to Three services to children who meet specific eligibility requirements.

The system also facilitates the online billing process for early intervention services. The billing system allows early intervention providers to only bill for what was written by the IFSP team in regard to frequency / intensity and location of early intervention services. Each provider reimbursement request is reviewed by Birth to Three state office fiscal staff to ensure state and federal regulations and guidelines are met before payment is approved. All provider reimbursement requests are linked to IFSPs thus providers are unable to bill for services that are not linked to an IFSP.

THE SPP/APR
South Dakota Birth to Three with stakeholder input, implements a six-year SPP/APR and reports annual progress February 1 of each year. Compliance indicators C1, C7 and C8 are monitored through the state 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.

Data from section 618 reports are used for C2, C5, C6, C9 and C10. Child outcome data C3 is reported annually, based on all children who exited the program in the reporting year. C4 family outcome data is gathered using the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised. Indicator C11, State Systemic Improvement Plan is a compilation of the state’s on-going efforts to implement, scaleup and sustain evidence-based practices statewide resulting in improved outcomes for infants and toddlers with developmental delays and disabilities.

Annually, local performance reports on all indicators are reported on the state’s website and determinations are issued for all six regions.

DATA ON PROCESSES AND RESULTS
The State Birth to Three program has an online legacy data system that includes data on programmatic and demographic elements and includes all children's IFSP information and data points. State staff have access to the full data system in real time. The data system allows service coordinators to view reports relating to child count verification and SPP/APR indicators. There are several reports that serve as edit checks in order to assist service coordinators in ensuring the data they enter are valid and reliable. Examples of this would be Child Count Verification; Transition Conference Report; Exit Child List; etc.

INTEGRATED MONITORING ACTIVITIES
The Birth to Three state office conducts ongoing monitoring activities on all programs and services and utilizes the state data system as the primary source of monitoring data. Annually, the state monitors data related to the SPP/APR indicators and reports that year’s performance in relation to state and federal targets. Data for compliance indicators C1, C7 and C8 are reported annually for all six regions.

In addition, integrated monitoring activities are for four distinct entities with focus on their responsibilities in Part C consistent with federal and state requirements. These four are, six service coordination regional programs, 148 school districts, 11 regional educational cooperatives and 100+ contracted provider entities and private individuals consistent with federal and state requirements. Most monitoring activities occur through desk audits with focused onsite visits scheduled as needed. If the state determines to conduct an onsite focused monitoring based on findings, data slippage, parent information, past data reports etc., activities may include reviewing specific children’s files, interviewing service coordinators, early intervention providers, parents, etc. Findings resulting from the onsite focused monitoring are issued as necessary.

IMPROVEMENT, CORRECTION, INCENTIVES AND SANCTIONS
South Dakota Birth to Three uses a variety of responses to improve and sustain correction and results. When an instance of noncompliance is identified, the state issues a finding of non-compliance and works with the entity to ensure and verify correction of the noncompliance according to federal requirements. South Dakota Birth to Three uses “pre-finding correction” when both federal requirements for verifying correction are met prior to issuing a finding.

Correction of non-compliance is required as soon as possible, but no later than one year.

Verification of correction according to federal requirements
A corrective action plan (CAP) may be required as part of the finding, depending on the scope and level of noncompliance. A CAP for compliance 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 and provide technical assistance, assuring all activities are completed in accordance with federal requirements.

If a regional program or provider does not correct the noncompliance within one year, the state uses the additional incentives and/or sanctions as identified in writing to the agency. The content of the letter would include the following information:
1. Failure to voluntarily correct an identified deficiency constitutes a failure to administer the program in compliance with federal law.
2. The action the Part C Program / State Department of Education intends to take in order to enforce compliance with the state and federal law.
3. The right to a hearing prior to Part C exercise of its enforcement; and
4. The consequences of the Part C enforcement action on continued and future state and federal funding.

When monitoring for continuous improvement of results, Improvement Plans are required in response to improvements that do not meet state targets, show slippage or implementation of evidence-based practice.

EFFECTIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
Dispute resolution processes consistent with federal and state regulation are available including state administrative complaint resolution, a due process hearing, and mediation.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-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. A dedicated state team member is available and provides daily real-time TA via telephone calls, emails, virtual meetings, and onsite visits as requested.

Scheduled service coordinator and direct service provider virtual meetings are offered to provide TA on specific topics including improvement strategies for data quality, SPP/APR indicator training, child outcomes, outreach with other state partners and collaboration with family/community support entities. These calls are pre-scheduled and include not only Part C state staff but also representation from early intervention partners and family resources such as the state’s Medicaid office responsible for reimbursements, IDEA PTI Center, EHDI, Deaf-Blind Project, SD School for the Deaf, Part B 619, Head Start Collaboration Office, and the state UCEDDS (University Center for Excellence in Development Disabilities Research and Service) to name a few.

The South Dakota Part C program, historically, relies heavily on technology to provide ongoing support to service coordinators and providers. Examples of this would include a state listserv which is used to send information to service coordinators, school districts, SICC members and early intervention providers statewide. The listserv is used to provide pertinent program information about policy and procedure updates, rules and regulations, program needs/shortages, and training opportunities. 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.

Service coordinators quarterly submit additional professional development activities and case load data with TA responding as needed. All providers are added to the listserv along with SPED directors from all public-school districts. As new providers are signed on, their names are added to the listserv to ensure access to this source of communication.

Service coordinator contact information is shared among all state Birth to Three personnel, giving ease of access among providers and coordinators to share best practices and collaborate on issues.

The state staff have developed and provided local program staff a tool that encompasses selected IDEA Part C requirements including SPP/APR indicators and other federal/state rules and regulations. This is used by local program staff to determine the status of their implementation of IDEA Part C program requirements. It is also used to guide on-going supervision and continuous improvement. Regional programs can request technical assistance from state staff as needed to address topics and scenarios related to Part C program requirements and practice encounters.

The state office continues to communicate regularly with coordinators, providers, and families. Along with scheduled virtual meetings, if circumstances arise, the state will produce a pre-recorded TA session that is sent via a secure link to service coordinators, providers and school district staff with pertinent information and guidance and state office contact for questions. The Part C director, in role as Administrator of the Office of Early Childhood Services, takes part in monthly Department of Education management meetings which ensures alignment of program to other initiatives taking place in the state’s education system.

**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 provides ongoing comprehensive professional development (PD) that includes a dedicated state team member who is responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating the implementation and scaling up of the evidence-based practice as well as supplemental professional development to meet the identified immediate needs of service coordinators and direct service providers. This professional development work is instrumental in the implementation of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) and fully integrated into the Birth to Three program’s work.

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 fiscal accountability and reimbursement training.
5. Annual training is held for all Birth to Three service coordinators on a statewide and/or regional basis in a face-to-face or virtual setting.
6. Monthly service coordinator calls are held with Birth to Three state staff and include updates on policies and procedures, and presentations on relevant topics by Parent Connection (State PTI) and other state agency partners (i.e. Department of Health, Medicaid, Department of Social Services Child Protection Division, Head Start, Part B 619 etc.). Topics have included implementation of routines-based home visiting, Routines Based Interview (RBI) implementation and fidelity, family outcomes, functional outcomes, child development, parent rights, hearing services, vision services, outcome writing, state and federal rules, interpreter services, transition planning, and resources and support for families during difficult times, etc.
7. Statewide and regional public trainings are offered on topics such as early language development and literacy, family engagement, evidence-based practices, early childhood guidelines, and resources for families of children who are deaf and hard of hearing. These trainings are open to service coordinators and direct service providers.
8. Special topical trainings are offered in direct response to concerns brought forth by service coordinators and direct service providers related to behavior and mental health challenges families are facing. The state is contracting with two renowned specialists to provide mentoring and networking opportunities throughout the state. The SSIP portion of this report will provide additional details.
9. Periodic training events are also held as needed for service providers related to use of private insurance, Medicaid reimbursement, and tele-therapy.
10. An online platform is used continuously to support the ongoing professional development needs of service coordinators and direct service providers. This comprehensive learning opportunity provides a support system and promotes participation in ongoing professional development regardless of physical location. Within this online tool, modules have been developed to meet the specific needs of the early interventionist in implementing identified evidence-based practices and measuring child and family outcomes. Using this platform, the South Dakota Birth to Three program is building and implementing a continuum of learning opportunities for our early interventionists regardless of their role in the Birth to Three program. Established as a private learning community, participants can also access research, a video library, discussion boards and blogs. Resources are available for new and seasoned early interventionists. This online tool is facilitated by Birth to Three state professional development staff. The online platform provides cost-effective training opportunities for the SSIP. It also proves a reliable tool to present current and accurate information to all early interventionists.
11. 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.

The reader will note, the SSIP portion of this report provides additional activities and details related to professional development.

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

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

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

5

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

South Dakota has historically had strong parent representation and engagement on the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Existing membership has 5 parent members representing 20% of the council; the SICC chairperson is a parent representative. In addition to these five members, one council member has an older child who received Part C services. Since its inception, the SICC membership has included a representative from the Parent Training and Information Center (PTI). Current membership also includes a Department of Health representative who oversees the MIECHV home visiting program for the state. SICC Human Services representative coordinates the state Family Support Program’s services and supports. Two parent members also serve as foster parents and one member is actively involved in ongoing research projects surrounding indigenous people. Two SICC members represent Head Start/Early Head Start, one of which is with a tribal program. These last members mentioned, while not parents, have strong connections with families throughout the state.

Throughout the FFY 2022 year, as the state program began creating a culture of data use, parents were actively engaged in the activities with other stakeholders, including participation in the August and October data retreats with other SICC members. Parents attended and participated in the statewide Early Intervention Conference held in August 3, 2023. Parent perspectives continue to enhance discussions particularly surrounding the state’s performance in C4 Family Outcomes. Parents insight into the state’s work was invaluable in presenting possible barriers and recommendations for the work related to increasing representativeness in family outcome survey response.

Parent SICC members continue to express their appreciation for all the data that are available and shared and analyzed with SICC members to increase their ability to provide advice and assistance to the state lead agency to enhance the statewide early intervention system. All parents voluntarily give of their time to participate in SICC activities. In fact, all parents expressed their desire to be reappointed to the SICC when their term expire citing how valuable and enlightening the work has been.

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

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

Increasing the capacity of all Part C parents/families to improve the outcomes of their infants or toddlers with disabilities and their families is the goal of the South Dakota Part C program. The most influential and impactful way South Dakota is increasing all parents / family’s capacity is through implementation of evidence-based practices. South Dakota, with stakeholder input, purposefully selected evidence-based practices when implemented as intended, increase parent/families’ competence and confidence working with their infant and toddler with disabilities. As evidence in the progress of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, South Dakota is making great strides in building all families capacity. Providers implementing the EBP witness families increased involvement, awareness, and knowledge. Providers utilizing the EBP speak to families better understanding their infant and toddlers development and are building on early intervention sessions by incorporating activities in their daily routines. More evidence of this presented itself in the C4 Family Outcome data. South Dakota uses the ECO Family Outcome Survey - Revised tool to gather data for the C4 indicator. Overall, 95% of families responded that the South Dakota Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful “listening to you and respecting your choices” with Native American, African American or Black and Hispanic families responding 100%.

South Dakota holds strongly to the belief family engagement and the parent-child relationship and interactions is one of the most powerful predictors to improve outcomes. The reader will note throughout the State Systemic Improvement Plan the state has described multiple activities implemented with the result of increasing all parent/family capacity and improve outcomes for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The reader will note, in the SPP/APR SSIP Theory of Action portion of the report, the state will describe actions underway to increase family capacity to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

South Dakota Part C embarked on target setting process from September of 2020 through January 2022. The state sought volunteers to serve on small workgroups, interested individuals contacted the Part C director and in September 2020 work began. Small work groups met regularly, and final recommendations were brought forward at the November 2021 SICC meeting for the FFY 2020-2025 target package. During the FFY 2022 reporting year, the SICC continued to meet quarterly, analyzing data and providing input to the state on progress toward SSIP progress. During the August and October 2023 meetings and January 2024 meeting, stakeholders convened to analyze state and regional FFY 2022 data in conjunction with targets and progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting. At this time SICC determined no additional adjustments were needed.

Other stakeholders, providing feedback in the state’s SPP/APR include monthly communication with all service coordinators, including the service coordinator mentoring group, and quarterly meetings with direct service providers and additional meetings with providers who have reached Tier 1 status (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

To ensure public input, South Dakota Part C follows state open meeting laws. SICC meeting agendas, containing meeting date/times, location, information for joining in person or telephonic or virtually and directions for special accommodations are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commission website and in the public area of the Department of Education building a minimum of 72 hours prior to the meeting date (not including weekend or holidays). SICC agendas contain a Public Comment agenda line item. During this time the SICC chair pauses the meeting to take any comments from members or public who may be joining. Any comments are recorded in the meeting minutes and posted on the Boards and Commission website.

