

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part C**

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

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**South Dakota**



**PART C DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C is known as the Birth to Three program in South Dakota and is housed within the Department of Education within the Division of Educational Services and Support. This division is comprised of SPED Part B, Title, Child and Adult Nutrition (CANs) and SPED Part C.

The Birth to Three program has contracts with six regional Birth to Three programs throughout the state. These regional programs provide the service coordination for all 66 counties in South Dakota. South Dakota Birth to Three has a strong partnership with school districts as all evaluations for Birth to Three are conducted by school district personnel. This creates a link for family engagement and communication between families, Birth to Three and the child's resident school district.

South Dakota Birth to Three utilizes an online data system in which Individualized Family Service Plans are entered. This secure system allows for real time information for providers, service coordinators and state staff. Through this system, South Dakota can verify that regional programs and providers are consistently achieving high levels of compliance with IDEA requirements.

The federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) evaluates states data using the Results-Driven Accountability (RDA) Matrix. The RDA Matrix is individualized and annually each state receives a Determination of Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance or Needs Intervention. The determination is based on combined scoring of two components 1) Compliance and 2) Results for an overall score. States scoring 80% or greater are Determined to Meet Requirements. States with at least 60% but less than 80% would be Needs Assistance and State's with less than 60% are Needs Intervention.

South Dakota received 100% in the Compliance component and 62.5% in Results for an overall percentage of 81.25%. This resulted in South Dakota's 2019 OSEP Determination of Meets Requirements for Part C of IDEA. Over the past four years with the assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as DaSy, ECTA, NCSI and IDC as well as collaboration with the National BDI Users Group, BDI States and BDI Publisher South Dakota has taken necessary steps to improve child outcome data. South Dakota will continue to work with these groups towards continued improvement for children and families served.

#### General Supervision System

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

The South Dakota Birth to Three program policies and procedures are based on the federal regulations for Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) at 34 CFR Part 303 and state rules at Article 24:14. The following is an overview of the State's general supervision system:

##### Infrastructure

The lead agency is the Department of Education. The Birth to Three program has divided the state into six regions which include 66 counties. Every five years, the Birth to Three program puts forth a Request for Proposal (RFP) to provide service coordination. This RFP is advertised to the public and interested organizations through the State of South Dakota Bureau of Administration's procurement management office. Upon approval, one-year contracts are approved with recipients submitting financial and budgetary information through quarterly progress reports. Early intervention providers are required to submit certification, licensure, and background checks to ensure they meet the state's qualified standards. These documents are reviewed by Birth to Three state staff. Early intervention providers sign an annual provider agreement to abide by all federal and state laws and regulations which include requirements related to serving children in natural environments, implementation of the state's evidence based model, confidentiality and code of ethics. In addition, the state Birth to Three office provides oversight to school district programs providing Birth to Three services to children who meet specific eligibility requirements.

In the summer of 2015, in conjunction with the State Systemic Improvement Plan Phase II, South Dakota restructured the Birth to Three program state leadership team. In order to better meet the needs of the Birth to Three program and support the systemic changes of the SSIP, a team member was designated to provide statewide technical assistance, a team member was devoted to data analysis and data quality, and another team member to the professional development associated with the evidence-based practices and the training that will be ongoing. Each program specialist is, however, cross-trained for each area to ensure full assistance to Birth to Three partners.

##### Data System

The State Birth to Three program has an online data system that includes data on programmatic and demographic elements and includes all children's IFSPs. The system also facilitates the billing process for early intervention services. The billing system allows early intervention providers to only bill for what was written by the IFSP team in regard to frequency/intensity/location of early intervention services. Each provider reimbursement request, submitted via the online system, is reviewed by Birth to Three state office staff to ensure state and federal regulations and guidelines are met before payment is approved. All provider reimbursement requests are linked to IFSPs. Providers are unable to bill for services that are not linked to an IFSP.

The State Birth to Three online IFSP data system also allows service coordinators to view reports relating to child count verification and SPP/APR indicators. There are several reports that serve as edit checks in order to assist service coordinators in ensuring the data they enter are valid and reliable. Examples of this would be: Child Count Verification; Transition Conference Report; Exit Child List; etc.

