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# Introduction

**Instructions**

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

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Part C is known as the Birth to Three program in South Dakota with the Department of Education as the lead agency. The program is housed in the Office of Early Childhood Services within the Division of Special Education (IDEA Part B) and Early Learning. The ECS office is comprised of Part C and the Head Start Collaboration Office. The administrator of the ECS office also serves as the Part C Coordinator.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three has been using a legacy online data system, in which Individualized Family Service Plans are entered, for over a decade. This secure system allows for real time information for providers, service coordinators and state staff. Through this system, South Dakota can verify that regional programs and providers are consistently achieving high levels of compliance with IDEA requirements. South Dakota is pleased to announce a new comprehensive data system, known as South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS) launched August 1, 2024.

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, Needs Intervention or Substantial 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. South Dakota received 100% in the Compliance component and 75% in Results for an overall percentage of 87.5%. This resulted in South Dakota's 2024 OSEP Determination of Meets Requirements for Part C of IDEA. Over the past eight years with the assistance of OSEP-funded technical assistance centers such as DaSy, ECTA and CIFR as well as collaboration with the National BDI Users Group, BDI States and BDI Publisher South Dakota has focused on improving data surrounding child and family outcomes. South Dakota will continue to work with these groups towards continued improvement in data quality and performance toward improved results for children and families served.

The reader will note, the December 1, 2023, birth to three child count revealed a 6.6% increase from the previous year. This represents a 12.8% increase since the 2019 pre-pandemic child count. The state has continued to experience a significant increase in referrals.

The reader will also note throughout the SPP/APR, the steps taken by the state team to ensure significant stakeholder input for SSIP work and data analysis of performance in relation to targets and demographic variables as well as improvement strategies. Continued work with stakeholders, OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, DaSy and ECTA, and guidance from OSEP has enabled the State to create a culture of data use both at the state and local level. Full implementation of the state’s new data system will enhance these opportunities, particularly for local EI programs given increased access to real-time data and reporting features.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

**General Supervision System**

The systems that are in place to ensure that the IDEA Part C requirements are met (e.g., integrated monitoring activities; data on processes and results; the SPP/APR; fiscal management; policies, procedures, and practices resulting in effective implementation; and improvement, correction, incentives, and sanctions). Include a description of all the mechanisms the State uses to identify and verify correction of noncompliance and improve results. This should include, but not be limited to, State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which the State is able to determine compliance and/or issue written findings of noncompliance. The State should include the following elements:

**Describe the process the State uses to select EIS providers and/or EIS programs for monitoring, the schedule, and number of EIS providers/programs monitored per year.**

Annually, the state monitors and reports on all SPP/APR indicators as part of integrated monitoring system. These monitoring activities are inclusive of all children in the system, sampling is not used.

On a cyclical basis, all six service coordination regions and 250+ direct service providers entities are monitored on additional state-determined indicators of compliance and results.

Service Coordination Regions:
The state monitors one service coordination region each year of the six-year cycle via a desk audit. The monitoring event takes place in the spring of each year via a desk audit. Regional selection is based upon 1) fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practice, 2) number of children served, 3) concerns that have been received by the state office, 4) fiscal issues, and 5) state capacity. Upon selection, a formal letter is sent from the state office to the service coordination region’s leadership indicating their selection and the date the monitoring event will take place. A conference call is held between the regional leadership and the state monitoring team lead to discuss monitoring activities and answer questions. One week prior to the monitoring activity the region receives another letter with a list of child names and subsequent documentation that must be uploaded into a secure platform and the date by which all documentation must be uploaded. The state gives approximately 5 working days for items to be uploaded.

Direct Service Provider Entities:
The 250+ direct service provider entities will be assigned to six cohorts, approximately 40 direct service provider entities will be monitored each year of the six-year cycle. Selection of entities for each year are based upon 1) fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practice, 2) number of children being served, 3) concerns received by the state office, 4) fiscal matters, and 5) state capacity. Upon selection, a formal letter is sent to the direct service provider entity’s leadership indicating their selection and the date the monitoring event will take place. Providers are given the option for a conference call with the state office prior to the monitoring event. One week prior to the monitoring event, provider leadership receives a letter indicating the child records that will be reviewed. Providers are instructed to upload all requested documentation into a secure platform by the indicated date. The state gives approximately five working days for items to be uploaded.

In addition, whenever the state identifies a potential area of concern with a particular EI program (service coordination region and/or direct service provider entity), a targeted, focused monitoring activity is conducted. Findings resulting from these monitoring activities are issued as necessary.

**Describe how child records are chosen, including the number of child records that are selected, as part of the State’s process for determining an EIS provider’s and EIS program’s compliance with IDEA requirements and verifying the EIS provider/program’s correction of any identified compliance.**

PROCESS FOR DETERMINING THE NUMBER OF CHILD RECORDS THAT ARE SELECTED AS PART OF THE STATE'S PROCESS FOR DETERMINING AN EI PROVIDER 'S AND EIS PROGRAM'S COMPLIANCE WITH IDEA REQUIREMENTS

On a cyclical basis, all six service coordination regions and 250+ direct service provider entities, including 148 public school districts, are monitored.

Service Coordination Regions:
Upon selection, a formal letter is sent from the state office to the service coordination region’s leadership indicating their selection and the date the monitoring event will take place. A conference call is held between the regional leadership and the state monitoring team lead to discuss monitoring activities and answer questions. One week prior to the monitoring activity the region receives another letter with a list of child names and subsequent documentation that must be uploaded into a secure platform and the date by which all documentation must be uploaded. The state gives approximately 5 working days for items to be uploaded.

Child records are selected by the state team, the regional program has no prior knowledge of which files will be selected. The amount of data reviewed is sufficient to reach a sound conclusion about performance. The State has determined the number of child records selected is dependent upon the size of the regional program and geographic location. The State has determined that ten percent of child records are monitored, with a maximum of 25 files and a minimum of 5 files. Race/ethnicity, socioeconomic, gender, age and eligibility category in comparison to the service coordination region population are considered when selecting child records. The State selects active child records, but also requests records for children who were not found eligible or have exited the program. These additional records are selected based upon the requirement being monitored.

Direct Service Provider Entities:
Upon selection, a formal letter is sent to the direct service provider entity’s leadership indicating their selection and the date the monitoring event will take place. Providers are given the option for a conference call with the state office prior to the monitoring event. One week prior to the monitoring event, provider leadership receives a letter indicating the child records that will be reviewed. Providers are instructed to upload all requested documentation into a secure platform by the indicated date. The state gives approximately five working days for items to be uploaded.

Child records are selected by the state team, the direct service provider program has no prior knowledge of which files will be selected. The amount of data reviewed is sufficient to reach a sound conclusion about performance. The State has determined the number of child records selected is dependent upon the number of children served and the geographic location. The State has determined that ten percent of child records are monitored, with a maximum of 25 files. Providers who serve ten or fewer children will have all their child records reviewed. Race/ethnicity, gender, age and socioeconomic in comparison to the providers caseload will be considered when selecting child records. The State selects active child records but may request additional records based upon the requirement being monitored.

VERIFYING THE EIS PROVIDER/PROGRAM'S CORRECTION OF ANY IDENTIFIED NONCOMPLIANCE

When verifying correction of noncompliance through a review of subsequent data, the state has determined the number of records are based upon the amount of noncompliance being addressed. If the noncompliance was found related to one child, then the state reviews subsequent records on three additional children being seen by the service coordinator or EI provider. If the noncompliance was found related to more than one child, the state reviews subsequent records on three additional children for each service coordinator or EI provider with the noncompliance. If the same service coordinator or EI provider has more than one instance or noncompliance, the state will review six additional records of children served by that individual.

**Describe the data system(s) the State uses to collect monitoring and SPP/APR data, and the period from which records are reviewed.**

The State Birth to Three program has an online legacy data system that includes data on programmatic and demographic elements and includes all children's IFSP information and data points. State staff have access to the full data system in real time. The data system allows service coordinators to view reports relating to child count verification and SPP/APR indicators. There are several reports that serve as edit checks 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.

For the annual monitoring of SPP/APR indicators, the state uses data from the second quarter of the Federal Fiscal year for indicators 1, 7 and 8. A full fiscal year of data is used for all other indicators.

For cyclical and targeted monitoring activities, the timeframe is determined based upon the dates of the monitoring, priority areas being monitored, the children and EI activities being reviewed.

The reader will note, the state launched a new comprehensive data system August 1, 2024.

**Describe how the State issues findings: by EIS provider and/or EIS program; and if findings are issued by the number of instances or by EIS provider and/or EIS program.**

South Dakota issues finding by EI program (service coordination region or direct service provider entity) not by instances of noncompliance. When noncompliance is identified, the state Birth to Three program provides an opportunity for the program to correct noncompliance prior to the finding being issued (see below pre-finding correction). If, however, correction is not verified, or the noncompliance is systemic a written finding is issued to the EI program.