The South Dakota Birth to Three website provides multiple opportunities for the public to interact with a state Part C team member and also follow the SICC. Through a 1-800 number and email link the public has direct linkage to a state Part C team member. A direct link to the South Dakota Boards and Commission website is also available where the public can view any SICC meeting agenda, minutes and presentation.

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

South Dakota Birth to Three posts all SICC meeting work which includes target setting, data analysis, improvement strategies and evaluation to the South Dakota Boards and Commission website located https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57 no more than 10 days from the meeting date. A link to this site is available on the South Dakota Department of Education / Part C page where the State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is posted no more than 120 days from submission. Program SPP/APRs from the last five years are posted on this site, https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ , under “Public Reporting”.

The South Dakota Birth to Three program annually reports to the public on performance of each region for Indicators C1 to C10 as compared to state performance. These reports titled Regional Performance are located on the Birth to Three website at http://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ under Public Reporting and posted within the required federal timelines.

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2021 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 2021 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 revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2021 APR in 2023, is available.**

South Dakota Part C reports to the public on the FFY 2021 performance of each EIS region for Indicators C1 to C10 as compared to the state performance via South Dakota Department of Education website. These reports titled Regional Performance are located on the Part C page at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ under Public Reporting within the required federal timelines.

Additionally, public notices are posted in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website where State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and regional reports can be accessed and availability of hard copies of the reports upon request. Newspapers printing the public notices are as follows: Sioux Falls Argus Leader; Aberdeen American News; Huron Plainsman; Pierre Capital Journal; and Rapid City Journal.

Notification is also sent to SICC, all regional Birth to Three programs, service coordinators, direct service providers and other stakeholders of the availability of these reports on the Birth to Three website https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ and the availability of hard copies upon request.

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

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

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs’ (OSEP’s) response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.17% | 99.14% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner** | **Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 254 | 279 | 99.14% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

25

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

During this reporting period, the 30-day timeline criteria was missed 25 times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation of all 25 children who had missed the 30-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay included illness, families reschedule of services, changes in family contact information, family vacations, and physician appointments. In addition, the state suffered several winter weather conditions during the winter months of the FFY 2022 reporting year that delayed services. Blizzard like conditions were reported statewide, lasting multiple days. As a result, many roads were impassable and the state emergency management no travel warnings were frequently issued across the state. In some instances families reported having no power. Almost a fourth of the delays are a result of these severe weather conditions.

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

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

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

State database

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

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2022 (Oct. 1, 2022, to Dec. 31, 2022).

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

For Indicator C1, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2022 the state selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022).

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

SD Part C is pleased in the progress made over the last year in reaching 100% for Indicator C1 in FFY 2022. The state provided TA to all service coordinators on how to correctly document reasons for delay, emphasizing that service coordinator documentation must clearly determine if the reason for delay is due to exceptional family circumstances or due to systems reasons for delay. The state team reviewed the service coordinators’ documentation on all 25 children who had missed the 30-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

In relation to FFY 2021 data, the reader will note, South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of it’s monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of each identified noncompliance and determined all three regions to be isolated incidences. A timely review of subsequent data from each region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% of subsequent services provided timely. In the two regions with one child receiving services late, three random records were selected from each service coordinator who had instance of non-compliance. In the remaining region six records were randomly selected from the one service coordinator who had two instances of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% for each region verified the regions were correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued noncompliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base and provider log notes, the state also reviewed each of the four individual cases of noncompliance and verified that each child, although late, did receive their required services.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that each region 1) is correctly implementing the 30-day timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) each child, while late, did receive services, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to any of the three regions exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to each region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary, and the state recorded documentation of these pre-finding corrections.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

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

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

South Dakota has six regional Part C / Birth to Three programs located across the state. Based on noncompliance reported in FFY 2021, in one region, two children were identified as having missed the 30-day timeline, and in two other regions one child in each region missed the 30-day timeline. Analysis of the three regions’ data determined that the four children did not receive their services in a timely manner during the FFY 2021 reporting period.

South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of it’s monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of each identified noncompliance and determined all three regions to be isolated incidences. A timely review of subsequent data from each region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% of subsequent services provided timely. In the two regions with one child receiving services late, three random records were selected from each service coordinator who had instance of non-compliance. In the remaining region six records were randomly selected from the one service coordinator who had two instances of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% for each region verified the regions were correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued noncompliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base and provider log notes, the state also reviewed each of the four individual cases of noncompliance and verified that each child, although late, did receive their required services.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that each region 1) is correctly implementing the 30-day timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) each child, while late, did receive services, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to any of the three regions exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to each region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary, and the state recorded documentation of these pre-finding corrections.

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2023). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target>= | 96.80% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% |
| Data | 99.92% | 99.76% | 99.63% | 99.89% | 99.61% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 08/30/2023 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,134 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 08/30/2023 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,156 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings** | **Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,134 | 1,156 | 99.61% | 97.00% | 98.10% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 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 (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

Stakeholders were actively involved in reviewing the state’s performance in comparison to targets throughout FFY 2022. At the time of target setting, the state had just announced it would be transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) to Battelle Developmental Inventory 3 (BDI-3) to measure child outcomes. The state and stakeholders were aware there were noted differences between the BDI-2 and BDI-3, and determined to analyze data each year to note if any changes to targets were needed. The FFY 2022 reporting year is the second complete year using the BDI-3, and following data analysis activities during the August 2023, October 2023 and January 2024 SICC meetings stakeholders noted, performance had met targets, with no slippage for Outcome A and Outcome B. However, Outcome C did not meet target and had slippage. After careful discussion, noting how high the targets were for Outcome C, stakeholders considered suggesting a target change but noted this was only the second year of using the BDI-3 tool. Stakeholders unanimously agreed to leaving targets as established for the FFY 2022 year, however, reserved the right to revisit following the FFY2023 year after three years of reporting data to determine if changes were needed.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| **A1** | 2019 | Target>= | 50.48% | 51.00% | 51.00% | 41.00% | 41.50% |
| **A1** | 42.80% | Data | 52.34% | 37.83% | 42.80% | 41.00% | 38.63% |
| **A2** | 2019 | Target>= | 85.37% | 85.50% | 85.50% | 72.40% | 72.50% |
| **A2** | 73.40% | Data | 80.67% | 75.77% | 73.40% | 72.45% | 71.35% |
| **B1** | 2019 | Target>= | 58.82% | 60.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% |
| **B1** | 74.36% | Data | 75.95% | 74.91% | 74.36% | 75.00% | 74.16% |
| **B2** | 2019 | Target>= | 69.51% | 70.00% | 70.00% | 54.76% | 53.40% |
| **B2** | 53.20% | Data | 61.04% | 57.92% | 53.20% | 54.76% | 57.30% |
| **C1** | 2019 | Target>= | 57.26% | 57.76% | 60.00% | 91.20% | 91.25% |
| **C1** | 91.03% | Data | 93.20% | 90.93% | 91.03% | 91.21% | 88.76% |
| **C2** | 2019 | Target>= | 84.63% | 85.00% | 85.00% | 81.80% | 81.90% |
| **C2** | 80.13% | Data | 83.41% | 80.29% | 80.13% | 81.80% | 77.82% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1>= | 42.00% | 42.50% | 43.00% | 43.50% |
| Target A2>= | 72.75% | 73.00% | 73.50% | 74.00% |
| Target B1>= | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% | 77.00% |
| Target B2>= | 53.60% | 53.80% | 54.00% | 54.20% |
| Target C1>= | 91.50% | 91.75% | 92.00% | 92.25% |
| Target C2>= | 82.00% | 82.10% | 82.20% | 82.30% |

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 12 | 2.07% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 105 | 18.13% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 21 | 3.63% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 78 | 13.47% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 363 | 62.69% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 99 | 216 | 38.63% | 42.00% | 45.83% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 441 | 579 | 71.35% | 72.75% | 76.17% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 8 | 1.38% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 99 | 17.10% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 118 | 20.38% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 239 | 41.28% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 115 | 19.86% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 357 | 464 | 74.16% | 75.50% | 76.94% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 354 | 579 | 57.30% | 53.60% | 61.14% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 0 | 0.00% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 55 | 9.50% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 110 | 19.00% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 182 | 31.43% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 232 | 40.07% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 292 | 347 | 88.76% | 91.50% | 84.15% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 414 | 579 | 77.82% | 82.00% | 71.50% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

South Dakota continues to focus on the data quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in two outcome areas, Child Outcome C Summery Statement 1 and 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator the slippages are noted with a statistical meaningful difference.

Seeking assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, DaSy, the BDI User group and a private consultant with expertise in child outcome data, stakeholders and the state Part B 619 coordinator, the state team formed hypotheses that may explain the slippage in child outcome data. The reader should note, the first hypotheses for the slippage focuses on FFY 2022 as the state’s second year transitioning from the BDI-2 to the BDI-3 to measure child outcomes.

In communicating with the Part B 619 coordinator it was noted, Part B Indicator 7 data has experienced similar dips in child outcomes given both programs use the BDI-2 and BDI-3 tools and the same evaluators. The state noted possible contribution to the slippage was the misunderstanding among evaluators on completing the BDI-2 or BDI-3 when a child exits the program. Given the BDI-2 and BDI-3 are norm-referenced differently, protocol was established stating children who entered the Part C program using the BDI-2 must receive a BDI-2 when exiting the program. Several instances were discovered of children who received a BDI-2 upon entry yet were evaluated using the BDI-3 upon exit. Those results are not considered valid and had to be discarded which led to a significant decrease in the overall percent of children exiting with a qualifying score. Further analysis of those children’s performance led the state to believe had those children been tested using the correct evaluation tool they would have, in fact, assisted the state in meeting the established targets.

The second hypothesis explaining the slippage may be the publishers’ noted differences between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 tools with regard to the demographic characteristics of the standardization samples as well as the test blueprint, test content and item scoring criteria. The BDI-3 and BDI-2 standardization samples are composed of different examinees, tested approximately 15 years apart. The BDI-3 standardization sample reflects recent US census estimates and 2020 US population projections and the continued shift of populations toward other racial/ethnic groups. The BDI-3 includes a greater balance of items oriented towards younger children and expansion of domains to reflect current literature. Revisions to the BDI-3 add greater objectivity and precision to the tool. The state believes this will lend to more accurate reporting reflected in the a through e developmental trajectories and as the state totally transitions away from the BDI-2 tool, scores will begin to reflect child progress more accurately. In addition, the reader will note Data Quality is one strand within the state’s SSIP.

The state continues to focus on implementation of the BDI. August 1, 2023, the state Part C program, in collaboration with Part B 619, hosted a statewide, in-person, Early Intervention Conference for all direct service providers (including school district staff), service coordinators and stakeholders. One entire strand of the conference was dedicated to implementation of the BDI and child outcomes. Speakers included experts from Riverside Insights Publishing and other content experts from across the nation including ECTA and DaSy. During the conference some direct service providers indicated confusion as to which BDI tool was to be used. The state notes, the total transition to the BDI-3 will occur in the FFY 2024 reporting year.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

South Dakota continues to focus on the data quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in two outcome areas, Child Outcome C Summery Statement 1 and 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator the slippages are noted with a statistical meaningful difference.

Seeking assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center, DaSy, the BDI User group and a private consultant with expertise in child outcome data, stakeholders and the state Part B 619 coordinator, the state team formed hypotheses that may explain the slippage in child outcome data. The reader should note, the first hypotheses for the slippage focuses on FFY 2022 as the state’s second year transitioning from the BDI-2 to the BDI-3 to measure child outcomes.

In communicating with the Part B 619 coordinator it was noted, Part B Indicator 7 data has experienced similar dips in child outcomes given both programs use the BDI-2 and BDI-3 tools and the same evaluators. The state noted possible contribution to the slippage was the misunderstanding among evaluators on completing the BDI-2 or BDI-3 when a child exits the program. Given the BDI-2 and BDI-3 are norm-referenced differently, protocol was established stating children who entered the Part C program using the BDI-2 must receive a BDI-2 when exiting the program. Several instances were discovered of children who received a BDI-2 upon entry yet were evaluated using the BDI-3 upon exit. Those results are not considered valid and had to be discarded which led to a significant decrease in the overall percent of children exiting with a qualifying score. Further analysis of those children’s performance led the state to believe had those children been tested using the correct evaluation tool they would have, in fact, assisted the state in meeting the established targets.