##### Monitoring

The Birth to Three state office conducts ongoing monitoring activities on all programs and services. The six regional programs are held responsible for implementing the Birth to Three program consistent with federal and state requirements. The state data system is the primary source of monitoring data. State staff are able to review compliance and reports on most SPP/APR indicators through the data system. In some instances, state staff conduct

additional drill-down and inquiry to obtain information on reasons for potential delay or other factors important to consider in monitoring for requirements.

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

Focused monitoring involves reviewing specific children's files, interviewing service coordinators, early intervention providers, parents, etc. Findings resulting from the focused monitoring are issued as necessary. A corrective action plan for compliance issues or an improvement plan for data slippage is developed involving the regional service coordinators and others (e.g. early intervention providers, school districts, etc.). State Birth to Three staff approve the corrective action plan or improvement plan and provide technical assistance, assuring all improvement activities are completed in accordance with federal requirements. Verification of correction of any noncompliance is made in accordance with the required 2 prongs of correction in OSEP 09-02.

If a regional program does not meet the corrective action plan within one year, the state uses the additional incentives and/or sanctions as identified in writing to the agency. The content of the letter would include the following information:

1. Failure to voluntarily correct an identified deficiency constitutes a failure to administer the program in compliance with federal law.
2. The action the Division of Educational Services and Support (DESS) / State Department of Education intends to take in order to enforce compliance with the state and federal law.
3. The right to a hearing prior to DESS exercise of its enforcement; and
4. The consequences of the DESS enforcement action on continued and future state and federal funding.

#### Dispute Resolution

Public and parent concerns may be submitted to the state office at any time. Program contact information and a 1-800 number is available on the Birth to Three website and public awareness materials. Dispute resolution processes consistent with federal and state regulation are available including: state administrative complaint resolution, due process hearing, mediation and resolution.

#### Technical Assistance System:

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

The South Dakota Birth to Three program provides ongoing comprehensive technical assistance (TA) that includes the provision of specific technical assistance to regional service coordination programs and direct service providers. State staff are available and provide daily real-time TA via telephone calls and emails and onsite visits as requested.

Scheduled service coordinator and direct service provider calls are offered to provide TA on specific topics including improvement strategies for data quality, SPP/APR indicator training, child outcomes, outreach with other state partners and collaboration with family/community support entities.

Technology is used to provide ongoing support as well. This includes a state listserv which is used to send information to service coordinators, school districts, SICC members and early intervention providers statewide. The listserv is used to provide pertinent program information about policy and procedure updates, rules and regulations, program needs/shortages, and training opportunities.

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

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

The state staff have developed and provided regional staff a self-monitoring checklist that covers the SPP/APR indicators and federal/state rules and regulations. This is recommended to be used by regional staff to determine the status of their implementation of Part C requirements to guide their ongoing supervision and continuous improvement. Regional programs can request technical assistance from state staff as needed to address any issues identified.

The state team also uses the results of the annual APR performance including the results from the annual parent surveys to help plan technical assistance activities.

#### Professional Development System:

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

The South Dakota Birth to Three program's Professional Development system has a number of components including:

1. All providers who work in the program must meet qualified personnel standards as required by federal and state regulations.
2. All new service coordinators receive several days of one-on-one trainings along with comprehensive online module training on evidence-based practices.
3. All new service coordinators receive peer coaching to reach fidelity in implementing evidence based practice.
4. All new service providers receive one-on-one reimbursement training.
5. Annual face to face training is held for all Birth to Three service coordinators on a statewide and/or regional basis.
6. Monthly service coordinator calls are held with Birth to Three state staff and include updates on policies and procedures, and presentations on relevant topics by Parent Connection (State PTI) and other state agency partners (i.e. Medicaid, Department of Social Services Child Protection Division etc.). Topics have included implementation of routines-based home visiting, Routines Based Interview (RBI) implementation and fidelity, functional outcomes, child development, parent rights, hearing services, vision services, outcome writing, state and federal rules, interpreter services, etc.
7. Statewide and regional public trainings are offered on topics such as early literacy, family engagement, evidence-based practices, early childhood guidelines and a Birth to Three program overview. These trainings are open to service coordinators and direct service providers.
8. Periodic training events are also held as needed for service providers related to use of private insurance, Medicaid reimbursement, and tele-therapy.
9. An online platform is used continuously to support the ongoing professional development needs of service coordinators and direct service providers. This comprehensive learning opportunity provides a support system and promotes participation in ongoing professional development regardless of physical location. Within this online tool, modules have been developed to meet the specific needs of the early interventionist in implementing identified evidence-based practices and measuring child and family outcomes. Using this platform, the South Dakota Birth to Three program is building a continuum of learning opportunities for our early interventionists regardless of their role in the Birth to Three program. Established as a private learning community, participants can also access research, a video library, discussion boards and blogs. Resources are available for new and seasoned early interventionists. This online tool is facilitated by Birth to Three state professional development staff. The online platform provides cost-effective training opportunities for the SSIP. It also proves a reliable tool to present current and accurate information to all early interventionists.
10. Periodic training opportunities are provided in collaboration with other state and community agencies including the Center for Disabilities, Part B, Parent Connection, Head Start, Medicaid, MIECHV, Child Care Services and Human Services.