The state Birth to Three program issues a written letter of finding to the EI program of any items of noncompliance identified and not corrected through pre-finding correction. The written finding is issued, generally within three months of conclusion there has been a violation of IDEA. The written finding includes a description of IDEA noncompliance; the statutory or regulatory IDEA requirements with which the program or provider is in noncompliance; a description of the quantitative and/or qualitative data; a statement that the noncompliance must be corrected as soon as possible; and in no case later than one year of the state written notification of noncompliance; any required correction action(s); and a timeline for submission of a correction action plan or evidence of correction.

**If applicable, describe the adopted procedures that permit its EIS providers/ programs to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction).**

In accordance with federal guidance, the state Birth to Three program allows pre-finding correction.

When noncompliance is identified, the state allows the opportunity for the program to verify correction by reviewing subsequent data from the state’s data base. Subsequent data must demonstrate the EI program is correctly implementing the IDEA requirement with 100% compliance for the requirement. In addition, each individual case of child specific noncompliance must be verified as corrected, unless the child has moved from the region and no outstanding correction action exists under a complaint or due process hearing for the child.

If these conditions are met timely, less than three months after the noncompliance was identified, South Dakota does not issue a finding, and documents the pre-finding correction. The state issues a letter to the EI program advising them of the non-compliance and the use of the pre-finding process.

If the subsequent data reflects performance of less than 100%, a finding of noncompliance is issued.

Describe the State’s system of graduated and progressive sanctions to ensure the correction of identified noncompliance and to address areas in need **of improvement, used as necessary and consistent with IDEA Part C’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State policies.**

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

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

Verification of correction according to federal requirements
A corrective action plan (CAP) may be required as part of the finding, depending on the scope and level of noncompliance. A CAP for compliance is developed involving the regional service coordinators and others (e.g., early intervention providers, school districts, etc.). State Birth to Three staff approve the corrective action plan and provide technical assistance, assuring all activities are completed in accordance with federal requirements.

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

South Dakota enforces a range of sanctions for noncompliance, including the potential termination of contracts. If noncompliance is not corrected within one year, the state may require the entity to provide additional data and participate in mandated technical assistance. Additionally, the state may delay reimbursements or require refunds for monetary discrepancies. The state may also delay the referral of new children or pause services for existing children. Finally, as specified in the annual contracts, the state has the authority to terminate the agreement, prevent the entity from future contracts with the program and lead agency, and restrict contracts with other state agencies.

**Describe how the State makes annual determinations of EIS program performance, including the criteria the State uses and the schedule for notifying EIS programs of their determinations. If the determinations are made public, include a web link for the most recent determinations.**

Each year, following the receipt of the state’s determination from the federal Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), Birth to Three issues regional determinations to the six service coordination programs. The state uses the regional performance data from the Annual Performance Report and other data to make determinations about how the region is meeting the requirements of IDEA. Possible determinations include Meets Requirements, Needs Assistance, Needs Intervention or Needs Substantial Intervention in implementing Part C of the IDEA.

These annual determinations are required by Section 616 of the IDEA and are based on a variety of data. The state reviews each regional program’s performance against compliance and results indicators, timely correction of noncompliance, submission of valid, reliable, and timely data, and audit findings.

The state prepares a Determination Matrix for each region. Points are awarded to the region for each of the above items based on their performance. These points result in a total score which is applied towards state established criteria for each of the four determination categories.

Regions are provided a letter with their determination status and a copy of their matrix. If applicable, the letter includes requirements for taking appropriate enforcement action and timelines. Regional determinations are not made public.

**Provide the web link to information about the State’s general supervision policies, procedures, and process that is made available to the public.**

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

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidence-based technical assistance and support to EIS programs.**

The South Dakota Birth to Three program provides ongoing comprehensive technical assistance (TA) that includes the provision of specific technical assistance to regional service coordination programs and direct service providers. A dedicated state team member is available and provides daily real-time TA via telephone calls, emails, virtual meetings, and onsite visits as requested.

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

The South Dakota Part C program, historically, relies heavily on technology to provide ongoing support to service coordinators and providers. Examples of this would include a state listserv which is used to send information to service coordinators, school districts, SICC members and early intervention providers statewide. The listserv is used to provide pertinent program information about policy and procedure updates, rules and regulations, program needs/shortages, and training opportunities. The state team also uses the results of the annual APR performance including the results from the annual parent surveys to help plan technical assistance activities.

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

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

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

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

**Professional Development System:**

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

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

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

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

**Stakeholder Engagement:**

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

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

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

YES

**Number of Parent Members:**

4

**Parent Members Engagement:**

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

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

Throughout the FFY 2023 year, as the state program began creating a culture of data use, parents were actively engaged in the activities with other stakeholders, including participation in the August and October 2023 data retreats with SICC members. Parent perspectives continue to enhance discussions particularly surrounding the state’s performance in C4 Family Outcomes. Parents insight into the state’s work was invaluable in presenting possible barriers and recommendations for the work related to increasing response rate and representativeness in family outcome survey. The reader will note, the state experienced a phenomenal increase in response rate to family surveys in FFY 2023. This will be discussed in Indicator C4.

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

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

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

the South Dakota Part C program. The most influential and impactful way South Dakota is increasing all parents / family’s capacity is through implementation of evidence-based practices. South Dakota, with stakeholder input, purposefully selected evidence-based practices when implemented as intended, increase parent/families’ competence and confidence working with their infant and toddler with disabilities. As evidence in the progress of the State Systemic Improvement Plan, South Dakota is making great strides in building all families capacity. Providers implementing the EBP witness families increased involvement, awareness, and knowledge. Providers utilizing the EBP speak to families better understanding their infant and toddlers development and are building on early intervention sessions by incorporating activities in their daily routines. More evidence of this presented itself in the C4 Family Outcome data. South Dakota uses the ECO Family Outcome Survey - Revised tool to gather data for the C4 indicator. FFY 2023 saw an almost 200% increase in surveys returned. With 96% of families responding that the South Dakota Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful “listening to you and respecting your choices”.

South Dakota holds strongly to the belief family engagement and the parent-child relationship and interactions is one of the most powerful predictors to improve outcomes. The reader will note throughout the State Systemic Improvement Plan the state has described multiple activities implemented with the result of increasing all parent/family capacity and improve outcomes for all infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The reader will note, in the SPP/APR SSIP Theory of Action portion of the report, the state will describe actions underway to increase family capacity to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. South Dakota recently launched a comprehensive new data system with the intent of launching a Parent Portal in 2026.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

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

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

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

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

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

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

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

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

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

**Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2022 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 2022 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revisions if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2022 APR in 2024, is available.**

South Dakota Part C reports to the public on the FFY 2022 performance of each EIS region for Indicators C1 to C10 as compared to the state performance via South Dakota Department of Education website. These reports titled Regional Performance are located on the Part C page at https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/ under Public Reporting within the required federal timelines.

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

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

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## Intro - OSEP Response

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

## Intro - Required Actions

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 99.17% | 99.14% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 496 | 524 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

***This number will be added to the "Number of 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.***

28

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

During this reporting period, the 30-day timeline criteria was missed 28 times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation of all 28 children who had missed the 30-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay included illness, families reschedule of services, family relocations, physician appointments, families snow bound due to inclement weather.

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

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

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

State database

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

For Indicator C1, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2023 (Oct. 1, 2023, to Dec. 31, 2023).

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

For Indicator C1, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determine compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2023 the state selected the second quarter, October 1, through December 31, 2023.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024). The State described how the time period in which the datawere collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target>= | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% | 97.00% |
| Data | 99.76% | 99.63% | 99.89% | 99.61% | 98.10% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/31/2024 | Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings | 1,213 |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/31/2024 | Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs | 1,232 |

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,213 | 1,232 | 98.10% | 97.25% | 98.46% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

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

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

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

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

 C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

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

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

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 3 - Indicator Data

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

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

Throughout the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2023, stakeholders were actively engaged in reviewing the state’s performance relative to the established targets. At the time of target-setting, the state had recently transitioned from using the Battelle Developmental Inventory 2 (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory 3 (BDI-3) as the tool for measuring child outcomes. Acknowledging the differences between the two assessment tools, the state and stakeholders agreed to conduct annual data analyses to determine if any adjustments to the targets were necessary.

The FFY 2023 reporting period marked the third complete year of using the BDI-3. During the December 2024 and January 2025 State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) meetings, stakeholders conducted a thorough review of the performance data. The analysis revealed that performance met the targets for Outcome A and Outcome B, with no slippage observed. However, while Outcome C did not meet the target, there was no slippage, and the data showed a slight improvement over the results from FFY 2022.

Stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the progress made in Outcomes A and B. Despite Outcome C not meeting the target, the observed improvement over the previous year was seen as a positive trend. Given the state’s progress in this area and the limited time remaining in the current SPP/APR (State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report) cycle, stakeholders unanimously agreed to maintain the existing targets without modification.