The second hypothesis explaining the slippage may be the publishers’ noted differences between the BDI-2 and BDI-3 tools with regard to the demographic characteristics of the standardization samples as well as the test blueprint, test content and item scoring criteria. The BDI-3 and BDI-2 standardization samples are composed of different examinees, tested approximately 15 years apart. The BDI-3 standardization sample reflects recent US census estimates and 2020 US population projections and the continued shift of populations toward other racial/ethnic groups. The BDI-3 includes a greater balance of items oriented towards younger children and expansion of domains to reflect current literature. Revisions to the BDI-3 add greater objectivity and precision to the tool. The state believes this will lend to more accurate reporting reflected in the a through e developmental trajectories and as the state totally transitions away from the BDI-2 tool, scores will begin to reflect child progress more accurately. In addition, the reader will note Data Quality is one strand within the state’s SSIP.

The state continues to focus on implementation of the BDI. August 1, 2023, the state Part C program, in collaboration with Part B 619, hosted a statewide, in-person, Early Intervention Conference for all direct service providers (including school district staff), service coordinators and stakeholders. One entire strand of the conference was dedicated to implementation of the BDI and child outcomes. Speakers included experts from Riverside Insights Publishing and other content experts from across the nation including ECTA and DaSy. During the conference some direct service providers indicated confusion as to which BDI tool was to be used. The state notes, the total transition to the BDI-3 will occur in the FFY 2024 reporting year.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting 618 data | 999 |
| 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. | 276 |
| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 579 |

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

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

NO

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

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

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine an infant or toddlers’ eligibility for Part C services. The state is transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory Third Edition (BDI-3). These tools are 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 assessment is given to children who have been in the Part C program for at least six months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for the Part C program to determine child’s developmental status at exit and second for children transition at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs.

Entry and exit BDI scores are stored in the respective BDI databases. From these databases, state Part C staff retrieve scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period and have been in the program for at least six months. Part C state staff collaborate with evaluators and the Part B 619 coordinator to ensure all appropriate testing was completed and scores reported. BDI entry and exit scores are then compared for those exiting children and formulated according to the state’s BDI business rules to determine the child’s progress in the three outcome areas.

During FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022, to June 30, 2023), 999 children exited the Birth to Three program of which 579 children had qualifying entry and exit BDI-2 or BDI-3 scores. Entry scores for the 579 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 579 exiting children computes to a 57.96% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. The state recognizes this is a decrease increase from FFY 2021 completion rate.

Additional data analysis of FFY 2022 exit data indicates of the 420 children who exited the Birth to Three program but did not receive a qualifying exit score, 276 or 65.71% were in the Birth to Three program less than 6 months. If the 276 children exiting before 6 months are subtracted from the denominator of the exit data, the completion rate increases to 80.08%.

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

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 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 and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year’s response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

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

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

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 94.00% | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.10% |
| A | 93.90% | Data | 98.78% | 99.44% | 98.95% | 97.98% | 88.11% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.20% |
| B | 89.40% | Data | 98.79% | 98.60% | 96.50% | 97.96% | 90.98% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 89.50% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.10% |
| C | 89.30% | Data | 99.09% | 99.16% | 98.25% | 99.19% | 87.30% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

Stakeholders are intricately involved in all aspects of the South Dakota Part C program. This is especially evident for Indicator C4, Family Outcomes. Stakeholders have been and continue to be heavily engaged. Beginning in February 2021, a small stakeholder workgroup representing parents, providers, PTI center, school districts, program prep, service coordinators and childcare services and led by a DaSy content expert met frequently with the state team discussing the tool and distribution methods used to collect C4 data from families. Acting upon the workgroup’s recommendations, in April 2021 the full SICC approved the state’s use of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised. At the stakeholders’ recommendation the state began distributing the survey electronically to families to gather Indicator C4 data.

In January 2022 and April 2022, the state brought to stakeholders the required changes in the family outcomes measurement language. Led by content experts from DaSy, stakeholders discussed the new language and analyzed possible data elements. Stakeholders considered socio-economic status, maternal education, geographic location, and parent native language. Pros and cons of each were discussed at length with items eliminated based upon discussions such as concern when enhancements would be required to the existing data system and cost associated with, accuracy of representativeness due to data element size etc. After careful consideration, stakeholders unanimously agreed on recommending socio-economic status, with Medicaid eligibility as the data element or proxy. Stakeholders expressed socio-economic status is more inclusive of maternal education but captures the root cause and has more connectedness between child development and maternal education and native language. The state accepted this recommendation given this data element is already captured in the existing data system resulting in no additional costs. Therefore, beginning July 1, 2022 the state added the Medicaid eligible data element to the existing ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised.

During the October 2023 and January 2024 SICC meetings and the monthly service coordinator meetings, the state presented stakeholders with FFY 2022 Indicator C4 data, including representativeness based on race/ethnicity and the socio-economic Medicaid eligible element. Stakeholders discussed the current performance in relation to the target and noted a decline in overall response rate and a decline in performance measure A, B and C with slippage noted in performance measure A and B. There was consideration of a target change, but SICC stakeholders noted this was only the second year of using the ECO tool and electronic distribution and given the dramatic changes there is no compatibility to previous years’ data for this indicator. The SICC held firm to the belief that while there was a dip in response and in performance, there was no support for re-establishing targets and determined, additional years of data are needed to effectively analyze the data and determine if an adjustment to targets is warranted. SICC unanimously agreed to leaving targets as established for the FFY 2022 year. Some SICC members did note, targets were set quite high and recommended upon receiving three years of reporting data, with the FFY 2023 year, the SICC consider if changes to targets may be needed.

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 938 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C  | 221 |
| Survey Response Rate | 23.56% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 189 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 221 |
| B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 194 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 221 |
| C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 191 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 221 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2) | 88.11% | 94.20% | 85.52% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2) | 90.98% | 90.40% | 87.78% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2) | 87.30% | 90.20% | 86.43% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

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

FFY 2022 noted the second year of the state’s transition from a state developed tool to the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised which includes a new scoring process and delivery method. Overall, results were very positive. On 14 of the 17 items, 90% or more of families had positive responses. Measurement A Know Their Rights, four of the five questions families expressed between 90-95% positive attitude. Survey item “giving you useful information about services and support for you and your child” was selected most favorable with 95% of families selecting “Very Helpful” or “Extremely Helpful”. In comparison, the survey item “giving your child useful information about available options when your child leaves the program” was selected 84% of the time as “Very Helpful” or “Extremely Helpful”.

The state conducted additional analysis of the response examining by regions, child’s length of time in the program, child’s age when exiting the program and self-identified racial group. This analysis revealed to the state no significant difference among the regional programs, service coordinators or racial groups. The analysis did reveal, however, a trend similar to the previous year’s results with families whose children exit the program with less than one year rated less favorably than those whose children had been in the program more than one year. This was especially evident among those families who identified their child as having left the program prior to age three.

The state hypothesis length of time in program, age of child upon exit and developmental level could be impacting families’ responses. Those children exiting prior to age three having met outcomes may not be as in need of outside services. However, the state recognizes opportunities for improvement in this area and is working with service coordination regions to ensure communication related to resources is occurring with all families, regardless of their child’s age upon exit, reason for exit or amount of time in the program are provided with necessary information related to information and supports throughout program enrollment and upon exiting the program.

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

FFY 2022 noted the second year of the state’s transition from a state developed tool to the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised which includes a new scoring process and delivery method. Overall, results were very positive. On 14 of the 17 items, 90% or more of families had positive responses. Measurement B Effectively Communicate Their Child’s Needs, five of the six items families expressed between 91 and 95% positive attitude. Survey item “listening to you and respecting your choices” was selected most favorable with 95% of families selecting “Very Helpful” or “Extremely Helpful”. In comparison, the survey item “connecting you with other services or people who can help your child and family” was selected 88% as “Very Helpful” or “Extremely Helpful”.

The state conducted additional analysis of the responses examining by regions, child’s length of time in the program, child’s age when exiting the program and self-identified racial group. This analysis revealed to the state no significant difference among the regional programs, service coordinators or racial groups. The analysis did reveal, however, families whose children exiting the program with less than one year of services rated less favorably than those whose children had been in the program more than one year.

The state notes, similarities in data analysis of Measurement A and Measurement B. In both instances, families whose child is in the program less than one year, regardless of their child’s age upon exit, respond less favorably than those whose children have been in the program more than one year. The state hypotheses length of time in program could be impacting families’ responses and is working with service coordination regions to ensure connecting families to other services is occurring with all families, regardless of the amount of time their child is in the program.

The state also noted data anomalies in the analysis process. Measurement A survey item “giving you useful information about services and support for you and your child” received the most favorable responses among all 17 survey items at 95% favorable. While Measurement B survey item “connecting you with other services or people who can help your child and family” was selected less favorable at 88%. The state is working with service coordination to ensure not only are all families being provided information about services, but all families, regardless of amount of time their child is in the program are provided connections to those resources.

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

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a collection tool used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?  | NO |
|  |  |

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Survey Response Rate | 26.55% | 23.56% |

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

The metric varied due to using a statistical formula (i.e., proportional testing) to determine if two percentages are considered different from each other. The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show African American or Black (-1% difference), American Indian or Alaska Native (-4% difference), Asian (0% difference), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0% difference), Hispanic (2% difference), and More than One Race (2% difference) families were all representative. The metric determined all racial/ethnic groups are representative except for White families who are over-represented (+12%).

**Include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

South Dakota collects data for indicator C4 by surveying families who exit the Part C program in the reporting period. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing:
1. The percentage of surveys received by race and ethnicity (within each subgroup) by the percentage of families enrolled in the Part C program in the reporting period; and
2. The percentage of surveys received by Medicaid eligibility by the percentage of Medicaid eligible families enrolled in the Part C program in the reporting period.

The data show the following by race and ethnicity: White families had the highest percentage enrolled in the program (75%), followed by Native American Indian or Alaska Native (12%), Hispanic (9%), More than One Race (7%), African American or Black (3%), Asian (2%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).

Comparatively, White families had the highest representation in surveys received (88%), followed by Hispanic (11%), More than One Race (9%), American Indian or Alaska Native (8%), African American or Black (2%), Asian (2%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).

The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show that American Indian or Alaska Native (-4% difference), African American or Black (-1% difference), Asian (0% difference), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0% difference), Hispanic (+2% difference) and More than One Race (+2% difference) were all representative of the demographics of population enrolled with the exception of White families who were overrepresented (+12%).

With stakeholder input, the state selected socio-economic status as the additional demographic analysis with Medicaid eligibility as the data point. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the percentage of surveys received indicating Medicaid eligibility by the percentage of families in the reporting period identified as Medicaid eligible. The data showed the following: families who did not report having Medicaid had the highest percentage in the program (56%) compared to families who were eligible for Medicaid services (44%). Families who were not Medicaid eligible had the highest representation in surveys received (62%) compared to families who were Medicaid eligible (38%).

The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show that families who are not Medicaid eligible (+6%) and families who are Medicaid eligible (-6%) were representative of the population enrolled.

The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. (yes/no)

NO

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

The state notes, the responses are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program due to the over-representativeness of White families. Using the ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The state found African American or Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, Hispanic and more than one race families were representative in the C4 data, however, White families were over-represented.

While the state is pleased with the representativeness and the increased response rate from Hispanic (+20%) families, the state is aware of the need to ensure future response data is representative. To address this the state will continue to meet with each of the six service coordination regions and analyze the regional data performance to ensure continued representativeness of all families.

Other steps the state will take to promote response from a broad cross-section of families are:
1. Ongoing training of service coordinators on how to encourage families to complete the ECO Family Outcome Survey.
2. Increased promotion of the electronic delivery method to reach families with the ECO Family Outcome tool.
3. The state will work with stakeholders to identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of all parents – particularly parents of infants and toddlers with response rates below the state average.
4. The state will continue to encourage parents of infants and toddlers of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey.

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

FFY 2022 marks the second year South Dakota has used the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised to collected Indicator C4 data and the second year distributing the tool electronically with hard copy available if requested. Responses remain anonymous; however, each service coordinator receives a survey link that is unique to them and contains an electronic version of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised and other demographic information. Service coordinators forward their link to families via text, email, or hard copy, based on the family’s preference. The unique link allows the state to identify early intervention regions. To ensure data quality, the link provided is set so each parent can only complete one survey.

South Dakota recognized a decrease in the state’s overall response rate, however, is pleased the efforts of service coordinators over the FFY 2022 year resulted in increased responses from Hispanic and African American or Black families which resulted in representativeness. South Dakota recognizes areas for improvement, however, and will take the following steps to promote responses from families:
1. Continue to analyze data and collect regional program input.
2. Continue to dialogue with service coordinators on how to encourage families to complete the ECO Family Outcome Survey.
3. Continue promotion of the electronic delivery method to reach families with the ECO Family Outcome tool.
4. Ensure service coordinators continue to promote the ECO Family Outcome Survey Spanish version.
5. Continue to promote service coordinators usage of interpreter for completion of surveys.