## **Stakeholder Involvement:**

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

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

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

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

YES

## **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

The South Dakota Birth to Three State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) is located on the state's Department of Education website at <https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/>. Program APRs from the last several years are also posted on this site under "Public Reporting".

The South Dakota Birth to Three program annually reports to the public on performance of each region for Indicators C1 to C8 as compared to state performance. These reports titled Regional Performance are located on the Birth to Three website at <http://doe.sd.gov/Birthto3/> under Public Reporting and posted within the required federal timelines.

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

Public Notices are posted in the five (5) major South Dakota newspapers notifying the public of the website <https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/>, where State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) and regional reports can be accessed and availability of hard copies of the reports upon request. Newspapers printing the public notices are as follows: Sioux Falls Argus Leader; Aberdeen American News; Huron Plainsman; Pierre Capital Journal; and Rapid City Journal.

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

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

## **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**Intro - OSEP Response**

**Intro - Required Actions**

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

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

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

### Data Source

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

### Measurement

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

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

### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	100.00%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
276	301	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

25

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

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

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

State database

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

XXX

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

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2018.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

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

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

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

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

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

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**1 - OSEP Response**

**1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	96.80%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	96.80%	96.80%	96.80%	96.80%	96.80%
Data	98.96%	99.92%	99.83%	100.00%	99.92%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	97.00%	97.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

### Prepopulated Data

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

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,224	1,227	99.92%	97.00%	99.76%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**2 - OSEP Response**

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

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

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

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

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

#### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

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

#### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

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

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

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

### 3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

#### Historical Data

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

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	51.00%	51.00%

Target A2>=	85.50%	85.50%
Target B1>=	60.00%	60.00%
Target B2>=	70.00%	70.00%
Target C1>=	57.76%	60.00%
Target C2>=	85.00%	70.00%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

751

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

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	101	267	52.34%	51.00%	37.83%	Did Not Meet Target	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	569	751	80.67%	85.50%	75.77%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	415	554	75.95%	60.00%	74.91%	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	435	751	61.04%	70.00%	57.92%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

South Dakota continues to focus on the quality of Indicator C3 in accurately measuring child outcomes. The state noted slippage in four outcome areas: Child Outcome A: Summary Statement 1 and 2, Child Outcome B: Summary Statement 2 and Child Outcome C Summary Statement 2. Using the OSEP Meaningful Difference Calculator Child Outcome A was noted as the outcome with a meaningful difference (see attachment). The state team sought

assistance from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance center and private consultant with expertise in child outcome data and the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) evaluation tool used by South Dakota to measure child outcomes.

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

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

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

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

	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	33	4.39%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	115	15.31%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	216	28.76%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	387	51.53%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	331	364	93.20%	57.76%	90.93%	Met Target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	603	751	83.41%	85.00%	80.29%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

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

XXX

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

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

It was determined the observed decline in summary statement 1 is related to an increased percentage of infants and toddlers exiting the program who did not make progress relative to same age peers. This could mean that there was a decrease in the child's standard score between entry and exit or

that their standard score remained the same between entry and exit. State staff considered multiple hypotheses to explain the observed slippage including changes to data collection fidelity and subgroup differences including regional areas, Medicaid usage, race/ethnicity and Exit reason. None of these hypotheses were supported by the analysis. Another hypothesis to explain this decline is that parents better understand the meaning of the interview questions on the BDI-2 after participation in the evidence-based practice. Parents participating in the evidence-based practice receive coaching to increase their ability to communicate with others about their child's development. This increased skill in communicating about child development could improve the accuracy of the parent's report of their child's development at exit. This increased accuracy of parent report could lead to a lower standard score at time 2 because the parents are able to understand and describe their child's behavior. This was further supported when SICC members reviewed the SPP/APR. South Dakota SICC members include school district SPED staff with knowledge of the evaluation process and the BDI-2 tool. SICC member stated dependent upon who the adult is providing the information during the evaluation (i.e. child care provider, Head Start, parent etc), ability could be determined differently because of the social interaction that adult witnesses. The state is currently conducting follow-up quantitative and qualitative analysis to examine this hypothesis further.