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| **A1** | 2019 | Target>= | 51.00% | 51.00% | 41.00% | 41.50% | 42.00% |
| **A1** | 42.80% | Data | 37.83% | 42.80% | 41.00% | 38.63% | 45.83% |
| **A2** | 2019 | Target>= | 85.50% | 85.50% | 72.40% | 72.50% | 72.75% |
| **A2** | 73.40% | Data | 75.77% | 73.40% | 72.45% | 71.35% | 76.17% |
| **B1** | 2019 | Target>= | 60.00% | 60.00% | 75.00% | 75.00% | 75.50% |
| **B1** | 74.36% | Data | 74.91% | 74.36% | 75.00% | 74.16% | 76.94% |
| **B2** | 2019 | Target>= | 70.00% | 70.00% | 54.76% | 53.40% | 53.60% |
| **B2** | 53.20% | Data | 57.92% | 53.20% | 54.76% | 57.30% | 61.14% |
| **C1** | 2019 | Target>= | 57.76% | 60.00% | 91.20% | 91.25% | 91.50% |
| **C1** | 91.03% | Data | 90.93% | 91.03% | 91.21% | 88.76% | 84.15% |
| **C2** | 2019 | Target>= | 85.00% | 85.00% | 81.80% | 81.90% | 82.00% |
| **C2** | 80.13% | Data | 80.29% | 80.13% | 81.80% | 77.82% | 71.50% |

**Targets**

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

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

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 28 | 4.06% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 72 | 10.43% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 14 | 2.03% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 91 | 13.19% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 485 | 70.29% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 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 | 105 | 205 | 45.83% | 42.50% | 51.22% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program | 576 | 690 | 76.17% | 73.00% | 83.48% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 8 | 1.16% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 68 | 9.86% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 183 | 26.52% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 151 | 21.88% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 280 | 40.58% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 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 | 334 | 410 | 76.94% | 76.00% | 81.46% | 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 | 431 | 690 | 61.14% | 53.80% | 62.46% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Total** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning | 3 | 0.43% |
| b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 44 | 6.38% |
| c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 134 | 19.42% |
| d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 173 | 25.07% |
| e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 336 | 48.70% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 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 | 307 | 354 | 84.15% | 91.75% | 86.72% | Did not meet 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 | 509 | 690 | 71.50% | 82.10% | 73.77% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

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

| **Question** | **Number** |
| --- | --- |
| The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State’s Part C exiting 618 data | 1,140 |
| 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. | 281 |
| Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed | 690 |

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

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

NO

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

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

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine an infant or toddlers’ eligibility for Part C services. The state is transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory Third Edition (BDI-3). These tools are utilized by Part B 619 and Part C programs for reporting child outcomes. Children are evaluated using this consistent method which enhances the validity of the data. The entry scores are determined by the standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child. An “exit” BDI assessment is given to children who have been in the Part C program for at least six months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for the Part C program to determine child’s developmental status at exit and second for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs.

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

During FFY 2023 (July 1, 2023, to June 30, 2024), 1140 children exited the Birth to Three program of which 690 children had qualifying entry and exit BDI-2 or BDI-3 scores. Entry scores for the 690 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 690 exiting children computes to a 60.53% completion rate when using the full exit data as the denominator. The state recognized this is a 1.5% increase from FFY 2022 completion rate.

Additional data analysis of FFY 2023 exit data indicates of the 450 children who exited the Birth to Three program but did not receive a qualifying exit score, 281 or 62.44% were in the Birth to Three program less than 6 months. If the 281 children exiting before 6 months are subtracted from the denominator of the exit data, the completion rate increases to 80.33%.

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

## 3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 3 - OSEP Response

## 3 - Required Actions

# Indicator 4: Family Involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

A. Know their rights;

B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and

C. Help their children develop and learn.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 4 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline**  | **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| A | 2006 | Target>= | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.10% | 94.20% |
| A | 93.90% | Data | 99.44% | 98.95% | 97.98% | 88.11% | 85.52% |
| B | 2006 | Target>= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.20% | 90.40% |
| B | 89.40% | Data | 98.60% | 96.50% | 97.96% | 90.98% | 87.78% |
| C | 2006 | Target>= | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.00% | 90.10% | 90.20% |
| C | 89.30% | Data | 99.16% | 98.25% | 99.19% | 87.30% | 86.43% |

**Targets**

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

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

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

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

During the December 2024 and January 2025 SICC meetings, the state presented stakeholders with FFY 2023 Indicator C4 data, including representativeness based on race/ethnicity and the socio-economic Medicaid eligible element. Stakeholders were thrilled with the dramatic increase in response rates and complementing service coordination regional programs for their dedication encouraging families to complete the family outcome survey.

Stakeholders noted targets were not met, however, outcome A and Outcome B did not have slippage. Given the significant increase in response rates, the state recommended to Stakeholders that targets not be re-established. Instead the state wishes to focus on maintaining high response rates and those areas in the survey where family responses were not rates as high as in past years. Stakeholders agreed with the State team, and stated new targets would not necessarily bring about program improvement. As such it was unanimously agreed upon to leave the targets as established for FFY 2023.

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The number of families to whom surveys were distributed | 1,069 |
| Number of respondent families participating in Part C  | 470 |
| Survey Response Rate | 43.97% |
| A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 401 |
| A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights | 470 |
| 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 | 410 |
| B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs | 470 |
| 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 | 399 |
| C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn | 470 |

| **Measure** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 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) | 85.52% | 94.30% | 85.32% | Did not meet 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) | 87.78% | 90.60% | 87.23% | Did not meet 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) | 86.43% | 90.30% | 84.89% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

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

The transition to the ECO Family Outcomes Survey - Revised in FFY 2021 brought significant changes to both the scoring process and delivery method. By FFY 2023, it marked the third year of using the revised survey, offering insights into the stability and effectiveness of these changes over time. One of the most noteworthy findings was the increase in the family response rate, which rose to 45.97% in FFY 2023. This represented a 180% increase from the FFY 2022 response rate of 23.56%, highlighting a positive shift in data quality.

Overall, survey results were very positive, with 83% or more of families giving favorable responses on all 17 items assessed. Twelve out of the 17 items saw 90% or more families reporting positive responses. Three out of six items related to Measurement C “Helping Their Child Develop and Learn” saw 90% or higher positive responses from families. The most favorable response in Measurement C was survey item "working with you to know when your child is making progress," 91.49% of families selected "Very Helpful" or "Extremely Helpful." Conversely, the item "giving you useful information about how to help your child get along with others" received 82.98% positive response rate. The state does note, families whose children exited at age three were more likely to respond favorably to this survey item.

The state conducted additional analysis on survey responses based on factors such as region, length of time in the program, child's age at exit, and self-identified racial group. Families whose children had received less than one year of services tended to rate the services less favorably compared to families whose children had been in the program for longer than one year. This suggests that families with more experience in the program may have a more complete understanding of the support their child is receiving, and the perceived effectiveness of the services may improve over time. There were also some regional differences in responses, with certain regions showing statistically less favorable feedback when comparing FFY 2022 and FFY 2023 results. These regional differences warrant further investigation to understand any specific challenges or needs in those areas that may need addressing.

The state is also analyzing its professional development training protocols and training calendars. Ensuring that providers have the knowledge and are implementing the EBP practices as intended, and that ongoing training is available.

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

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

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2022** | **2023** |
| Survey Response Rate | 23.56% | 43.97% |

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

South Dakota Part C used the ECTA Representativeness Calculator to determine representativeness. The calculator uses an accepted formula (Chi-square test) to evaluate the statistical significance of the overall table. If this overall test shows no significant difference, the data are representative of the population. If the overall test shows a significant difference, there are groups within the table that are under or overrepresented. The calculator uses an accepted formula (z test of proportional difference) to determine whether the difference between the expected percentage and the observed percentage within a category (e.g. Hispanic) is statistically significant (or meaningful), based upon the 95% confidence intervals for each table (significance level = 0.05). Differences that are statistically significant are marked as 'No' in the row labeled 'Are your data representative?' The calculator uses the Bonferroni method to correct for the increased probability of finding a significant difference that results from conducting multiple significance tests on a table of dependent data. This method divides the significance level (i.e. p<.05) by the number of tests conducted on the table (overall Chi Square test plus all pairwise tests of individual categories).

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

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

When comparing the demographics of the infants and toddlers responding to the survey to those enrolled in the Part C program by race and ethnicity, White families had the highest percentage enrolled in the program (69%), followed by Native American Indian or Alaska Native (12%), Hispanic (10%), More than One Race (5%), African American or Black (2%), Asian (1%), and Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (0.24%).
Comparatively, families of More than One Race had the highest representation in surveys received (78%), followed by White (41%), Native American or Alaska Native (29%), Asian (31%), African American or Black (20%) and Hispanic (15%). Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander had high return rate (67%), however, the values were too small to include in the overall calculations.

These calculations demonstrate the survey responses are representative of African American or Black, American Indian, or Alaska Native, Asian, and White families enrolled in the Part C program. The responses were not representative of Hispanic families and over representative of More than one race families.