With only two years of data South Dakota believes the new survey tool and distribution method have affected the state’s performance and overall response rates. The state will continue to examine response rates quarterly by regions and strategize with regions identifying approaches to encourage a higher percentage of parents of infants and toddlers of all race/ethnicities and socio-economic background to complete the survey.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.**

The statewide response rate for this year’s family outcomes survey is 23.56%. The state analyzed response rate by comparing the number of families sent a survey compared to the number of families who responded. Families of More than One Race had the highest response rate (27%), followed by White families (25%), Hispanic (24%), Asian (20%), American Indian or Alaska Native (14%), African American or Black (12%), and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (0%). More than One Race, White and Hispanic family response rates are above the statewide percent while Asian, American Indian or Alaska Native, African American or Black, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander are below the statewide percent.

While overall the state had a decrease in response rate, the state is pleased with the significant increase in FFY 2022 response rates from Hispanic (+20%) families. The state does recognize decreases in response rates among other racial/ethnic groups and conducted a comparison of scores on the three scales to determine if any particular group of families was significantly more positive or negative than other groups of families. No significant differences by race/ethnicity were evident. However, the state does recognize there is indication of nonresponse bias since American Indian or Alaska Native, African American or Black and Asian are below the statewide percent.

The steps the state will take to reduce identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families are the following:
1. Continued use of Spanish ECO Family Outcome Survey – Revised, including offering interpretation services.
2. Use of both the electronic and hard-copy survey to reach families based on their preference.
3. Continued analysis of data including regional service coordinator input as to why the response rate of parents of infants and toddlers is below the state average.
4. The state will work with stakeholders to identify additional communication and/or dissemination strategies for increasing the response rate of all parents – particularly parents of infants and toddlers with response rates below the state average.
5. The state will continue to encourage parents of infants and toddlers of all race/ethnicities to complete the survey.
6. The state will be implementing a new comprehensive data system estimated for late 2024, from which surveys will be launched. This new data system will allow the state to track the disposition (result) of the attempts and in turn determine reasons why completed surveys are not being returned.

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

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2022 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

South Dakota collects data for indicator C4 by surveying families who exit the Part C program in the reporting period. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing:
1. The percentage of surveys received by race and ethnicity (within each subgroup) by the percentage of families enrolled in the Part C program in the reporting period; and
2. The percentage of surveys received by Medicaid eligibility by the percentage of Medicaid eligible families enrolled in the Part C program in the reporting period.

The data show the following by race and ethnicity: White families had the highest percentage enrolled in the program (75%), followed by Native American Indian or Alaska Native (12%), Hispanic (9%), More than One Race (7%), African American or Black (3%), Asian (2%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).

Comparatively, White families had the highest representation in surveys received (88%), followed by Hispanic (11%), More than One Race (9%), American Indian or Alaska Native (8%), African American or Black (2%), Asian (2%) and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0%).

The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show that American Indian or Alaska Native (-4% difference), African American or Black (-1% difference), Asian (0% difference), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0% difference), Hispanic (+2% difference) and More than One Race (+2% difference) were all representative of the demographics of population enrolled with the exception of White families who were overrepresented (+12%).

With stakeholder input, the state selected socio-economic status as the additional demographic analysis with Medicaid eligibility as the data point. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the percentage of surveys received indicating Medicaid eligibility by the percentage of families in the reporting period identified as Medicaid eligible. The data showed the following: families who did not report having Medicaid had the highest percentage in the program (56%) compared to families who were eligible for Medicaid services (44%). Families who were not Medicaid eligible had the highest representation in surveys received (62%) compared to families who were Medicaid eligible (38%).

The ECTA Response Rate and Representativeness calculator which applies proportional testing was utilized to determine if the surveys received were representative of the target population. The results show that families who are not Medicaid eligible (+6%) and families who are Medicaid eligible (-6%) were representative of the population enrolled.

## 4 - OSEP Response

## 4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2023 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

# Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 0.85% | 0.86% | 0.88% | 0.88% | 0.88% |
| Data | 1.76% | 1.40% | 1.27% | 0.97% | 1.24% |

**Targets**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 08/30/2023 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 149 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | 06/20/2023 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 11,445 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 149 | 11,445 | 1.24% | 0.89% | 1.30% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

## 6 - Indicator Data

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target >= | 2.82% | 2.83% | 2.85% | 2.56% | 2.81% |
| Data | 3.29% | 3.31% | 3.00% | 2.56% | 2.97% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 2.83% | 2.83% | 2.84% | 2.85% |

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 08/30/2023 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,156 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2021 | 06/20/2023 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 34,292 |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,156 | 34,292 | 2.97% | 2.83% | 3.37% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 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 child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 92.07% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline** | **Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 247 | 293 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.**

46

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

During this reporting period, the 45-day timeline criteria was missed 46 times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation of all 46 children who had missed the 45-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay include family rescheduling evaluations and meeting times, family illnesses and difficulty in reaching families. In addition, the state suffered several winter weather conditions during the winter months of the FFY 2022 reporting year that delayed services. Blizzard like conditions were reported statewide, lasting multiple days. As a result, many roads were impassable and the state emergency management no travel warnings were frequently issued across the state. A few of the delays are a result of these severe weather conditions.

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

State database

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

The State selected the second quarter of FFY2022 (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022).

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

For Indicator C7, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2022 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022).

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

SD Part C is pleased to reach 100% for Indicator C7 in FFY 2022. The state continued to provided TA to all service coordinators on correct documentation of delays, emphasizing that service coordinator documentation must clearly determine if the reason for delay is due to exceptional family circumstances or due to systems reasons for delay.

The state team reviewed the service coordinators’ documentation on all 46 children who had missed the 45-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

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

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2023). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.86% | 94.74% | 99.40% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 148 | 152 | 99.40% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.**

4

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

During this reporting period, the IFSP meeting with transition steps and services timeline criteria was missed four times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation on all four children who had missed the C8A timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay include death in family, family cancellation and families delaying transition planning as they relocated to another state for a period of time.

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2022 (Oct. 1, 2022, to Dec. 31, 2022).

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

For Indicator C8A, the state has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2022 the state again selected the second quarter (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022).

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

SD Part C is pleased in the progress made over the last year in reaching 100% for Indicator C8A. The state continues to provide TA to all service coordinators emphasizing transition steps and services timelines at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation on all four children who had missed the C8A timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

In relation to FFY 2021 data, the reader will note, South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of its monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of the identified noncompliance and determined it an isolated incidence. A timely review of subsequent data from the region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% of subsequent IFSP transition steps and services provided timely. In the region with non-compliance, three random records were selected from the service coordinator who had the instance of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% verified the region was correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued non-compliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base and provider log notes, the state also reviewed the individual case of non-compliance and verified that the child, although late, did receive transition steps and services.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that the region 1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition steps and services timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) the child, while late, did receive transition steps and services, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to the region exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to the region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary, and the state recorded documentation of the pre-finding correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

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

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

South Dakota has six regional Part C / Birth to Three programs located across the state. Based on noncompliance reported in FFY 2021, in one region, one child was identified as having missed the IFSP transition steps and services timeline criteria during this reporting period.

South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of it’s monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of the identified noncompliance and determined it an isolated incidence. A timely review of subsequent data from the region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% of subsequent IFSP transition steps and services provided timely. In the region with noncompliance, three random records were selected form the service coordinator who had the instance of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% verified the region was correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued non-compliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base, the state also reviewed the individual case of noncompliance and verified that the child, although late, did receive transition steps and services.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that the region 1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition steps and services timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) the child, while late, did receive transition steps and services, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to the region exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to the region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary, and the state recorded documentation of the pre-finding correction.

## 8A - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2023). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 152 | 152 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

0

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

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

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

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

NO

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2022 (Oct. 1, 2022, to Dec. 31, 2022).

**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 FFY 2022 (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022). 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 Part C program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY 2022.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

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

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2023). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

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

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of child-specific and regulatory/systemic noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, 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 2022 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2021), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 98.86% | 94.74% | 99.40% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 148 | 152 | 99.40% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**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.**

4

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

During this reporting period, the IFSP transition conference timeline criteria was missed four times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation on all four children who had missed the C8C timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay include death in family, family cancellation and families delaying transition planning as they relocated to another state for a period of time.

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2022 (Oct. 1, 2022, to Dec. 31, 2022).

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

For Indicator C8C, the state has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2022 the state again selected the second quarter (October 1, 2022, through December 31, 2022).

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

SD Part C is pleased in the progress made over the last year in reaching 100% for Indicator C8C. The state continues to provide TA to all service coordinators emphasizing transition conference timelines at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation on all four children who had missed the C8C timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

In relation to FFY 2021 data, the reader will note, South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of it’s monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of the identified noncompliance and determined it an isolated incidence. A timely review of subsequent data from the region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% of subsequent IFSP transition conferences provided timely. In the region with noncompliance, three random records were selected from the service coordinator who had the instance of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% verified the region was correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued non-compliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base, the state also reviewed the individual case of noncompliance and verified that the child, although late, did receive transition conference.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that the region 1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition conference timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) the child, while late, did receive a transition conference, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to the region exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to the region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary, and the state recorded documentation of the pre-finding correction.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2021**

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

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2021 SPP/APR**

South Dakota has six regional Part C / Birth to Three programs located across the state. Based on noncompliance reported in FFY 2021, in one region, one child was identified as having missed the IFSP transition conference timeline criteria during this reporting period.

South Dakota uses pre-finding correction as part of its monitoring system.

In accordance with federal guidance, the state considered the extent of the identified noncompliance and determined it an isolated incidence. A timely review of subsequent data from the region, through the state’s Part C data base, found no additional non-compliance, with 100% subsequent IFSP transition conferences provided timely. In the region with non compliance, three random records were selected from the service coordinator who had the instance of non-compliance. This subsequent 100% data verified the region was correctly implementing the IFSP requirement and did not reveal any continued noncompliance.

Through the state’s Part C data base and provider log notes, the state reviewed the individual case of noncompliance and verified that the child, although late, did receive a transition conference.

Therefore, the state was able to verify that the region 1) is correctly implementing the IFSP transition conference timeline based on subsequent data collected through the state’s data system; and 2) the child, while late, did receive a transition conference, and no outstanding corrective action exists under a complaint or due process hearing. As such the state did not issue a finding to the region exercising the option of pre-finding correction. The state issued a pre-finding letter to the region advising them of the non-compliance, reporting that a finding was not necessary and the state recorded documentation of the pre-finding correction.

## 8C - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2022- June 30, 2023). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8C - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2022-23 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/15/2023 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

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

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

South Dakota had less than ten resolution sessions during the FFY 2022 reporting year. As such, the state is not required to enter baseline and/or target data if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

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

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s 618 data, explain.

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

South Dakota had less than ten mediations during the FFY 2022 reporting year. As such, the state is not required to enter baseline and/or target data if the number of mediations is less than 10.

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

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

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis*:

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

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

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

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

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

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

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

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

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

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

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

https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/FFY2022.aspx

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

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

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **Current Relationship** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | Data must be greater than or equal to the target | 75.50% | 76.00% | 76.50% | 77.00% |

**FFY 2022 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Numerator represents Indicator C3B progress categories c+d | Denominator represents Indicator C3B progress categories a+b+c+d | **FFY 2021 Data** | **FFY 2022 Target** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 357 | 464 | 74.16% | 75.50% | 76.94% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2022 data.**

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

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine an infant or toddlers’ eligibility for Part C services. The state is transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory Third Edition (BDI-3). These tools are 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 assessment is given to children who have been in the Part C program for at least 6 months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for the Part C program to determine child's developmental status at exit and second for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs.

Entry and exit BDI scores are stored in the respective BDI databases. From these databases, state Part C staff retrieve scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period and had been in the program for at least 6 months. Part C state staff collaborate with evaluators and the Part B 619 coordinator to ensure all appropriate testing was completed and scores reported. BDI entry and exit scores are then compared for those exiting children and formulated according to the state’s BDI business rules to determine the child’s progress in the three outcome areas.

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

NO

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

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19**, **specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

South Dakota Part C and Part B 619 programs measure child progress using the Battelle Development Inventory evaluation tool. FFY 2022 is the second complete year of the state’s transition from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory Third Edition (BDI-3). Evaluators were instructed to use the BDI-3 for any child entering after 7/1/2022 but to use the BDI-2 for any child exiting who had an entry score with the BDI-2. During this transition phase the state noted a decline in the completion rate, or percentage of children who had a qualifying entry and exit score. Further investigation, and stakeholder input, led the state to hypothesis this drop was due to confusion on the evaluators’ part on which tool to use at time of exit. Children who enter with a BDI-2 must be evaluated with a BDI-2 upon exit. The state notes, with a lower completion rate, this did impact the states progress towards the SiMR and is taking action, along with the Part B 619 program to educate and ensure protocols are followed for completion of exit evaluations. The state notes, total transition to the BDI-3 will occur in the FFY 2024 reporting year and estimates as progress is made towards all children receiving a BDI-3 upon entry and exit the quality concerns will dissipate.