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

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

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

XXX

**Historical Data**

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

<b>C2</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2 AR</b>	XXX	Target>=	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
<b>C2 AR</b>	XXX	Data	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target A1 >=	XXX	XXX
A1 AR	XXX	
Target A2 >=	XXX	XXX
A2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B1 >=	XXX	XXX
B1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target B2 >=	XXX	XXX
B2 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C1 >=	XXX	XXX
C1 AR	XXX	XXX
Target C2 >=	XXX	XXX
C2 AR	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

XXX

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

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for A1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for A2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	XXX	XXX
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	XXX	XXX
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	XXX	XXX

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

<b>Not including at-risk infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

XXX

<b>Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers</b>	<b>Numerator</b>	<b>Denominator</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**Provide reasons for B1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Provide reasons for B2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

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

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

Not including at-risk infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable

XXX

Just at-risk infants and toddlers/All infants and toddlers	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX
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	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for C1 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide reasons for C2 AR/ALL slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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	1,148
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.	285

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

	Yes / No
Has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide sampling plan.	

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

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

NO

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

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

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

In South Dakota, school districts are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine a child's eligibility for Part C services. The Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) is the tool utilized by Part B 619 and Part C programs for reporting child outcomes. Children are evaluated using this consistent method which enhances the validity of the data. The entry scores are determined by the standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child. An "exit" BDI-2 assessment is given to children who have been in the Birth to Three program for at least 6 months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs and secondly for the Part C program to determine child's developmental status.

Entry and exit BDI-2 scores are stored in the BDI-2 database. From this database, state Part C staff retrieve scores of children who have exited the Part C program during the reporting period. Part C state staff collaborate with evaluators and the Part B 619 coordinator to ensure all appropriate testing was completed and scores reported. BDI-2 entry and exit scores are then compared for those exiting children, and formulated according to the state's BDI-2 business rules to determine the child's progress in the three outcomes areas.

During FFY2018, July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019, 1148 children exited the Birth to Three program of which 751 children had qualifying entry and exit BDI-2 scores. Entry scores for the 751 exiting children were compared to their exit scores using the defined state business rules. Resulting data were entered into the Emaps Indicator C3 table and reported accordingly. The 751 exiting children computes to a 65.42% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. This completion rate is a 2.31% increase from FFY2017 completion rate of 63.11%. South Dakota will continue to monitor and provide technical assistance to increase the completion percentage for indicator C3.

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

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

### 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

### 3 - OSEP Response

### 3 - Required Actions

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2006	Target >=	93.90%	93.90%	93.90%	93.90%	94.00%
A	93.90%	Data	96.83%	99.67%	99.19%	98.97%	98.78%
B	2006	Target >=	89.40%	89.40%	89.40%	89.40%	89.50%
B	89.40%	Data	97.74%	98.68%	98.92%	98.27%	98.79%
C	2006	Target >=	89.30%	89.30%	89.30%	89.30%	89.50%
C	89.30%	Data	96.38%	98.68%	98.38%	98.96%	99.09%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A >=	94.10%	94.10%
Target B >=	90.00%	90.00%
Target C >=	90.00%	90.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child

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

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	1,116
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	359
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	356
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	358
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	353
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	358
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	354
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	357

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	98.78%	94.10%	99.44%	Met Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	98.79%	90.00%	98.60%	Met Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	99.09%	90.00%	99.16%	Met Target	No Slippage

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

XXX

	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	
If the plan has changed, please provide the sampling plan.	

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

	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
If your collection tool has changed, upload it here	XXX
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

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

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

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

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

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

Of parents who returned a survey:

- 12.53% indicated their child is American Indian/Alaska Native and 11.98% of Part C children were American Indian/Alaska Native;
- 2.23% indicated their child is Asian and 1.30% of Part C children are Asian;
- 1.11% indicated their child is Black or African American and 2.44% of Part C children are Black or African American;
- 3.62% indicated their child is Hispanic and 6.28% of Part C children are Hispanic;
- 3.90% indicated their child is multi-racial and 4.81% of Part C children are Hispanic;
- 1.08% indicated their child is Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander and 0.41% of Part C children are Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander;
- 74.93% indicated their child is white and 72.78% of Part C children are white; and
- 1.39% of parents did not indicate their child's ethnicity.