With stakeholder input, socio-economic status was selected as the additional demographic analysis with Medicaid eligibility as the data point. Representativeness was analyzed by comparing the percentage of surveys received indicating Medicaid eligibility by the percentage of families enrolled in the Part C program who are Medicaid eligible. Families who are not Medicaid eligible had the highest percentage enrolled in the Part C program (58%) compared to families who were eligible for Medicaid services (42%). Using the ECTA Representative Calculator, the state was able to establish representativeness of socioeconomic families. Families who are Medicaid eligible had a slightly more representative (14.35%) than families who are not Medicaid eligible (13.51%). The data are representative overall, but the State notes a lower response rate to this question. A factor for the low response is that families may see the question as too personal.

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

NO

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

The state notes the responses are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program due to non-representativeness of Hispanic families and over-representativeness of More than one Race. The state is aware of the need to ensure future response data is representative. To address this the state will continue to meet with each of the six service coordination regions and analyze the regional data performance to ensure continued representativeness of all families.

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

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

FFY 2023 marks the third year South Dakota has used the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised to collected Indicator C4 data and the third year distributing the tool electronically with hard copy available if requested. Responses remain anonymous; however, each service coordinator receives a survey link that is unique to them and contains an electronic version of the ECO Family Outcomes Survey – Revised and other demographic information. Service coordinators forward their link to families via text, email, or hard copy, based on the family’s preference. The unique link allows the state to identify early intervention regions. To ensure data quality, the link provided is set so each parent can only complete one survey.

South Dakota recognized a significant increase in the state’s overall response rate in FFY 2023. Families responded at 43.97% compared to 23.56% response rate in FFY 2022. Responses from African American or Black, American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, More than One Race and White all showed increases in response rates. While South Dakota experienced significant increases, the State will take the following steps to promote continued higher responses from families:
1. Continue to analyze data and collect regional program input.
2. Continue to dialogue with service coordinators on how to encourage families to complete the ECO Family Outcome Survey.
3. Continue promotion of the electronic delivery method to reach families with the ECO Family Outcome tool.
4. Ensure service coordinators continue to promote the ECO Family Outcome Survey Spanish version.
5. Continue to promote service coordinators' usage of interpreter for completion of surveys.

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

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

Nonresponse bias measures the differences in opinions between respondents and non-respondents in meaningful ways, such as the positivity of responses. A few things can be examined to determine nonresponse bias. One is the overall response rate. The higher the response rate, the less likely nonresponse bias will occur. The statewide response rate for this year’s family outcomes survey is 43.97%. The State is pleased with this significant response rate and the representativeness of families who responded to the survey. The state analyzed response rates from FFY 2022 compared to FFY 2023. Response rate increases were noted from White families (+23%), American Indian or Alaska Native (+20%), Asian (+9%), and African American or Black (+6%). Families More than One Race had the most significant increase in response (+51%). Hispanic families had a slight decrease (-6%).

While overall the state had an increase in response rate, the state did conduct a comparison of scores on the three scales to determine if any particular group of families was significantly more positive or negative than other groups of families. No significant differences by race/ethnicity were evident. The state did not families whose children exit at age three rated slightly higher than families whose children exited prior to age 1. The State also recognizes there is indication of nonresponse bias since American Indian or Alaska Native, African American or Black, Asian, Hispanic and White are below the statewide percent.

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

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

## 4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

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

**Response to actions required in FFY 2022 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.

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

The State should conduct a root cause analysis of child find identification rates, including reviewing data (if available) on the number of children referred, evaluated, and identified. This analysis may include examining not only demographic data but also other child-find related data available to the State (e.g., geographic location, family income, primary language, etc.). The State should report the results of this analysis under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator. If the State is required to report on the reasons for slippage, the State must include the results of its analyses under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target >= | 0.86% | 0.88% | 0.88% | 0.88% | 0.89% |
| Data | 1.40% | 1.27% | 0.97% | 1.24% | 1.30% |

**Targets**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/31/2024 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs | 192 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2023 | 06/25/2024 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 | 11,434 |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 192 | 11,434 | 1.30% | 0.89% | 1.68% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide results of the root cause analysis of child find identification rates.**

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

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

The State should conduct a root cause analysis of child find identification rates, including reviewing data (if available) on the number of children referred, evaluated, and identified. This analysis may include examining not only demographic data but also other child-find related data available to the State (e.g. geographic location, family income, primary language, etc.). The State should report the results of this analysis under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator. If the State is required to report on the reasons for slippage, the State must include the results of its analysis under the “Additional Information” section of this indicator.

## 6 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target >= | 2.83% | 2.85% | 2.56% | 2.81% | 2.83% |
| Data | 3.31% | 3.00% | 2.56% | 2.97% | 3.37% |

**Targets**

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

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age | 07/31/2024 | Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs | 1,232 |
| Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2020 to July 1, 2023 | 06/25/2024 | Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 | 34,152 |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs** | **Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1,232 | 34,152 | 3.37% | 2.83% | 3.61% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide results of the root cause analysis of child find identification rates**

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

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

## 6 - Required Actions

# Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

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

**Instructions**

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

Targets must be 100%.

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

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 92.07% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 227 | 268 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

During this reporting period, the 45-day timeline criteria was missed 41 times due to exceptional family circumstances. The state team reviewed the service coordinators' documentation of all 41 children who had missed the 45-day timeline and verified that all delays were due to exceptional family circumstances.

Family reasons for delay included illness, families' requests to reschedule, family relocations, physician appointments, families snow bound due to inclement weather.

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

State database

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

The State selected the second quarter of FFY2023 (October 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

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

For Indicator C7, the State has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2023 the state again selected the second quarter, (October 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024). The State described how the time period in which the datawere collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 7 - Required Actions

# Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C at age 3 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 at age 3)] 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 8A: The measurement is intended to capture those children exiting at age 3 for whom an IFSP must be developed with transition steps and services within the required timeline consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(d) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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 consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(e) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 8A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 98.86% | 94.74% | 99.40% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C at age 3 for whom the Lead Agency was required to develop an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler’s third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

| **Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 165 | 167 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

Family reasons for delay included family relocation to another state for a period of time and family request to reschedule.

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8A, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2023 (Oct. 1, 2023, to Dec. 31, 2023).

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

For Indicator C8A, the state has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2023 the state again selected the second quarter (October 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8A - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024). The State described how the time period in which the datawere collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8A - Required Actions

# Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C at age 3 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 at age 3)] 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 8A: The measurement is intended to capture those children exiting at age 3 for whom an IFSP must be developed with transition steps and services within the required timeline consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(d) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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 consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(e) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 8B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 167 | 167 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of parents who opted out**

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

0

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

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

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

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

NO

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2023 (Oct. 1, 2023, to Dec. 31, 2023).

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

For Indicator C8B, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with the indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2023 (October 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023). This data set is considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter of the fiscal year as in all quarters. The South Dakota Part C program is confident that the chosen reporting period accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for FFY 2023.

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8B - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024). The State described how the time period in which the datawere collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8B - Required Actions

# Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C at age 3 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 at age 3)] 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 8A: The measurement is intended to capture those children exiting at age 3 for whom an IFSP must be developed with transition steps and services within the required timeline consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(d) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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 consistent with 34 CFR §303.209(e) and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and 2 years 9 months should be included in the denominator.

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

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

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2022), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Beginning with the FFY 2024 SPP/APR (due February 2, 2026), if the State did not issue any findings because it has adopted procedures that permit its EIS programs/providers to correct noncompliance prior to the State’s issuance of a finding (i.e., pre-finding correction), the explanation within each applicable indicator must include how the State verified, prior to issuing a finding, that the EIS program/provider has corrected each individual case of child-specific noncompliance and is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements.

## 8C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 98.86% | 94.74% | 99.40% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

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

YES

| **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler’s third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B** | **Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 165 | 167 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

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

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

0

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

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

2

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

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

Family reasons for delay included family relocation to another state for a period of time and family request to reschedule.

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

State database

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

For Indicator C8C, one quarter of the fiscal year was used to determine compliance with this indicator. The state selected the second quarter of FFY 2023 (Oct. 1, 2023, to Dec. 31, 2023).

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

For Indicator C8C, the state has historically selected the second quarter of the fiscal year to determined compliance with this indicator. This data set has been considered representative of the full reporting year because the same variables are in place for this quarter as for all quarters. For FFY 2023 the state again selected the second quarter (October 1, 2023, through December 31, 2023).

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

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

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2022**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2022 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 8C - OSEP Response

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2023- June 30, 2024). The State described how the time period in which the datawere collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

## 8C - Required Actions

# Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

States are not required to establish baselines 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 baselines and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

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

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

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

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

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

NO

**Select yes to use target ranges.**

Target Range not used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/13/2024 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 0 |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/13/2024 | 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 established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 9 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2023. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

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

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

**Data Source**

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range is used

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

NO

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 2.1 Mediations held | 0 |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2023-24 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/13/2024 | 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 established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

**Historical Data**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **2021** | **2022** |
| Target>= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

| **FFY** | **2023 (low)** | **2023 (high)** | **2024 (low)** | **2024 (high)** | **2025 (low)** | **2025 (high)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Target |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2023 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 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target (low)** | **FFY 2023 Target (high)** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  | N/A | N/A |

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

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2023. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

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

**Measurement**

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

**Instructions**

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

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

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

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

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

*Phase I: Analysis*:

- Data Analysis;

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

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

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

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

- Infrastructure Development;

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

- Evaluation.