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/FFY2022.aspx

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

NO

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

Below responses are aligned to the Action Strands outlined on the state’s Theory of Action and represent the strategies continued to improve child and family outcomes through routines-based home visiting.

Data Quality
• Both SD Part C and Part B 619 use the Battelle Developmental Inventory evaluation tools to measure progress towards child outcome. FFY 2022 marks the second year transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI- 2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-3). While protocols were established, some confusion was apparent among evaluators. Children who received a BDI-2 for eligibility are required to have a BDI-2 upon exit. Multiple occasions were noted when the incorrect tool was used upon exit. This resulted in the tests being invalid and unusable. As a result, the completion rate for FFY 2022 was 57.96%.
• The state continues to make available through the BDI publisher, Riverside, online training modules for all evaluators, one specific for infants and toddlers from birth to age three. SD Part C in collaboration with Part B 619 is tracking the number of LEA personnel who have completed the training.
• August 3, 2023, the state Part C program, in collaboration with Part B 619, hosted a statewide, in-person, Early Intervention Conference for all direct service providers (including school district staff), service coordinators and stakeholders. One entire strand of the conference was dedicated to implementation of the BDI and child outcomes. Speakers included experts from Riverside Insights Publishing and other content experts from across the nation including ECTA and DaSy. During the conference some direct service providers indicated confusion as to which BDI tool was to be used. The state notes, the total transition to the BDI-3 will occur in the FFY 2024 reporting year.

Accountability
• Through involvement with the Johns Hopkins RBM Academy, the state collaborated with multiple states and foreign countries to develop a set of indicators reflecting quality of the IFSP process. SD has adapted the RBI monitoring tool from New Zealand to be part of the overall monitoring event for results. The state will be piloting this in the spring of 2024.
• December 2023, the state awarded a contract to pursue a new comprehensive data system. This new system will be more robust and allow more rigorous monitoring ability. The system will include many new data elements, functionality and reporting features, including a parent portal. Once the new data system is functioning, the state will have the ability to monitor appropriateness of services based on the individual family priorities. The state will also be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the evidence-based practice (EBP) in relation to services and child outcomes. The new system also will have additional features to allow increased fiscal monitoring capabilities. Over the coming year the state will work with OSEP sponsored TA centers as the new data system is implemented.

Professional Development
• Leveraging ARP dollars, the state continued PD training of EBP to direct service providers (DSP) and peer coaching for fidelity of practice. The revised structure, which began FFY 2021, increased the number of DSP in each training cohort by 70%, shortening the timeframe to reach statewide implementation of EBP.
• Sustained fidelity reviews occurred during the most recent reporting period for providers who reached fidelity two years prior. Once notified, providers are paired with a state contracted content expert who facilitates an on-line refresher of the EBP followed by submission of a practice video with coaching support and a final video for sustained fidelity review. If the practice video is determined to meet sustained fidelity criteria a second video is not required.
• Service coordinators (SC), new to the state Part C program, take part in an online training in the EBP Routines Based Interview (RBI) facilitated by a veteran SC who has meet initial and sustained fidelity. Upon completion of the online portion, new SC have a practice period and then proceed with fidelity review. The veteran SC also serves as a coach during this period.
• The state continued to support the service coordinators’ RBI Mentoring Group at the local and state level to support fidelity of implementing the RBI with families of infants and toddlers.
• In summer 2023, the state offered an early literacy course for providers. The course, Children’s Literature explored how to increase family engagement with children by telling the family story. Providers were given content in early literacy instruction as well as author studies on the most engaging and well-known authors in early childhood. The final project was to create a family story in collaboration with a Birth to Three family and their child. Providers found this to be a rich activity to build a literacy bridge to last a lifetime. One provider, employed by a public school district, commented as a result of the course she would be refocusing her literacy curriculum for the coming year.
• Based off the summer 2023 early literacy participant feedback, the state concluded the value of including content surrounding literacy to all sustained fidelity reviews. This was done in effort to reach more providers. Beginning in October 2023 new content was added to the sustained fidelity curriculum. New content consisted of Visual Thinking Strategies and applying deep reflection methods during all early intervention home visits. These enhancements to the home visits will increase family’s literacy awareness and practices which can be done with their child during every day routines to increase the child’s oral literacy and higher order thinking.

Child Find and Workforce
• The Part C director continued to participate in the state’s Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Early Childhood Comprehensive System work as it relates to EI services and families disproportionately served.
• A pilot program, to study the impact of community play groups as a child find activity is taking place in a rural native community. The pilot has meet with much success and by year two the region had experienced a 67% increase in child count for that geographic location in the state. The state continues to monitor progress and collect data on this effort.
• The Part C professional development specialist collaboration with postsecondary professional preparation programs promoting early intervention career opportunities and the programs EBP focusing on family engagement has resulted in a $1 million dollar grant from U.S. Department of Education to the University of South Dakota to support education costs for physical, occupation and speech therapy students with an interest in practicing within early intervention programs. As part of the learning experience, students will complete a portion of their internships under the direction of existing South Dakota Part C providers serving infants and toddlers in geographic areas of the state demonstrating need for providers.

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

Below responses are aligned to the Action Strands outlined on the state’s Theory of Action and Evaluation Plans.

Data Quality
Regarding the strategies described in the Data Quality Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:
• South Dakota has a completion rate of 57.96% in FFY 2022, this is a 1.3% increase from FFY 2021.
• 290 individuals completed a BDI-3 training as of 6/30/2023.
• 80% of LEA’s have at least one evaluator who completed the training.
• The state continues to focus on implementation of the BDI. August 3, 2023, the state Part C program, in collaboration with Part B 619, hosted a statewide, in-person, Early Intervention Conference for all direct service providers (including school district staff), service coordinators and stakeholders. One entire strand of the conference was dedicated to implementation of the BDI and child outcomes. Speakers included experts from Riverside Insights Publishing and other content experts from across the nation including ECTA and DaSy.

The strategies designed to meet these short-term and intermediate outcomes in turn work towards increasing the percentage of usable child outcome data. This also contributes to scaling up and maintaining the fidelity of evaluators. This will ensure high quality data for child outcomes towards achieving the SiMR and sustaining systems improvement efforts.

Accountability
Regarding the strategies described in the Accountability Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:

• In 2021-2022, South Dakota joined a multi-state, international work group, led by Johns Hopkins University staff and Dr. Robin McWilliams known as the RBM Academy. One of the outcomes of the Johns Hopkins experience was the connection with New Zealand and the tool used to measure quality IFSPs. With New Zealand’s permission, South Dakota has adopted the tool and incorporated it and the state’s EBP sustained fidelity criteria into the state overall monitoring protocols for providers. This will now be included in South Dakota’s monitoring protocols moving forward. Each provider will take part in a monitoring event, including sustained fidelity review, a minimum of once in every six-year period. Incorporating these into one event elevates the importance of the IFSP quality and sustained fidelity.
• South Dakota Part C has contracted for the development of a new comprehensive data system to replace the existing legacy system. Work on the new system begins February 2024. The new data system will have the ability to monitor appropriateness of services based on the individual family priorities. The state will also be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the EBP in relation to services and child outcomes. The new system will have additional features encompassing increased fiscal monitoring capabilities. Over the coming year the state will work with OSEP sponsored TA centers as the new data system is implemented.

Professional Development
Regarding the strategies described in the Professional Development Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:

• The state continued to respond to provider requests for training conducive to full-time provider schedules. Condensed training options were made available in addition to the standard sixteen-week fall/spring semester rotation.
• The State increased statewide percentage of SC & DSP meeting initial fidelity
 \*100% of SC met initial fidelity
 \*100% of DSP met initial fidelity
• 100% of service coordinators in the state are trained and implementing the EBP as intended. One new service coordinator was trained in this time period.
• The state is over 95% towards statewide implementation of all direct service providers being trained and implementing as intended.
• A Sustained fidelity cohort for trainees that met initial fidelity in cohort 2 and 3 was held in fall 2023.
 \*100% DSP met fidelity through sustained fidelity coaching
• Fall 2023 the state initiated a mentoring opportunity for service coordinators who expressed enhanced needs working with families who were in strife. The needs expounded beyond the evidence-based practice. Service coordinators related challenges presented with mental and behavior health issues in families not necessarily related to the child being served by Part C. In response the state contracted with an internationally known early childhood and family relations expert to meet with regional service coordinators throughout the year and provide strategies to assist when working with families in strife. This group will continue to meet until June 2024.
• In August 2023 the state team met with peer coaches to evaluate the reliability and accuracy when scoring trainees fidelity of implementing the EBP. Coaches participated in a fidelity rubric calibration via an inter-rater reliably study. The state was pleased to note, all coaches are calibrated with 97% accuracy in coaching using the state fidelity rubric.
• A mentoring program for new providers began in the fall of 2023. A veteran direct service provider facilitates the program and assists the state in onboarding new providers. The provider meets with new early intervention providers who are unable to immediately access the full EBP training.
• DSP feedback throughout the year noted the increased needs of families addressing stressors often not directly related to the child in the Part C program. Providers expressed mental and behavioral health issues families were experiencing. In response, the state contracted with a licensed marriage and family therapist with extensive experience in adult education to hold regularly scheduled monthly zoom and quarterly face-to-face meetings with providers to offer professional advice on issues encountered in the field in regard to child behavior and family dynamics.
• In August 2023, the State held an early intervention conference open to all providers, service coordinators and other EI stakeholders. Topics included family centered practices, brain-based learning, post-covid impacts on children and families and serving families with dual sensory needs. Other presentations were made by the SD Division of Developmental Disabilities, Medicaid program and state PTI program. OSEP sponsored ECTA and DaSy staff presented on Understanding Child Outcomes; OSEP DMS; and Key Steps to Building a Culture of Data Use.

Child Find & Workforce
Regarding the strategies described in the Child Find and Workforce Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:

• 2023 notes the second year of the pilot program implemented in a rural Native American community, studying the impact of community play groups as a child find activity. The project has resulted in overwhelming success with a 67% increase in child count for that geographic location in the state and 75% increase in referrals. A second pilot was recommended by stakeholders in another native community. The state has contracted with a service coordination region and a search is currently under way for the person to lead the second pilot.
• The state Part C professional development representative presented to multiple university programs across the state that prepare direct service providers and other early intervention professionals. At the University of South Dakota 35 pre-internship PT students, 20 Pre-Internship OT students and 30 pre-internship SLP students were engaged in learning about early intervention. As a result the USD PT/OT/SLP pursued the state as a partner in their multi-year grant activities that include the state coordinate internship placement with early intervention (B-3) providers. The PD specialist will teach a university course on family engagement to PT/OT students beginning with the 2024-2025 academic year.
• Multi-lingual materials were developed for B-3 families and distributed throughout the state.

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

NO

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

The follow steps will be taken for each improvement strategy outlined by Action Strands on the Theory of Action and Evaluation Plans.

Data Quality Improvement Strategies
1. South Dakota will monitor for continuous improvement in obtaining, analyzing, and reporting BDI scores for children in Part C.
2. South Dakota will continue to provide BDI training in collaboration with 619.
Next Steps:
• Part C will continue to analyze data and ensure quality in collecting analyzing and reporting child outcome data from the BDI data.
• In collaboration with Part B 619, Part C will continue to train on BDI implementation and data quality protocols.

Accountability Improvement Strategy
1.South Dakota will develop and implement a monitoring protocol to address results and compliance.
Next Steps:
• The state will select a monitoring team to train and pilot the new set of indicators that will reflect quality IFSP processes.
• Part C will pilot new set of indicators that will reflect quality of IFSP processes in the spring 2024
• The state will begin development of new comprehensive data system.

Professional Development Improvement Strategies
1. South Dakota will continue to provide relevant and rigorous training under the State’s Bright Beginnings PD program.
2. South Dakota continue to design, enhance, and deliver training and TA opportunities as identified for service coordinators, direct service providers and families.
Next Steps:
• Adapt existing sustained fidelity coursework to reflect agency early literacy priorities, including state SiMR.
• Create and implement a training schedule for initial fidelity to accommodate smaller numbers of participants. Due to lower numbers the course will be offered more frequently.
• Continue rotation of coaching to compliment the rotation of initial fidelity.
• Continue with statewide implementation of EBP by SC and DSP meeting initial fidelity.
• Continue with sustained fidelity practices of SC and DSP, two years from initial fidelity.
• Continue with RBI mentor group for SC focusing on self-care strategies and reflective practices with families.
• Continue with “new to the EI field” provider mentoring.
• Full transition of all training materials to Department of Education new learning management system
• Develop and deliver family engagement course material to university OT, PT and SLP preparation programs.
• Coordinate pre-prep internship placements of OT, PT and SLP wishing to work with EI.
• Develop data driven topical professional development offerings beginning with Deaf / Hard of Hearing, and early intervention with Hispanic households.
• Create additional videos to be used in training and at conference to promote benefits of state evidence-based model Bright Beginnings and for use with families who may be cautious about Birth to Three services.
• Participate in the statewide Special Education Conference spring 2024.