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

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

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

#### 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

#### 4 - OSEP Response

#### 4 - Required Actions

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	0.82%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.82%	0.85%
Data	1.64%	1.67%	1.26%	1.63%	1.76%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	0.86%	0.88%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

### Prepopulated Data

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

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
169	12,109	1.76%	0.86%	1.40%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Compare your results to the national data**

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

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

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

**5 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**5 - OSEP Response**

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

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

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

### 6 - Indicator Data

Baseline	2009	2.81%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.81%	2.82%
Data	3.21%	3.43%	3.17%	3.25%	3.29%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.83%	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. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

#### Prepopulated Data

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

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,227	37,020	3.29%	2.83%	3.31%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

**Compare your results to the national data**

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

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

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

**6 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**6 - OSEP Response**

**6 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### Measurement

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

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

#### Instructions

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	97.30%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.44%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
223	287	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

64

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C7, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2018.

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

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

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

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

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

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

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR**

**7 - OSEP Response**

**7 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8A - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

If no, please explain.

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
159	164	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

**Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable**

XXX

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

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

5

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

State database

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

XXX

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

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2018.

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

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

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

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

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**8A - OSEP Response**

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	100.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

If no, please explain.

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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
164	164	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Number of parents who opted out

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

0

Describe the method used to collect these data

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

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

NO

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

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

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

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

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**8B - OSEP Response**

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

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

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	94.60%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	99.38%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

If no, please explain.

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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
159	164	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met Target	No Slippage

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

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

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

0

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

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

5

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

State database

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

XXX

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

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the 2nd quarter of FFY2018 (Oct. 1, 2018 to Dec. 31, 2018).

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

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The State selected the second quarter of FFY2018 (October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Birth to Three program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY2018.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

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

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

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

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

XXX

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

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

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

XXX

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

XXX

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

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

XXX

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**8C - OSEP Response**

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

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

#### 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

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

#### Select yes to use target ranges.

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Provide an explanation below.**

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/11/2019	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. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The

diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the Governor's office.

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

**Historical Data**

<b>Baseline</b>					
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target>=					
Data					

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target>=		

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0				N/A	N/A

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolutions sessions	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**9 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**9 - OSEP Response**

**9 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

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

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

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

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

#### Instructions

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

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

NO

#### Provide an explanation below

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	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. Through quarterly meetings, members are kept abreast of program development and data trends. The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the 5-year Birth to Three SPP/APR plan. This was through regularly scheduled SICC meetings as well as other communications.

In September 2019, the SICC convened to review Birth to Three 2019 Determinations and data trends in relation to targets. SICC members reviewed and analyzed state and regional data with special consideration of data quality, child count trends, South Dakota exiting data, national data and child outcome business rules. During this meeting SICC members also began an in-depth review of Family Outcome Indicator (C4). As the focus of South Dakota's State Systemic Improvement Plan is family engagement, SICC members are tuned into the importance of Indicator C4. Over the course of the next year the SICC will continue to examine other options and suggest possible changes to the existing tool used to collect this data.

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

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

To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota's Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health, South Dakota State University Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff. The diversity of membership results in valuable discussion of resources, challenges, initiatives and recommendations.

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

A final copy of the SPP/APR is provided to the Secretary of Education who is a member of the Governor's cabinet. A copy is also provided to the

Governor's office.

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

**Historical Data**

<b>Baseline</b>	2005				
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target>=					
Data					

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target>=		

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

**Targets**

<b>FFY</b>	2018 (low)	2018 (high)	2019 (low)	2019 (high)
Target	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

**FFY 2018 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 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target (low)	FFY 2018 Target (high)	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX	XXX

Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

XXX

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

Response to actions required in FFY 2017 SPP/APR

**10 - OSEP Response**

**10 - Required Actions**

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

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

### **Certify**

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

### **Select the certifier's role**

Lead Agency Director

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

**Name:**

Sarah Carter

**Title:**

Part C Director

**Email:**

sarah.carter@state.sd.us

**Phone:**

605-773-4478

**Submitted on:**

01/30/20 2:33:53 PM