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

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

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

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

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

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

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

A. Data Analysis

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

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, (e.g., a logic model) of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., February 1, 2024). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025).

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

C. Stakeholder Engagement

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

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2023 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2024, i.e., July 1, 2024-June 30, 2025) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

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

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

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

NO

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

NO

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

YES

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

South Dakota Part C has used the SSIP process not only to implement early intervention improvements but to continuously reflect and adjust based on progress and stakeholder input. Over the course of FFY 2023, stakeholders were kept involved in the process, providing feedback and helping shape the direction of the State’s efforts towards meeting the SiMR (State identified Measurable Result).

During the December 2024 and January 2025 SICC meetings, stakeholders participated in an exercise reviewing current SSIP implementation strategies, progress towards outcomes and recommendations for the state to consider in the coming year. Stakeholders identified the state was at an important milestone in the SSIP process. Due to the strides the state had made over the past two years, the Theory of Action no longer accurately captured the current scope of work involved in the SSIP. One SICC member stated the changes are a necessary move as the current strategies no longer reflected all the progress within the program in the last few years. Stakeholders noted the Strands of Action were still applicable and recommended keeping those, with changes to the comprehensive strategies (If, Then Statements) better reflecting current activities and plans.

With stakeholder input, the following changes were made to the Theory of Action. The reader will note, all four strands are listed below depicting the previous and revised language.

Data Quality Strand (Previous)
• If the state monitors for continuous improvement the process to obtain, analyze and report BDI scores for children in the Birth to Three program, and continues to provider BDI training in collaboration with 619;
• Then regionally service coordinators and districts will continue to increase the number of usable BDI exit evaluations and evaluations will improve the reliability and validity of BDI administrations.
Data Quality Strand (Revised)
• If the state supports a statewide culture of data informed decision making using the Birth to Three comprehensive data system SEIDS
• Then regionally administrators and early intervention providers use data to inform continuous improvement.

Accountability Strand (Previous)
• If the state develops and implements a monitoring protocol to address results and compliance;
• Then regionally IFSP teams will increase the quality of decisions related to outcomes and services.
Accountability Strand (Revised)
• If the state implements general supervision monitoring protocols including results and compliance;
• Then regionally IFSP teams increase the quality of decisions related to outcomes and services and early intervention providers implement EI services in accordance with federal and state requirements

Professional Development Strand (Previous)
• If the state continues to provide relevant and rigorous training under the state’s Bright Beginnings PD program and continues to design, enhance and deliver training and TA opportunities as identified for service coordinators, direct service providers and families;
• Then regionally early intervention providers will continually increase the use of evidence-based practices and family and caregiver engagement through coaching practices.
Professional Development Strand (Revised)
• If the state continues to provide comprehensive, relevant, and rigorous training based upon changing needs of providers and families;
• Then early intervention providers continually improve their knowledge and skills in evidence-base coaching practices.

Child Find and Workforce Strand (Previous)
• If the state increases awareness of early intervention routines-based family engagement services to all South Dakota families and attracts, recruits, and retains qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide;
• Then enrollment increases with emphasis on children and families most often underserved and an increased community-based provider pool is available to meet the needs of all Part C families.
Child Find and Workforce Strand (Revised)
• If the state continues to increase awareness of early intervention routines-based family engagement services to all South Dakota families; and continues to attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet early intervention needs statewide;
• Then regionally enrollment increases with emphasis on children and families most often underserved and an increased community-based provider pool is available to meet the needs of all Part C families.

During the January 2025 ICC meeting, SICC members reviewed the updated Theory of Action and recommended the state move forward with the revisions. SICC members felt this was a better reflection of the state’s activities and aligned more closely to the evolving goals and strategies. The language changes are designed so that the Theory of Action will continue to serve as an effective guide for ongoing progress toward the SiMR “infants and toddlers exiting early intervention services will demonstrate increased growth in their acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication)”.

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

https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/FFY2023.aspx

Progress toward the SiMR

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

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

NO

**Historical Data**

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

**Targets**

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

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Numerator represents Indicator C3B progress categories c+d | Denominator represents Indicator C3B progress categories a+b+c+d | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 334 | 410 | 76.94% | 76.00% | 81.46% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2023 data.**

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

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

In South Dakota, local education agencies (LEA) are required by administrative rule to conduct the evaluation to determine an infant or toddlers’ eligibility for Part C services. The state is transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory Second Edition (BDI-2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory Third Edition (BDI-3). These tools are utilized by Part B 619 and Part C programs for reporting child outcomes. Children are evaluated using this consistent method which enhances the validity of the data. The entry scores are determined by the standard deviation scores from each outcome area for each child. An "exit" BDI assessment is given to children who have been in the Part C program for at least 6 months and are exiting. This exit assessment serves two purposes, one for the Part C program to determine child's developmental status at exit and second for children transitioning at age three to determine eligibility for Part B 619 programs.

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

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

NO

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

NO

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

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

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

https://doe.sd.gov/birthto3/FFY2023.aspx

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

YES

**If yes, provide a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan.**

The State, with input from stakeholders, has revised its evaluation plan to more accurately reflect the dynamic nature of the work being done. A new evaluation plan has been developed that honors the rich history of the original evaluation goals, while also introducing more strategic, annual goals designed to propel the organization forward and better address the needs of children and families in South Dakota. Simply put, the State has outgrown the purpose and format of the existing evaluation plan.

The revised evaluation plan maintains a similar structure to the previous one. Each Action Strand of the Theory of Action is represented with the Action Strands Improvement Strategy listed. Activities that have become integrated into daily Part C practices have been transitioned to "ongoing strategies." New activities are now presented as Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Timebound (SMART) goals and outcomes. This new format will allow the State to more effectively track and depict the evolving nature of its work year over year, ensuring that the evaluation plan continues to guide progress in a way that aligns with the changing needs of the program and the families it serves.

**If yes, describe a rationale or justification for the changes to the SSIP evaluation plan.**

The State, in collaboration with stakeholders, has revised its evaluation plan to better reflect the evolving work of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). Historically, the evaluation plan served primarily as a tool to fulfill federal reporting requirements. While it was essential to measure the components outlined in the plan and the strategies recommended by stakeholders, the document was often viewed as a yearly report rather than a tool for ongoing guidance. Over time, however, the strategies outlined in the evaluation plan became increasingly integrated into daily practices. Achieving the established goals each year became more manageable as they aligned more closely with the work being carried out on a day-to-day basis. It became clear that the evaluation plan was being used less as a framework to guide the work and more as a tool for annually reviewing progress toward outcomes.

As a result, the need arose to revise the existing evaluation plan, not only to preserve the foundational intent of the original implementation strategies but also to acknowledge the strategies that have now become part of the ongoing operations of the Part C program. Additionally, the State recognized the importance of creating a plan that sets the stage for more strategic, annual goals that will continue to drive the program forward, addressing the evolving needs of children and families in South Dakota. This will also position the State as a model for other Part C programs. In essence, the previous evaluation plan had outlived its original purpose and format. Therefore, a new approach is necessary to ensure that program time, funds, and human resources are used efficiently and effectively.

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

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

Data Quality
• Both SD Part C and Part B 619 use the Battelle Developmental Inventory evaluation tools to measure progress towards child outcome. FFY 2023 marks the third and final year, transitioning from the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI- 2) to the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI-3). While protocols were established, some confusion was apparent among evaluators. Children who received a BDI-2 for eligibility are required to have a BDI-2 upon exit. Multiple occasions were noted when the incorrect tool was used upon exit. This resulted in the tests being invalid and unusable. As a result, the completion rate for FFY 2023 was 60.53%.
• The state continues to make available through the BDI publisher, Riverside, online training modules for all evaluators, one specific for infants and toddlers from birth to age three. SD Part C in collaboration with Part B 619 is tracking the number of LEA personnel who have completed the training.

Accountability
• August 2024, the state launched a new comprehensive data system. This new system, referred to as South Dakota Early Intervention Data System (SEIDS) includes many new data elements, functionality and reporting features. The state will have the ability to monitoring compliance and results, including appropriateness of services based on the individual family priorities. The state will also be able to evaluate the effectiveness of the evidence-based practice (EBP) in relation to services and child outcomes. The new system also will have additional features to allow increased fiscal monitoring capabilities.
• The state piloted the new identified general supervision monitoring protocols spring 2024. The monitoring event included both compliance and results indicators. Also included were protocols that included fidelity of implementation of evidence-based practices.