Child Find and Workforce Improvement Strategies
1. South Dakota will increase awareness of EI routines-based family engagement services to all South Dakota Families.
2. South Dakota will attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet EI needs statewide.
Next Steps:
• Continue to analyze resources to assist all families to engage in EI process.
• Continue to develop multi-lingual materials for families including development and implementation of training regarding contextual factors for early intervention in Spanish speaking homes and for deaf and hard of hearing populations.
• Implement a second pilot project in a Native American community to study the impact of community play groups as a child find activity.
• Partner with state university PT, OT and SPR program personnel to redesign curriculum to include the Part C family engagement EBP to pre-professional students.
• Collaborate with state university Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy and SLP program prep programs through internship placements with established Birth to Three providers who are implementing the EBP as intended.

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

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

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

With Stakeholder input, the state selected the following two evidence-based practices:

1. Routines Based Interview (RBI) for family assessment, implemented by SC. The RBI is conducted with each family found eligible for Part C. Family priorities, identified from the RBI, lead to functional outcomes on the IFSP.

2. Getting Ready, University of Nebraska - Lincoln Center for Research on Children, Youth, Families and Schools, is implemented by direct service providers (DSP) during early intervention sessions. This EBP provides a framework to help guide exchanges, building on culturally relevant family and child strengths. It is not a curriculum or a packaged, stand-alone program, but an ecologically sound, intentional approach for infusing meaningful family engagement into all aspects of the natural early childhood environment. Getting Ready EBP strengthens relationships between DSP and families and helps DSP build parent competencies for interacting with their children, skills necessary for DSP to cultivate family and caregiver engagement as noted in the TOA.

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

The Routines-Based Interview is a semi-structured interview about the family's day-to-day life, focusing on the child's engagement, independence, and social relationships. Its purposes are to create a strong relationship with the family, to obtain a rich and thick description of child and family functioning, to determining the family’s ecology and the family’s needs and writing child-level functional goals and family goals. Service coordinators facilitate the three components of this evidence-based practice with all families of infants and toddlers who are found eligible for Part C program. The first component, the Ecomap, is developed to determine and depict the family’s informal, intermediate, and formal supports. The Routines-Based Interview is the second component through which service coordinators establish positive relationships with families and provides a rich and deep description of child and family functioning. The third component consists of the functional outcomes which are family chosen, child-level and family level.

The Getting Ready model of early childhood intervention (Sheridan, Edwards, & Knoche, 2003) recognizes the transactional nature of young children’s development and the important role parents play in their success. In the Getting Ready model, collaborative partnerships between parents and DSP are encouraged to promote parent’s competence and confidence in maximizing children’s natural learning opportunities and preparing both parents and children for long-term success. Parent-child interactions in everyday experiences, mutual observations and goal-directed problem solving, and young children’s successful development constitute the input, processes, and outcomes of the Getting Ready model.

The combining of these two evidence-based practices results in greater family engagement and increased child and family outcomes. Early intervention, when done as intended result in:
• Enhanced ability for DSP to implement individualized and culturally sensitive early intervention home visits that emphasize parent child interactions during typical routines in children’s homes and early care settings;
• Greater ability to promote families’ understanding of and ability to positively support, young children’s physical, social, emotional, cognitive and language development; and
• Promote family awareness of strategies to increase language and literacy rich learning experiences for their children.

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

The state collects data for both EBP being implemented and trained on.

1. Routines Based Interview – service coordinators are assessed through the initial fidelity review process using RBI criteria checklist by their assigned peer coach and second reviewer. Those who meet the criteria receive a “Certificate of Recognition” from state office.

During this reporting period one service coordinator took part in the initial fidelity process and 1met initial fidelity. 100% of service coordinators have met initial fidelity.

As part of the state data system, service coordinators enter RBI information into the online IFSP system. From here, state team members can do spot checks to determine if RBI’s are being done consistently. Service Coordinators are also required to make note in the data system when an RBI has been completed for an IFSP.

Having gained significant knowledge about RBI sustained fidelity from participation in the John’s Hopkins RBM Academy, the state will continue the virtual RBI Mentor Group. The RBI mentor group will meet four times a year, with each meeting focusing on reflexive and reflective practice of one piece of the RBI at a time and culminating in a fidelity review.

2. Getting Ready – DSP are assessed through the initial fidelity review process using the evidence-based practice checklist by their assigned peer and master coach. Those who meet the criteria in implementing the evidence-based practice receive a “Certificate of Recognition” from South Dakota Department of Education. The certificate indicates they are “Recognized” as proficient in the EBP having met the established criteria and are a Tier 1 DSP.

• 100% Direct service providers met initial fidelity during the reporting period.

During the reporting period the state conducted sustained fidelity reviews for eight DSP who met initial fidelity two years prior. 100% of the providers met sustained fidelity. Over 80% met fidelity with one video submission, the remaining met with additional coaching and a second video submission. Family surveys are also collected as part of the sustained fidelity review process. These surveys are aligned to the EBP fidelity criteria and indicate overwhelming agreement with the impact the EBP has had on their family.

3. The state will begin development of a new comprehensive data system in February 2024. The existing data system was deemed obsolete by the state’s technology agency, in late 2022. The legacy system was created by the State’s technology agency and has outlived its capacity and capabilities. To assist in more seamless data collection, reduction of repetitive work, connection between families, providers, and service coordinators, a new data system is necessary. Stakeholders have been engaged in the process from early conception to ensure the best product available to meet the state’s current and future needs. The state is utilizing OSEP sponsored DaSy technical assistance throughout these activities.

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

The state gathers feedback from direct service providers throughout the professional development. This reporting period survey responses on the influence this model has had on providers relationships with families include:
Question: This training influences my thinking about…
Examples of responses:
• how to get families involved and feel empowered.
• the importance of communication. I need to slow down and check for family understanding.
• the important role caregivers play in treatment.
• putting parents first and focusing more on how to encourage them to participate, not just jumping in with my ideas.

Question: The most critical thing I have learned is…
Examples of responses:
• how I can get families to understand the impact of the first three years.
• sessions are not about what I want, but what the family needs.

Question: Was learning this model of family centered early intervention useful?
97% indicated agree or strongly agree.

The state uses the ECO Family Outcome Survey to provide data for indicator C4. The survey supports the state’s efforts to engage families by building confidence and competence in supporting their infant or toddler with developmental delays or disabilities. One portion of the survey asks families a series of question related to communicating their child(s) needs. One survey question asks families “How helpful has early intervention been in….. listening to you and respecting your choices".
• 95% of families responded the Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful.
• Notably 100% of Native American families responded as very helpful or extremely helpful.

Another portion of the survey asks families a series of questions related to helping your child develop and learn. One survey question asks families “how helpful has early intervention been in identifying things you do that help your child learn and grow”.
• 92% families responded the Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful.

The state sponsored 2023 Early intervention conference focused on “I” Am Early Intervention. The “I" reflecting the I in Individualized, IFSP, and of course, I as a DSP intimately involved in early intervention. This promoted DSP and service coordinator roles in early intervention and family engagement that supports evidence-based early intervention practices. An astounding 95% of conference survey respondents indicated the sessions directly impacted their work in early intervention and 80% would like to hear from all the presenters again.

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

South Dakota will continue to implement training on the selected evidence-based practices.

Routines Based Interview: Service coordinator training on the RBI evidence-based practice will continue as new service coordinators come on board. Participants of the RBI Mentoring Group will begin their sustained fidelity reviews in the coming reporting period.

Getting Ready: Due to the state’s movement towards statewide implementation of EBP the state will be restructuring the DSP professional development to accommodate smaller participant numbers. The state recognizes not 100% of providers have been trained, however, the majority of those remaining represent new providers awaiting a training cohort to begin or providers who are not actively serving a Part C / Birth to Three child. To accommodate this new norm, the state will be restructuring DSP professional development to accommodate smaller participant numbers. A new rotation of training will begin spring 2024. The coursework will be offered more frequently but for a shorter amount of time. Courses will begin the first week of each month with completion at the end of week six. Coursework will remain the same, and all participants will continue to be paired with a peer coach to complete the fidelity review process. This increased frequency and shorter turnaround will allow the state to offer the PD training more “on demand” and thus train new providers upon entering the Part C program. The state notes this new system is a more sustainable practice now with smaller numbers.
For sustainability, the state is restructuring existing provider compliance monitoring to include results and fidelity of implementing the EBP.

Beginning spring 2024, the state’s monitoring events will include a component focusing on sustained implementation of the EBP. This will result in each provider participating in a sustained fidelity event at least once in every six year period.

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

NO

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

The reader will note throughout this FFY 2022 SSIP report, the state has described completed activities, outcomes achieved, and next steps. Any adjustments or modifications were discussed in detail based on the evaluation data provided, including stakeholder input.

Getting Ready: Based upon the state's significant movement towards statewide implementation of the EBP the state will be restructuring the course timelines to accommodate smaller participant numbers and offer the PD more often.

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has a strong relationship with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC). Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The majority of SICC meetings are held virtually to accommodate members significant travel distances, annually the SICC meets in person for an all-day retreat to review and analyze data, discuss trends, successes and challenges as well as provide in-depth guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, State ICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and meeting minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public. Meeting announcements are posted a minimum of 72 hours before the meeting is scheduled, not including weekends and holidays. Information on how to join the meeting either virtually or in person are also made available at the time agendas are posted. Accommodations are made available with adequate notice. Each meeting of the SICC contains a Public Comment period, during this time the SICC Chair asks for any public comment. This is reflected in the presentation and minutes of each meeting. A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program 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 Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2022, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

To ensure broad representation, these stakeholders represent a variety of factors including demographics such as county residence, city vs. rural, geographic location within the state, race/ethnicity of self and of household, current employer, previous employment as relates to children and families, and civic or community organization affiliation. The stakeholders indicate representing the state’s geographic lay out, including those residing on tribal lands. Stakeholders identify themselves or their household as 21% Native American, 4% Black or African American, 9% Hispanic, 4% Native Hawaiian, 4% 2 or more races and 58% white. The stakeholder group consists of 10 parents who self-reported present and past employment increased the representation to include childcare provider, small business owner, tribal school district, educator, school liaison, Indian Health Services, researcher with Indigenous communities, elementary educator, social worker, foster parents, and residential treatment center aid. Civic entities represented youth sporting, 4H, religious entities, child protection councils, domestic abuse shelter, developmental disabilities, Boys and Girls club, residential centers, tribal school district, professional association, residential counselor, and United Way. The diversity of the stakeholder membership and the broad reach of their work outside of the Part C stakeholder group and experience working with families leads to valuable discussions of resources, challenges, initiative, collaboration and recommendations.

Beginning in August 2022, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2022 Determinations in relation to state performance and progress towards SSIP implementation. At each SICC meeting, during FFY 2022, state team members shared State Systemic Improvement Plan activities and updates, preliminary data for the FFY 2022 SPP/APR and data quality initiatives.

Over this past year the state Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from OSEP sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA met with SICC members to analyze and discuss trend and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional FFY2022 data in relation to targets, begin the process of asking what critical questions data could provide and review progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan SiMR. This work was finalized during the January 2024 meeting with the presentation of the final FFY 2022 SPP/APR. After reviewing the data, the SICC unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

The reader will note, the work related to enhancing a statewide culture of data use was a focus at the state’s Early Intervention Conference, held August 3, 2023. Representatives of OSEP sponsored TA, DaSy and ECTA, presented on topics such as analyzing and using child and family outcomes data and DMS 2.0. The state also had representatives from Riverside Publishing, author of the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI) tools, meet with program stakeholders consisting of direct service providers (including school district personnel), service coordinators, SICC members, parents, and other partners in attendance, to review the BDI3 in conjunction with measuring of child progress.

Other stakeholders, proving feedback in the state’s SPP/APR and SSIP activities include monthly virtual meetings with service coordination regional staff, quarterly virtual meetings with direct service providers (including school district staff), and quarterly meetings with Tier 1 status providers (Tier 1 status are those direct service providers who have successfully completed all mandatory professional development and fidelity criteria and are implementing the state evidence-based practice as intended).

The reader will note throughout the SPP/APR, additional stakeholder input will be described within respective indicators.

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

South Dakota greatly values the input stakeholders have provided throughout the SSIP process and continues to seek input for continuous program improvement. Over this reporting year, the Part C program professional development staff met regularly with the service coordinator group as well as the RBI Mentor group. Both groups meet monthly to provide input and suggestions to the state.

The professional development staff meet regularly with contracted content experts, instructors, peer coaches and master coaches to evaluate progress and determine any needs for improvement. Through pre and post surveys, the state gathers valuable input from direct service providers and service coordinators who are participating in their respective professional development trainings. Survey responses measure if training was useful and if participants believe it will improve child and family outcomes. Participants also share the impact of implementing the new EBP has on their professional interactions with families.

Throughout the year the state met with small workgroups and large stakeholder groups to review the state’s performance and provide feedback on implementation of the SSIP. In August 2023, a coaches meeting was held to review the ECP fidelity rubric, gather information about what providers are asking/struggling with in the field (items that might be part of future PD offerings) and engaged in an inter-rater reliability activity to see how well aligned all coaches are in their coaching methods and adherence to the fidelity rubric. During a December 2023 coaches meeting participants brainstormed and provided the state PD team suggestions on restructuring of the Bright Beginnings training calendar and coaching rotation to accommodate smaller participant numbers.

Led by long-standing Tier 1 DSP who serves as a Peer and Master coach, Tier 1 providers continued to meet quarterly to discuss implementation of the EBP. These experiences, suggestions and feedback were all provided to the state to continued improvement of EBP curriculum and practices.

Throughout the year the state has met with small work groups and large stakeholder groups to discuss the state’s performance. A culmination of these meetings occurred in October 2023. Here stakeholders took a full day to review the state’s SSIP and subsequent data. From this meeting stakeholders strongly encouraged the state team to hold firm to the intent of the SSIP and continue with the implementation strategies as described.

The state firmly believes it is through broad, continuous stakeholder input progress towards the SiMR and statewide implementation of EBP have occurred. Directly involving parent and early intervention providers have improved the state’s ability to continually improve efforts, with no delays in implementation.

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

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

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

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

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

Having leveraging ARP dollars and implementation of dual capacity building, the state is poised to continue to offer a sustainable and effective PD program, robust child find and workforce activities while building a culture of data among all stakeholders, including parents, providers, service coordinators, partner entities and state staff.

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - 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**

Designated 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 Coordinator

**Email:**

sarah.carter@state.sd.us

**Phone:**

605-773-4478

**Submitted on:**

04/17/24 9:15:21 AM

# Determination Enclosures

## RDA Matrix

**South Dakota**

2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination** (1)

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 87.50% | Meets Requirements |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

| **Section** | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 8 | 6 | 75.00% |
| **Compliance** | 14 | 14 | 100.00% |

**2024 Part C Results Matrix**

**I. Data Quality**

**(a) Data Completeness: The percent of children included in your State’s 2021 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of Children Reported in Indicator C3 (i.e., outcome data) | 579 |
| Number of Children Reported Exiting in 618 Data (i.e., 618 exiting data) | 999 |
| Percentage of Children Exiting who are Included in Outcome Data (%) | 57.96 |
| **Data Completeness Score** (please see Appendix A for a detailed description of this calculation) | 1 |

**(b) Data Anomalies: Anomalies in your State’s FFY 2021 Outcomes Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score** (please see Appendix B for a detailed description of this calculation) | 2 |

**II. Child Performance**

**(a) Data Comparison: Comparing your State’s 2022 Outcomes Data to other States’ 2022 Outcomes Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Comparison Score** (please see Appendix C for a detailed description of this calculation) | 2 |

**(b) Performance Change Over Time: Comparing your State’s FFY 2022 data to your State’s FFY 2021 data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Change Score** (please see Appendix D for a detailed description of this calculation) | 1 |

| **Summary Statement Performance** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1 (%)** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2 (%)** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1 (%)** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2 (%)** | **Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS1 (%)** | **Outcome C: Actions to Meet Needs SS2 (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY 2022**  | 45.83% | 76.17% | 76.94% | 61.14% | 84.15% | 71.50% |
| **FFY 2021**  | 38.63% | 71.35% | 74.16% | 57.30% | 88.76% | 77.82% |

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

**2024 Part C Compliance Matrix**

| **Part C Compliance Indicator** (2) | **Performance (%)**  | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2021** (3) | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 1: Timely service provision** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 7: 45-day timeline** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 8A: Timely transition plan** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 8B: Transition notification** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 8C: Timely transition conference** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Programmatic Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

**(2) The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at:** [**https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024\_Part-C\_SPP-APR\_Measurement\_Table.pdf**](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2024_Part-C_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf)

**(3) This column reflects full correction, which is factored into the scoring only when the compliance data are >=90% and <95% for an indicator.**

**Appendix A**

**I. (a) Data Completeness:**

**The Percent of Children Included in your State's 2022 Outcomes Data (Indicator C3)**

Data completeness was calculated using the total number of Part C children who were included in your State’s FFY 2022 Outcomes Data (C3) and the total number of children your State reported in its FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 data. A percentage for your State was computed by dividing the number of children reported in your State’s Indicator C3 data by the number of children your State reported exited during FFY 2022 in the State’s FFY 2022 IDEA Section 618 Exit Data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Completeness Score** | **Percent of Part C Children included in Outcomes Data (C3) and 618 Data** |
| **0** | **Lower than 34%** |
| **1** | **34% through 64%** |
| **2** | **65% and above** |

**Appendix B**

**I. (b) Data Quality:**

**Anomalies in Your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes Data**

This score represents a summary of the data anomalies in the FFY 2022 Indicator 3 Outcomes Data reported by your State. Publicly available data for the preceding four years reported by and across all States for each of 15 progress categories under Indicator 3 (in the FFY 2018 – FFY 2021 APRs) were used to determine an expected range of responses for each progress category under Outcomes A, B, and C. For each of the 15 progress categories, a mean was calculated using the publicly available data and a lower and upper scoring percentage was set 1 standard deviation above and below the mean for category a, and 2 standard deviations above and below the mean for categories b through e (numbers are shown as rounded for display purposes, and values are based on data for States with summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). In any case where the low scoring percentage set from 1 or 2 standard deviations below the mean resulted in a negative number, the low scoring percentage is equal to 0.

If your State's FFY 2022 data reported in a progress category fell below the calculated "low percentage" or above the "high percentage" for that progress category for all States, the data in that particular category are statistically improbable outliers and considered an anomaly for that progress category. If your State’s data in a particular progress category was identified as an anomaly, the State received a 0 for that category. A percentage that is equal to or between the low percentage and high percentage for each progress category received 1 point. A State could receive a total number of points between 0 and 15. Thus, a point total of 0 indicates that all 15 progress categories contained data anomalies and a point total of 15 indicates that there were no data anomalies in all 15 progress categories in the State's data. An overall data anomaly score of 0, 1, or 2 is based on the total points awarded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome A** | **Positive Social Relationships** |
| **Outcome B** | **Knowledge and Skills** |
| **Outcome C** | **Actions to Meet Needs** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category a** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning** |
| **Category b** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers** |
| **Category c** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it** |
| **Category d** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers** |
| **Category e** | **Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers** |

**Expected Range of Responses for Each Outcome and Category, FFY 2022**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome\Category** | **Mean** | **StDev** | **-1SD** | **+1SD** |
| **Outcome A\Category a** | 1.57 | 3.26 | -1.69 | 4.83 |
| **Outcome B\Category a** | 1.39 | 3 | -1.6 | 4.39 |
| **Outcome C\Category a** | 1.26 | 2.6 | -1.33 | 3.86 |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome\Category** | **Mean** | **StDev** | **-2SD** | **+2SD** |
| **Outcome A\ Category b** | 24.07 | 9.01 | 6.05 | 42.08 |
| **Outcome A\ Category c** | 20.96 | 13.11 | -5.27 | 47.19 |
| **Outcome A\ Category d** | 26.97 | 9.61 | 7.74 | 46.2 |
| **Outcome A\ Category e** | 26.43 | 15.4 | -4.37 | 57.23 |
| **Outcome B\ Category b** | 25.63 | 9.71 | 6.21 | 45.04 |
| **Outcome B\ Category c** | 29.44 | 12.56 | 4.32 | 54.57 |
| **Outcome B\ Category d** | 31.02 | 8.11 | 14.8 | 47.25 |
| **Outcome B\ Category e** | 12.51 | 8.23 | -3.96 | 28.98 |
| **Outcome C\ Category b** | 20.98 | 8.89 | 3.19 | 38.76 |
| **Outcome C\ Category c** | 23.49 | 13.59 | -3.68 | 50.66 |
| **Outcome C\ Category d** | 33.36 | 8.28 | 16.8 | 49.93 |
| **Outcome C\ Category e** | 20.91 | 15.22 | -9.53 | 51.35 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score** | **Total Points Received in All Progress Areas** |
| 0 | 0 through 9 points |
| 1 | 10 through 12 points |
| 2 | 13 through 15 points |

**Anomalies in Your State’s Outcomes Data FFY 2022**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Number of Infants and Toddlers with IFSP’s Assessed in your State** | **579** |

| **Outcome A — Positive Social Relationships** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 12 | 105 | 21 | 78 | 363 |
| **Performance (%)** | 2.07% | 18.13% | 3.63% | 13.47% | 62.69% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

| **Outcome B — Knowledge and Skills** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 8 | 99 | 118 | 239 | 115 |
| **Performance (%)** | 1.38% | 17.10% | 20.38% | 41.28% | 19.86% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

| **Outcome C — Actions to Meet Needs** | **Category a** | **Category b** | **Category c** | **Category d** | **Category e** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **State Performance** | 0 | 55 | 110 | 182 | 232 |
| **Performance (%)** | 0.00% | 9.50% | 19.00% | 31.43% | 40.07% |
| **Scores** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

|  | **Total Score** |
| --- | --- |
| **Outcome A** | 4 |
| **Outcome B** | 5 |
| **Outcome C** | 5 |
| **Outcomes A-C** | 14 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Anomalies Score** | 2 |

**Appendix C**

**II. (a) Data Comparison:**

**Comparing Your State’s 2022 Outcomes Data to Other States’ 2022 Outcome Data**

This score represents how your State's FFY 2022 Outcomes data compares to other States' FFY 2022 Outcomes Data. Your State received a score for the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements for your State compared to the distribution of the 6 Summary Statements in all other States. The 10th and 90th percentile for each of the 6 Summary Statements was identified and used to assign points to performance outcome data for each Summary Statement (values are based on data for States with a summary statement denominator greater than 199 exiters). Each Summary Statement outcome was assigned 0, 1, or 2 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell at or below the 10th percentile, that Summary Statement was assigned 0 points. If your State's Summary Statement value fell between the 10th and 90th percentile, the Summary Statement was assigned 1 point, and if your State's Summary Statement value fell at or above the 90th percentile the Summary Statement was assigned 2 points. The points were added up across the 6 Summary Statements. A State can receive a total number of points between 0 and 12, with 0 points indicating all 6 Summary Statement values were at or below the 10th percentile and 12 points indicating all 6 Summary Statements were at or above the 90th percentile. An overall comparison Summary Statement score of 0, 1, or 2 was based on the total points awarded.

*Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered or exited 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.*

*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.*

**Scoring Percentages for the 10th and 90th Percentile for Each Outcome and Summary Statement, FFY 2022**

| **Percentiles** | **Outcome A SS1** | **Outcome A SS2** | **Outcome B SS1** | **Outcome B SS2** | **Outcome C SS1** | **Outcome C SS2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **10** | 45.63% | 35.29% | 54.05% | 27.07% | 51.93% | 33.56% |
| **90** | 82.58% | 69.37% | 81.10% | 56.55% | 85.30% | 71.29% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Data Comparison Score** | **Total Points Received Across SS1 and SS2** |
| **0** | 0 through 4 points |
| **1** | 5 through 8 points |
| **2** | 9 through 12 points |

**Your State’s Summary Statement Performance FFY 2022**

| **Summary Statement (SS)** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS1** | **Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships SS2** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS1** | **Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills SS2** | **Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS1** | **Outcome C: Actions to meet needs SS2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Performance (%)** | 45.83% | 76.17% | 76.94% | 61.14% | 84.15% | 71.50% |
| **Points** | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Points Across SS1 and SS2(\*)** | 9 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your State’s Data Comparison Score** | 2 |

**Appendix D**

**II. (b) Performance Change Over Time:**

**Comparing your State’s FFY 2022 data to your State’s FFY 2021 data**

The Summary Statement percentages in each Outcomes Area from the previous year’s reporting (FFY 2021) is compared to the current year (FFY 2022) using the test of proportional difference to determine whether there is a statistically significant (or meaningful) growth or decline in child achievement based upon a significance level of p<=.05. The data in each Outcome Area is assigned a value of 0 if there was a statistically significant decrease from one year to the next, a value of 1 if there was no significant change, and a value of 2 if there was a statistically significant increase across the years. The scores from all 6 Outcome Areas are totaled, resulting in a score from 0 – 12. The Overall Performance Change Score for this results element of ‘0’, ‘1’, or ‘2’ for each State is based on the total points awarded. Where OSEP has approved a State’s reestablishment of its Indicator C3 Outcome Area baseline data the State received a score of ‘N/A’ for this element.