Professional Development
• Leveraging remaining ARP dollars, the state revised the professional development training structure to accommodate a greater number of participants. As such, FFY 2023 saw a 95% statewide implementation of evidence-based practice. The State is now poised to maintain a training structure with existing budget resources going forward.
• Sustained fidelity reviews occurred during the most recent reporting period for providers who reached fidelity two years prior. Once notified, providers are paired with a state contracted content expert who facilitates an on-line refresher of the EBP followed by submission of a practice video with coaching support and a final video for sustained fidelity review. If the practice video is determined to meet sustained fidelity criteria a second video is not required.
• Service coordinators (SC), new to the state Part C program, take part in an online training in the EBP Routines Based Interview (RBI) facilitated by a veteran SC who has meet initial and sustained fidelity. Upon completion of the online portion, new SC have a practice period and then proceed with fidelity review. The veteran SC also serves as a coach during this period.
• The state continued to support the service coordinators’ RBI Mentoring Group at the local and state level to support fidelity of implementing the RBI with families of infants and toddlers.
• FY 2023 a focused mentoring activity for service coordinators to help them develop a sustainable community of practice to assist their regions with the ever-changing challenges presented to them was offered. This activity was led by a Ph.D. professional focused in Early Childhood Education with demonstrated history mentoring and consulting early childhood professionals. Mentoring activities took place with individual service coordination regions and statewide.
• During FFY 2023 direct service providers participated in a mentoring group led by a licensed professional counselor, family therapist and board-certified executive coach. This mentoring group covered current topics applicable to their work with families and provided individual sessions to assist providers with understanding exceptional family circumstances that could be impacting service delivery.
• Due to overwhelming impact of the Deaf & Hard of Hearing/Simple signs course that was offered summer 2023, a second course was offered summer 2023. This course, “Empowering Professionals working DHH/Families and Children and Simple Signs Part II was again a powerful lesson in the nuances of working with children and families with hearing related abilities.
• Indicator C4 family survey data indicated waning participation from our Hispanic family populations. The State enlisted the help of a Hispanic educator from a local land-grant institution to teach a course called Working with Hispanic Household: Cross-cultural Considerations & Introductory Spanish for providers. This course was well attended. A watchful eye will be turned toward forthcoming C4 data to see how it impacts the participation of Hispanic families.
With a state-wide literacy initiative from the SD Department of Education, and a SIMR focused on family and child literacy development, Part C professional development courses continue to have a thread of literacy through all required (EBP) and supplementary courses.

Child Find and Workforce
• The Part C director continued to participate in the state’s Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) Early Childhood Comprehensive System work as it relates to EI services and families disproportionately served.
• A pilot program, to study the impact of community play groups as a child find activity is taking place in a rural native community. The pilot has meet with much success and by year two the region had experienced a 67% increase in child count for that geographic location in the state. The state continues to monitor progress and collect data on this effort.
• The Part C professional development specialist collaborated with postsecondary professional preparation programs promoting early intervention career opportunities and the State’s routines-based family engagement evidence-based practice. This collaboration has resulted in a $1 million dollar PACE grant from U.S. Department of Education to the University of South Dakota to support education costs for physical, occupation and speech therapy students with an interest in practicing within early intervention programs. Students participating in the learning experience will complete a portion of their internships under the direction of an existing South Dakota Part C direct service provider who has met the fidelity requirements and is serving in an area of the state demonstrating need for providers. Three students graduated in December 2024 completing the program and two will graduate in May 2025. The state has been contacted by two of the providers seeking opportunities to be private providers for the program.
• The State has expanded the success and collaborated with other higher education entities across the state. South Dakota State University has implemented the evidence-based practice into one of their courses directed at future special instruction professionals. The state has extended to Mitchell Technical College’s SLPA program. Students will be trained in the evidence-based practice and have opportunity to practice during their clinical field work. The state has found this is not only a only a good recruitment tool to expose students in program to the EBP of SD Part C but it is increasing the likelihood that families in and out of Part C are provided with family engagement no matter where these future professional will be employed. Part C will continue to explore higher education partnerships while also expanding EBP training and program TA to the medical providers who are our greatest referral source.

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

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

Data Quality
Regarding the strategies described in the Data Quality Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:
• August 1, 2024 the State launched the new comprehensive data system referred to as SEIDS. The state began the process in September 2023. This comprehensive system contains all child records including providers record of early intervention sessions.
• The state provided monthly service coordinator technical assistance sessions to assist with implementation of SEIDS.
• During the month of July and August the state trained over 500 direct service providers and agency administrators in the new data system SEIDS.
• Using SEIDS, the state has provided technical assistance on reports service coordination regions and direct service providers can access to review their region or agency’s performance and implementation of IDEA Part C.
• South Dakota has a 60.53% completion rate in FFY 2023, this is a 3.87% increase in the last two years.

Accountability
Regarding the strategies described in the Accountability Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:
• South Dakota implemented a new monitoring protocol in spring 2024 for service coordination regions. The monitoring focused on compliance and results performance, including implementation of evidence-based practice. This protocol will be implemented across each of the six service coordination regions, with one region being monitored each year of the six-year SPP/APR cycle. |
• South Dakota made changes to the monitoring protocol for direct service providers identifying the monitoring priorities. These priorities include compliance and results and the providers implementation of the evidence-based practice.
• South Dakota’s new comprehensive system was launched August 1, 2024. Over the coming year, the state will work with OSEP sponsored TA centers to evaluate effectiveness of the EBP in relation to services and child outcomes using new system.

Professional Development
Regarding the strategies described in the Professional Development Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:
• The state continued to respond to provider requests for training conducive to full-time provider schedules. Training options were made available in an on-demand fashion where providers could enter training at any time that worked for then; there was not set schedule.
• The State increased statewide percentage of SC & DSP meeting initial fidelity
 \*100% of SC met initial fidelity
 \*100% of DSP met initial fidelity
• 100% of service coordinators in the state are trained and implementing the EBP as intended. One new service coordinator was trained in this time period.
• The state is over 95% towards statewide implementation of all direct service providers being trained and implementing as intended.
• A Sustained fidelity cohort for trainees that met initial fidelity in cohort 4 and 5 was held in fall 2023.
 \*100% DSP met fidelity through sustained fidelity coaching
• Fall 2023 the state initiated a mentoring opportunity for service coordinators who expressed enhanced needs working with families who were in strife. The needs expounded beyond the evidence-based practice. Service coordinators related challenges presented with mental and behavior health issues in families not necessarily related to the child being served by Part C. In response the state contracted with an internationally known early childhood and family relations expert to meet with regional service coordinators throughout the year and provide strategies to assist when working with families in strife. This project concluded in August 2024. Participants noted that they have learned how to manage their energy and mental health, regarding work-life balance and began to self-monitor with a continued community of practice among themselves; meeting monthly to quarterly (depending on the region and needs). One service coordinator (who works with very high needs/complex families) indicated the greatest thing she learned was that “she is enough” when thinking about the struggle to keep up with her own life and the lives of the families she works with.
• DSP feedback throughout the year noted the increased needs of families addressing stressors often not directly related to the child in the Part C program. Providers expressed mental and behavioral health issues families were experiencing. In response, the state contracted with a licensed marriage and family therapist with extensive experience in adult education to hold regularly scheduled monthly zoom and quarterly face-to-face meetings with providers to offer professional advice on issues encountered in the field regarding child behavior and family dynamics. This project concluded in August 2024 with providers feeling a sense of empowerment that the program listened to their needs and provided external resources. One provider commented that the mentoring program was a place of safety to discuss concerns about her own ability to provide for families who were challenging. It gave her a sense of knowing she was doing the right thing as also walking away with strategies tailored to her specific caseloads/needs.
• In March 2024, Part C was invited to have a special early intervention track in the Statewide SPED Topics including family centered practices, brain-based learning, post-covid impacts on children and families and serving deaf and hard of hearing populations. Feedback from EI providers and service coordinators in attendance reflected that this conference was too board, and their EI sessions were lost in the need to make all sessions apply to B-21. It was decided that beginning Summer 2025 Part C would go back to a separate EI conference every other summer.

Child Find & Workforce
Regarding the strategies described in the Child Find and Workforce Action Strand, the following outcomes were achieved during this reporting period:
• 2023 notes the third and final year of the pilot program implemented in a rural Native American community, studying the impact of community play groups as a child find activity. The project has resulted in overwhelming success with a 67% increase in child count for that geographic location in the state and 75% increase in referrals. A second pilot was recommended by stakeholders in another native community. While the state sought to contract with a second service coordination region an extensive search did not yield any viable candidates. There is discussion of how this process can be replaced with other disciplines is currently under way for the person to lead another pilot.
• The state Part C professional development representative presented to multiple university programs across the state that prepare direct service providers and other early intervention professionals. At the University of South Dakota 30 pre-internship PT students, 35 pre-internship OT students and 20 pre-internship SLP students were engaged in learning about early intervention. At South Dakota State University, 25 Early Childhood Students learned about EI through a virtual lecture in their online capstone course.