**Test of Proportional Difference Calculation Overview**

The summary statement percentages from the previous year’s reporting were compared to the current year using an accepted formula (test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the two percentages is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon a significance level of p<=.05. The statistical test has several steps. All values are shown as rounded for display purposes.

Step 1: Compute the difference between the FFY 2022 and FFY 2021 summary statements.

e.g., C3A FFY2022% - C3A FFY2021% = Difference in proportions

Step 2: Compute the standard error of the difference in proportions using the following formula which takes into account the value of the summary statement from both years and the number of children that the summary statement is based on

Sqrt[([FFY2021% \* (1-FFY2021%)] / FFY2021N) + ([FFY2022% \* (1-FFY2022%)] / FFY2022N)] = Standard Error of Difference in Proportions

Step 3: The difference in proportions is then divided by the standard error of the difference to compute a z score.

Difference in proportions /standard error of the difference in proportions = z score

Step 4: The statistical significance of the z score is located within a table and the *p* value is determined.

Step 5: The difference in proportions is coded as statistically significant if the *p* value is it is less than or equal to .05.

Step 6: Information about the statistical significance of the change and the direction of the change are combined to arrive at a score for the summary statement using the following criteria

0 = statistically significant decrease from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

1 = No statistically significant change

2= statistically significant increase from FFY 2021 to FFY 2022

Step 7: The score for each summary statement and outcome is summed to create a total score with a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 12. The score for the test of proportional difference is assigned a score for the Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score based on the following cut points:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Indicator 3 Overall Performance Change Score** | **Cut Points for Change Over Time in Summary Statements Total Score** |
| **0** | Lowest score through 3 |
| **1** | 4 through 7 |
| **2** | 8 through highest |

| **Summary Statement/ Child Outcome** | **FFY 2021 N** | **FFY 2021 Summary Statement (%)** | **FFY 2022 N** | **FFY 2022 Summary Statement (%)** | **Difference between Percentages (%)** | **Std Error** | **z value** | **p-value** | **p<=.05** | **Score: 0 = significant decrease; 1 = no significant change; 2 = significant increase** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SS1/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships** | 233 | 38.63% | 216 | 45.83% | 7.21 | 0.0465 | 1.5482 | 0.1216 | NO | 1 |
| **SS1/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills** | 418 | 74.16% | 464 | 76.94% | 2.78 | 0.0290 | 0.9577 | 0.3382 | NO | 1 |
| **SS1/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs** | 267 | 88.76% | 347 | 84.15% | -4.61 | 0.0275 | -1.6760 | 0.0937 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome A: Positive Social Relationships** | 541 | 71.35% | 579 | 76.17% | 4.82 | 0.0263 | 1.8317 | 0.067 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome B: Knowledge and Skills** | 541 | 57.30% | 579 | 61.14% | 3.84 | 0.0294 | 1.3070 | 0.1912 | NO | 1 |
| **SS2/Outcome C: Actions to meet needs** | 541 | 77.82% | 579 | 71.50% | -6.32 | 0.0259 | -2.4384 | 0.0148 | YES | 0 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total Points Across SS1 and SS2** | **5** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Your State’s Performance Change Score** | **1** |

## Data Rubric

**South Dakota**

**FFY 2022 APR** (1)

**Part C Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3** | 1 | 1 |
| **4** | 1 | 1 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8A** | 1 | 1 |
| **8B** | 1 | 1 |
| **8C** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | 1 | 1 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |

**APR Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** | 13 |
| **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2022 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
| **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 18 |

**(1) In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table.**

**618 Data** (2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
|  **Child Count/Settings Due Date: 8/30/23** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 2/21/24** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/15/23** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

**618 Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** | 9 |
| **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 2) = | 18.00 |

**Indicator Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 18 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 18.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 36.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 36.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.**

**(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2024 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part C 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits counts/ responses for an entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part C Child Count and Setting | Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAPS | 8/30/2023 |
| Part C Exiting | Part C Exiting Collection in EMAPS | 2/21/2024 |
| Part C Dispute Resolution  | Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 11/15/2023 |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all data elements, subtotals, totals as well as responses to all questions associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection. See the EMAPS User Guide for each of the Part C 618 Data Collections for a list of edit checks (available at: <https://www2.ed.gov/about/inits/ed/edfacts/index.html>).

## Dispute Resolution

**IDEA Part C**

**South Dakota**

**Year 2022-23**

A zero count should be used when there were no events or occurrences to report in the specific category for the given reporting period. Check “Missing’ if the state did not collect or could not report a count for the specific category. Please provide an explanation for the missing data in the comment box at the top of the page.

**Section A: Written, Signed Complaints**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(1) Total number of written signed complaints filed.** | 0 |
| (1.1) Complaints with reports issued. | 0 |
| (1.1) (a) Reports with findings of noncompliance. | 0 |
| (1.1) (b) Reports within timelines. | 0 |
| (1.1) (c) Reports within extended timelines. | 0 |
| (1.2) Complaints pending.  | 0 |
| (1.2) (a) Complaints pending a due process hearing.  | 0 |
| (1.3) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed.  | 0 |

**Section B: Mediation Requests**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.**  | 0 |
| (2.1) Mediations held.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (b) Mediations held no related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.2) Mediations pending.  | 0 |
| (2.3) Mediations not held.  | 0 |

**Section C: Due Process Complaints**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(3) Total number of due process complaints filed.**  | 0 |
| Has your state adopted Part C due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(1) or Part B due process hearing procedures under 34 CFR 303.430(d)(2)? | PARTB |
| (3.1) Resolution meetings (applicable ONLY for states using Part B due process hearing procedures). | 0 |
| (3.1) (a) Written settlement agreements reached through resolution meetings.  | 0 |
| (3.2) Hearings fully adjudicated.  | 0 |
| (3.2) (a) Decisions within timeline.  | 0 |
| (3.2) (b) Decisions within extended timeline. | 0 |
| (3.3) Hearings pending.  | 0 |
| (3.4) Due process complaints withdrawn or dismissed (including resolved without a hearing). | 0 |

**State Comments:**

**This report shows the most recent data that was entered by:**

South Dakota

**These data were extracted on the close date:**

11/15/2023

## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2024 will be posted in June 2024. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

## Final Determination Letter

June 18, 2024

Honorable Joseph Graves

Secretary of Education

South Dakota Department of Education

800 Governors Drive

Pierre, 57501

Dear Secretary Graves:

I am writing to advise you of the U.S. Department of Education’s (Department) 2024 determination under Sections 616 and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The Department has determined that South Dakota meets the requirements and purposes of Part C of the IDEA. This determination is based on the totality of South Dakota's data and information, including the Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2022 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), other State-reported data, and other publicly available information.

South Dakota's 2024 determination is based on the data reflected in South Dakota's “2024 Part C Results-Driven Accountability Matrix” (RDA Matrix). The RDA Matrix is individualized for South Dakota and consists of:

1. a Compliance Matrix that includes scoring on Compliance Indicators and other compliance factors;
2. a Results Matrix (including Components and Appendices) that include scoring on Results Elements;
3. a Compliance Score and a Results Score;
4. an RDA Percentage based on both the Compliance Score and the Results Score; and
5. South Dakota's Determination.

The RDA Matrix is further explained in a document, entitled “[How the Department Made Determinations under Sections 616(d) and 642 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in 2024: Part C](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/)” (HTDMD-C).

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is continuing to use both results data and compliance data in making the Department’s determinations in 2024, as it did for Part C determinations in 2015-2023. (The specifics of the determination procedures and criteria are set forth in the HTDMD-C document and reflected in the RDA Matrix for South Dakota.) For 2024, the Department’s IDEA Part C determinations continue to include consideration of each State’s Child Outcomes data, which measure how children who receive Part C services are improving functioning in three outcome areas that are critical to school readiness:

* positive social-emotional skills;
* acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
* use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Specifically, the Department considered the data quality and the child performance levels in each State’s Child Outcomes FFY 2022 data.

You may access the results of OSEP’s review of South Dakota's SPP/APR and other relevant data by accessing the EMAPS SPP/APR reporting tool using your State-specific log-on information at <https://emaps.ed.gov/suite/>. When you access South Dakota's SPP/APR on the site, you will find, in Indicators 1 through 11, the OSEP Response to the indicator and any actions that South Dakota is required to take. The actions that South Dakota is required to take are in the “Required Actions” section of the indicator.

It is important for your State to review the Introduction to the SPP/APR, which may also include language in the “OSEP Response” and/or “Required Actions” sections.

Your State will also find the following important documents in the Determinations Enclosures section:

1. South Dakota's RDA Matrix;
2. the HTDMD [link](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/);
3. “2024 Data Rubric Part C,” which shows how OSEP calculated the State’s “Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data” score in the Compliance Matrix; and
4. “Dispute Resolution 2022-2023,” which includes the IDEA Section 618 data that OSEP used to calculate the State’s “Timely State Complaint Decisions” and “Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions” scores in the Compliance Matrix.

As noted above, South Dakota's 2024 determination is Meets Requirements. A State’s 2024 RDA Determination is Meets Requirements if the RDA Percentage is at least 80%, unless the Department has imposed Specific Conditions on the State’s last three IDEA Part C grant awards (for FFYs 2021, 2022, and 2023), and those Specific Conditions are in effect at the time of the 2024 determination.

IDEA determinations provide an opportunity for all stakeholders to examine State data as that data relate to improving outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. The Department encourages stakeholders to review State SPP/APR data and other available data as part of the focus on improving equitable outcomes for infants, toddlers, children, and youth with disabilities. Key areas the Department encourages State and local personnel to review are access to high-quality intervention and instruction; effective implementation of individualized family service plans (IFSPs) and individualized education programs (IEPs), using data to drive decision-making, supporting strong relationship building with families, and actively addressing educator and other personnel shortages.

For 2025 and beyond, the Department is considering two additional criteria related to IDEA Part C determinations. First, the Department is considering as a factor OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three years ago). This factor would be reflected in the determination for each State through the “longstanding noncompliance” section of the Compliance Matrix beginning with the 2025 determinations. In implementing this factor, the Department is also considering beginning in 2025 whether a State that would otherwise receive a score of meets requirements would not be able to receive a determination of meets requirements if the State had OSEP-identified longstanding noncompliance (i.e., unresolved findings issued by OSEP at least three or more years ago). Second, the Department is reviewing whether and how to consider IDEA Part C results data reported under three indicators in order to improve results for all infants, toddlers, and children with disabilities. This review would include considering alternative scoring options for child outcome Indicator C-3 and considering as potential additional factors the information and data that States report under child find Indicators C-5 and C-6.

For the FFY 2023 SPP/APR submission due on February 1, 2025, OSEP is providing the following information about the IDEA Section 618 data. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data submitted as of the due date will be used for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR and the 2025 IDEA Part C Results Matrix and States will not be able to resubmit their IDEA Section 618 data after the due date. The 2023-24 IDEA Section 618 Part C data that States submit will automatically be prepopulated in the SPP/APR reporting platform for Part C SPP/APR Indicators 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10 (as they have in the past). Under EDFacts Modernization, States are expected to submit high-quality IDEA Section 618 Part C data that can be published and used by the Department as of the due date. States are expected to conduct data quality reviews prior to the applicable due date. OSEP expects States to take one of the following actions for all business rules that are triggered in the appropriate EDFacts system prior to the applicable due date: 1) revise the uploaded data to address the edit; or 2) provide a data note addressing why the data submission triggered the business rule. There will not be a resubmission period for the IDEA Section 618 Part C data.

As a reminder, South Dakota must report annually to the public, by posting on the State lead agency’s website, on the performance of each early intervention service (EIS) program located in South Dakota on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after South Dakota's submission of its FFY 2022 SPP/APR. In addition, South Dakota must:

1. review EIS program performance against targets in South Dakota's SPP/APR;
2. determine if each EIS program “meets the requirements” of Part C, or “needs assistance,” “needs intervention,” or “needs substantial intervention” in implementing Part C of the IDEA;
3. take appropriate enforcement action; and
4. inform each EIS program of its determination.

Further, South Dakota must make its SPP/APR available to the public by posting it on the State lead agency’s website. Within the upcoming weeks, OSEP will be finalizing a State Profile that:

1. includes South Dakota's determination letter and SPP/APR, OSEP attachments, and all State attachments that are accessible in accordance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973; and
2. will be accessible to the public via the ed.gov website.

OSEP appreciates South Dakota's efforts to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and looks forward to working with South Dakota over the next year as we continue our important work of improving the lives of children with disabilities and their families. Please contact your OSEP State Lead if you have any questions, would like to discuss this further, or want to request technical assistance.

Sincerely,



Valerie C. Williams

Director

Office of Special Education Programs

cc: State Part C Coordinator