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

NO

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

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

Data Quality Improvement Strategy:
• Support a statewide culture of informed data driven decision making using the Birth to Three comprehensive data system SEIDS.
Next Steps:
• Continue to collect, analyze and report child outcome data for continuous improvement.
• Continue to collaborate with Part B 619 to provider BDI training opportunities for evaluators.
• Implement full usage of program’s new comprehensive data system SEIDS.
• Provide TA opportunities to enhance service coordinators and providers data literacy skills.
• Support analysis of performance data by service coordinators and direct service providers.
• Implement Phase II of SEIDS including establishing Parent Portal.

Accountability Improvement Strategy:
• Implement general supervision monitoring protocols including results and compliance.
Next Steps:
• Continue to monitor early intervention programs, including service coordinator and direct service providers, on a cyclical basis.
• Evaluate and make necessary changes to monitoring protocols, priorities, tools, etc.

Professional Development Improvement Strategy:
• South Dakota will continue to provide comprehensive, relevant and rigorous training based upon changing needs of providers and families.
Next Steps:
• Continue to design, enhance, and deliver training and TA opportunities as identified for service coordinators, direct service providers and families including initial and sustained fidelity of practices
• Provide a rotation of professional development offerings to complement Bright Beginnings and based on data from the field
• Sustain collaboration with university/high-ed programs (including Tribal colleges) for internships, pilot programs, and research & to offer Bright Beginnings training as an elective to professional preparation students
• Disseminate program information at local, state, national and international conferences/meetings through vendor exhibits, presentations, and organizational boards
• Establish and implement refined and sustained practice of coaching and mentoring providers and service coordinators regarding evidence-based practice
• Establish a network of support mechanisms to engage early intervention providers with families (bring chapter of DEC to South Dakota, IE conference with family theme)
• Seek collaboration with medial entities to offer relevant Bright Beginnings training

Child and Workforce Improvement Strategy:
• South Dakota will continue to increase awareness of EI routines-based family engagement services to all South Dakota families
• South Dakota will continue to attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet EI needs statewide increased awareness of EI routines-based family engagement services to all South Dakota families.
Next Steps:
• Attract, recruit, and retain qualified personnel to meet EI needs statewide.
• Enhance existing resources to assist all families to engage in the EI process.
• Collaborate with relevant EC partners throughout the state and nation to assist in identification & referral of all families including children who have not had ready access to child find.
• Analyze options to increase community-based provider availability throughout the state for all Part C families.
• Facilitate relationships among state trial colleges and the Part C program to cultivate opportunities fort Native American Part C professionals
• Develop a comprehensive, relevant communication plan to ensure clear, responsive, respectful interactions between EI providers and families

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The combining of these two evidence-based practices results in greater family engagement and increased child and family outcomes. Early intervention, when done as intended result in:
• Enhanced ability for DSP to implement individualized and culturally sensitive early intervention home visits that emphasize parent child interactions during typical routines in children’s homes and early care settings;
• Greater ability to promote families’ understanding of and ability to positively support, young children’s physical, social, emotional, cognitive and language development; and
• Promote family awareness of strategies to increase language and literacy rich learning experiences for their children.
Additional research and resources from the medical and agricultural science regarding social determinants of health, are being added to the EBP required trainings to further exemplify the impact that health, well-being, and society have on family wellness and child development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question: Was learning this model of family centered early intervention useful?
98% indicated agree or strongly agree.

The state uses the ECO Family Outcome Survey to provide data for indicator C4. The survey supports the state’s efforts to engage families by building confidence and competence in supporting their infant or toddler with developmental delays or disabilities. One portion of the survey asks families a series of question related to communicating their child(s) needs. One survey question asks families “How helpful has early intervention been in….. listening to you and respecting your choices".
• 96% of families responded the Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful.

Another portion of the survey asks families a series of questions related to helping your child develop and learn. One survey question asks families “how helpful has early intervention been in identifying things you do that help your child learn and grow”.
• 91% families responded the Part C program was very helpful or extremely helpful.

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

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

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

Getting Ready: Due to the state’s movement towards statewide implementation of EBP the state restructured the DSP professional development to accommodate smaller participant numbers. The state recognized not 100% of providers have been trained, however, the majority of those remaining represent new providers awaiting a training cohort to begin or providers who are not actively serving a Part C / Birth to Three child. To accommodate this new norm, the state began on demand DSP professional development to accommodate smaller participant numbers. Upon review of two data points, course outcome/participant self-evaluation and C4 family data, it was deemed that a more rigorous, set schedule of training with PD specialist led conversations were a better fit for the program: providing stronger family engagement and more consistency across trainees. In winter 2025, the PD platform will return to a set course schedule and move “on-demand” training for anyone needing to brush up on their skills prior to or after monitoring activities.

During spring 2024, the state implemented a practice monitoring event to calibrate monitoring tools including monitoring rubrics specifically calibrated to the measure adherence to the EBP. Tools for EBP monitoring were shown to be efficient and effective in identity the family’s priorities for their child, family outcomes, and reflect the family engagement model. The State will continue focusing on sustained implementation of the EBP resulting in each provider participating in a sustained fidelity event at least once in every six-year period.

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

NO

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

The reader will note throughout this FFY 2023 SSIP report, the state has described completed activities, outcomes achieved, and next steps. Any adjustments or modifications were discussed in detail based on the evaluation data provided, including stakeholder input.

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

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

The South Dakota Part C Birth to Three program has established a strong partnership with the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), facilitating active and ongoing collaboration. Through regularly scheduled quarterly meetings, SICC members stay informed about program developments and data trends. To accommodate members’ significant travel distances, the majority of these meetings are held virtually. However, an annual in-person retreat is held, providing an opportunity for an in-depth review of data, analysis of trends, discussion of successes and challenges, and offering detailed guidance to the state team.

To ensure transparency, all SICC meeting dates, times, agendas, and minutes are posted on the South Dakota Boards and Commissions website at https://boardsandcommissions.sd.gov/Meetings.aspx?BoardID=57. These meetings are open to the public and are streamed live via South Dakota PBS. Meeting announcements are shared at least 72 hours in advance (excluding weekends and holidays), and information about how to join meetings virtually or in person is provided alongside the agendas. Accommodations are available upon request with adequate notice. Each meeting includes a Public Comment period, where the SICC Chair invites input from the public. This feedback is reflected in the presentation and meeting minutes. A final copy of the SPP/APR is submitted to the Secretary of Education, a member of the Governor's cabinet.

Members of this stakeholder group represent a wide spectrum of South Dakota and are located throughout the state. To ensure a broad overview of the state early intervention program and demographics, SICC members represent a wide variety of programs and agencies such as Head Start / Early Head Start, the Division of Insurance, early intervention providers, parents, South Dakota’s Parent Training and Information Center (PTI) Parent Connection, South Dakota Department of Health Maternal, Infant and Early Childhood Home Visiting (MIECHV) Bright Start, South Dakota State University Early Childhood Personnel Preparation, South Dakota Medical Service/Medicaid, South Dakota Office of Coordination of Homeless Children, South Dakota Foster Care/Child Protection Services/Auxiliary Placement, South Dakota Department of Human Services/Developmental Disabilities, South Dakota Child Care Services, Birth to Three regional program contractors, South Dakota education cooperative Black Hills Special Services, Part B, Part B 619, school district special education administration, Tribal Head Start, Head Start Collaboration Office, South Dakota State Legislator and Part C staff.

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

As was described in previous submissions, the SICC was heavily involved in the planning and writing of the FFY 2020 - FFY 2025 Birth to Three SPP/APR and SSIP plan including working with the state team to develop targets. During FFY 2023, SICC members continued to meet through regularly scheduled SICC meetings, stakeholder meetings and working sessions providing the state with feedback on indicator performance, data analysis in relation to targets, SSIP implementation and other communications.

The Birth to Three program has endeavored to create a culture of data use throughout the system with the engagement of stakeholders. In August 2023, representatives from the OSEP-sponsored TA centers DaSy and ECTA joined SICC members to analyze and discuss trends and preliminary data related to child and family outcomes. In October 2023, this team returned for a day-long retreat with state team members and SICC stakeholders to analyze state and regional SPP/APR data in relation to targets, address critical questions the data could answer, and evaluate progress toward the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SiMR).
SICC members convened in July 2024 to review Birth to Three 2024 Determinations. At each meeting during FFY 2023, state team members shared activities and reviewed progress towards the State Systemic Improvement Plan and SiMR. This work was finalized during the December 2024 and January 2025 meetings with the presentation of the FFY 2023 SPP/APR. Given the in-depth review SICC members felt very prepared when reviewing the data. In turn, SICC members unanimously determined to leave targets as presented, with no changes.

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

South Dakota Birth to Three, with the engagement of stakeholders, continues to promote and create opportunities for data use across the system, a goal further supported by the launch of the South Dakota Early Intervention System (SEIDS). This comprehensive data system integrates compliance and results data, enhancing the state’s capacity to provide timely, technical assistance. Stakeholders have been involved in every stage of SEIDS development, from researching and selecting the vendor to assisting with system testing.

Throughout the SPP/APR process, additional stakeholder input is described within the respective indicators. The collaborative input from stakeholders ensures that the South Dakota Birth to Three program remains responsive to the needs of families and continues to improve outcomes for children and families across the state.

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

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

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

Regular meetings between the State and DSP’s, coaches, and service coordinators to discuss implementation of the EBP. These experiences, suggestions and feedback were all provided to the state to continued improvement of EBP curriculum and practices.

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

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

YES

**Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.**

Stakeholders did not express any concerns instead they commended the state on the work being done with higher education to increase the provider pool while understating these efforts, in combination with very successful child find efforts need to be monitored. They understated the challenge of balance child find and the demand for providers but commend State with their increased efforts.

**Additional Implementation Activities**

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

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

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

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

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

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: General Supervision

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

**Compliance indicator:** This SPP/APR indicator focuses on the State lead agency’s exercise of its general supervision responsibility to monitor its Early Intervention Service (EIS) Providers and EIS Programs for requirements under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA) through the State’s reporting on timely correction of noncompliance (20 U.S.C. 1416(a) and 1435(a)(10); 34 C.F.R. §§ 303.120 and 303.700). In reporting on findings under this indicator, the State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State’s general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State.

**Data Source**

The State must include findings from data collected through all components of the State’s general supervision system that are used to identify noncompliance. This includes, but is not limited to, information collected through State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, and fiscal management systems as well as other mechanisms through which noncompliance is identified by the State. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation. Include all findings of noncompliance regardless of the specific type and extent of noncompliance.

**Measurement**

This SPP/APR indicator requires the reporting on the percent of findings of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

1. # of findings of noncompliance issued the prior Federal fiscal year (FFY) (e.g., for the FFY 2023 submission, use FFY 2022, July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023)
2. # of findings of noncompliance the State verified were corrected no later than one year after the State’s written notification of findings of noncompliance

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100

*States are required to complete the General Supervision Data Table within the online reporting tool.*

**Instructions**

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data expressed as a percentage. OSEP assumes that the State’s FFY 2023 data for this indicator is the State’s baseline data unless the State provides an explanation for using other baseline data.

Targets must be 100%.

Report in Column A the total number of findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2022 (July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023) and report in Column B the number of those findings which were timely corrected, as soon as possible and in no case later than one year after the State’s written notification of noncompliance.

Starting with the FFY 2023 SPP/APR, States are required to report on the correction of noncompliance related to compliance indicators 1, 7, 8a, 8b, and 8c based on findings issued in FFY 2022. Under each compliance indicator, States report on the correction of noncompliance for that specific indicator. However, in this general supervision Indicator 12, States report on both those findings as well as any additional findings that the State issued related to that compliance indicator.

In the last row of this General Supervision Data Table, States may also provide additional information related to other findings of noncompliance that are not specific to the compliance indicators. This row would include reporting on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported by the State under the compliance indicators (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.). In future years (e.g., with the FFY 2026 SPP/APR), States may be required to further disaggregate findings by results indicators (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11), fiscal and other areas.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2023 | 100.00% |

**Targets**

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

**Indicator 1. 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)**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| **Column A:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 1 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

NA

**Indicator 7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom initial evaluation, initial assessment, and the initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| **Column A:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 7 due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

NA

**Indicator 8A. 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442).**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| **Column A:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 8A due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

NA

**Indicator 8B. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:**

**B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy) the SEA and 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. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| **Column A:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 8B due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

NA

**Indicator 8C. The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:**

**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)**

**Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2022**

| **Column A:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D: # of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Please explain any differences in the number of findings reported in this data table and the number of findings reported in Indicator 8C due to various factors (e.g., additional findings related to other IDEA requirements).**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

NA

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

NA

***Optional for FFY 2023, 2024, and 2025:***

***Other Areas - All other findings: States may report here on all other findings of noncompliance that were not reported under the compliance indicators listed above (e.g., Results indicators (including related requirements), Fiscal, Dispute Resolution, etc.).***

| **Column B:** **# of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22** – **6/30/23)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

**Explain the source (e.g., State monitoring, State database/data system, dispute resolution, fiscal, related requirements, etc.) of any findings reported in this section:**

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirementsbased on *updated data*:**

**Please describe, consistent with OSEP QA 23-01, how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected:**

**Total for All Noncompliance Identified (Indicators 1, 7, 8A, 8B, 8C, and Optional Areas):**

| **Column A: # of written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 (7/1/22 – 6/30/23)** | **Column B: # of any other written findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 not reported in Column A (e.g., those issued based on other IDEA requirements), if applicable** | **Column C1:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column A that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column C2:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Column B that were timely corrected (i.e., verified as corrected no later than one year from identification)** | **Column D:** **# of written findings of noncompliance from Columns A and B for which correction was not completed or timely corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**FFY 2023 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of findings of Noncompliance that were timely corrected** | **Number of findings of Noncompliance that were identified in FFY 2022** | **FFY 2022 Data** | **FFY 2023 Target** | **FFY 2023 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 |  | 100% |  | N/A | N/A |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Percent of findings of noncompliance not corrected or not verified as corrected within one year of identification |  |

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

**Summary of Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected within one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Number of findings of noncompliance the State identified during FFY 2022 (the period from July 1, 2022 through June 30, 2023).  | 0 |
| 2. Number of findings the State verified as timely corrected (corrected within one year from the date of written notification to the EIS program/provider of the finding)  | 0 |
| 3. Number of findings not verified as corrected within one year  | 0 |

**Subsequent Correction: Summary of All Outstanding Findings of Noncompliance identified in FFY 2022 Not Timely Corrected in FFY 2023 (corrected more than one year from identification of the noncompliance):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 4. Number of findings of noncompliance not timely corrected  | 0 |
| 5. Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. A) the State has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline ("subsequent correction") - as reported in Indicator 1, 7, 8A, 8B, 8C | 0 |
| 6a. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Indicator 1 | 0 |
| 6b. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Indicator 7 | 0 |
| 6c. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Indicator 8A | 0 |
| 6d. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Indicator 8B | 0 |
| 6e. Number of additional written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Indicator 8C | 0 |
| 6f. (optional) Number of written findings of noncompliance (Col. B) the state has verified as corrected beyond the one-year timeline (“subsequent correction”) - Other Areas - All other findings | 0 |
| 7. Number of findings not yet verified as corrected  | 0 |

**Subsequent correction:** If the State did not ensure timely correction of previous findings of noncompliance, provide information on the nature of any continuing noncompliance and the actions that have been taken, or will be taken, to ensure the subsequent correction of the outstanding noncompliance, to address areas in need of improvement, and any sanctions or enforcement actions used, as necessary and consistent with IDEA’s enforcement provisions, the OMB Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles, and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (Uniform Guidance), and State rules.

NA

## 12 - OSEP Response

The State established a baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2023. However, the State is not required to establish a baseline until any fiscal year in which data are reported for this indicator.

## 12 - Required Actions

# Certification

**Instructions**

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

**Certify**

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

**Select the certifier’s role**

Designated by the Lead Agency Director to Certify

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

**Name:**

Sarah Carter

**Title:**

Part C Coordinator

**Email:**

sarah.carter@state.sd.us

**Phone:**

605-773-4478

**Submitted on:**

04/17/25 4:51:02 PM

# Determination Enclosures

## Data Rubric

**South Dakota**

**FFY 2023 APR** (1)

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3** | 1 | 1 |
| **4** | 1 | 1 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8A** | 1 | 1 |
| **8B** | 1 | 1 |
| **8C** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | 1 | 1 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | 1 | 1 |

**APR Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** | 14 |
| **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2023 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
| **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 19 |

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

**618 Data** (2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
|  **Child Count/Settings Due Date: 7/31/24** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 2/19/25** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/13/24** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

**618 Score Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Subtotal** | 9 |
| **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 2.11111111) = | 19.00 |

**Indicator Calculation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 19 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 19.00 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 38.00 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 38.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator) (3) = | 1.0000 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 100.00 |

**(2) In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 2.11111111 points are subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table.**

**(3) Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 2.11111111.**

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

**DATE: February 2025 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

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

**Part C 618 Data**

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **ED*Facts* Files/ EMAPS Survey**  | **Due Date** |
| Part C Child Count and Setting | Part C Child Count and Settings in EMAPS | 7/31/2024 |
| Part C Exiting | FS901 | 2/19/2025 |
| Part C Dispute Resolution  | Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 11/13/2024 |

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

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection.

## Dispute Resolution

**IDEA Part C**

**South Dakota**

**Year 2023-24**

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

**Section A: Written, Signed Complaints**

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

**Section B: Mediation Requests**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **(2) Total number of mediation requests received through all dispute resolution processes.**  | 0 |
| (2.1) Mediations held.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (a) Mediations held related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (a) (i) Mediation agreements related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (b) Mediations held not related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.1) (b) (i) Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints.  | 0 |
| (2.2) Mediations pending.  | 0 |
| (2.3) Mediations not held.  | 0 |

**Section C: Due Process Complaints**

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

**State Comments:**

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

South Dakota

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

11/13/2024