



Transforming State Systems  
to Improve Outcomes for  
Children with Disabilities




# Assessing the Impact of SSIP Infrastructure Improvements

June 6, 2016


NCSI, ECTA, and DaSy



# Session Logistics



- Your phone/microphone had been muted.
- To ask questions, type in the “chat Box”



# Today's Objectives

Participants will:

- Increase understanding of the value of assessing state-wide infrastructure improvements
- Learn about states-specific examples of approaches to assessing infrastructure improvements

# Agenda


- Overview of the topic: **Why** assess your infrastructure improvements?
- Introduction of virtual state panel
- State panelists share their experiences
- Q&A and discussion
- Evaluation of webinar

# Importance of Infrastructure to the SSIP

Infrastructure improvements are foundational to the SSIP.

- In Phase I, states **analyzed** various facets of their infrastructure that could support or pose barriers to their planned improvement strategies.
- In Phase II, states **developed a plan** to improve their infrastructure and measure changes in infrastructure.
- In Phase III, states will **enact** the infrastructure improvements from the Phase II plan, and measure the impact of these changes.

# Relationship of Infrastructure to EBP Implementation and SIMR Improvement



# Why Evaluate Infrastructure Improvements?

- To know whether your activities have occurred
- To understand the impact that this change has made at the local level (e.g., whether practices were implemented)
- To see whether there was a change in outcomes for children & families
- To improve your plans and make adjustments

# What to Assess?

## 1. Progress:

How are improvement efforts going?



Are we making the changes we planned to make?

If not, what do we need to do ?

## 2. Outcomes:

What impact are we seeing?



How is our state and local system different as a result of our changes to infrastructure?



# Guiding Questions

As you think about your own SSIP infrastructure efforts:

- 1. How will you know if your infrastructure improvements are being implemented as planned?*
- 2. How might you assess the impact of your infrastructure improvements?*

# Introducing Our State Panel

- Arizona Part C
- Maine Part C
- Nebraska Part B
- Oklahoma Part B

# Panel Format

- State introductions and SSIP context setting, including one key infrastructure improvement
- Each state will then respond to two questions about how they plan to assess the implementation and impact of their infrastructure work.
- Q&A dialogue with participants via chat box

# Arizona Early Intervention Program



Karie Taylor

Assistant Director, Part C  
Coordinator

Maureen Casey


Policy and Professional  
Development Coordinator



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

*Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona*  
Your Partner For A Stronger Arizona

# AZ-C: Theory of Action



## AZ-C: Improving PD/TA Infrastructure

- Strengthening various components of the **professional development system** across early childhood to support consistent expectations of early childhood professionals with emphasis on social emotional outcomes
- Incorporate TBEIS training as in-house function
- Enhance existing TBEIS master coaching structure and expand to implementation sites
- Revise personnel standards policies to differentiate between SC and DSI responsibilities
- Implement AzEIP Standards of Practice



# MAINE

**Janna Gregory**  
Deputy Director



**Roy Fowler**  
El Technical Advisor



**child  
development  
services**

## ME-C: Overview of SSIP

**SIMR-** Maine will increase the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they turn three or exit the program.



**child  
development  
services**



# ME-C: Overview of SSIP

## Broad Improvement Strategies

- Professional Development
- ***Data Collection and Reporting***

*If CDS enhances the capacity of the state-wide data system to collect and report comprehensive data on child indicator results then necessary data will be available for monitoring, evaluation, and improvement planning on child outcomes then Maine will increase the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they turn three or exit the program.*

- Early Intervention Outreach
- System Support



# Nebraska



Steve Milliken  
Office of Special Education,  
Administrator



Kelly Wojcik  
SSIP Coordinator



Teresa Berube  
619 Coordinator



Adria Bace  
Data Team Leader

## NE-B: SIMR

Increase reading proficiency for students with disabilities within the selected cohort at the third grade level as measured by the statewide reading assessment (NeSA).



## NE-B: Improvement Strategies

1. Create a newly integrated MTSS framework that integrates PBIS into the current RtI model;
2. Establish increasingly intensive implementation of evidence-based practices for reading; and
3. Continue alignment of the state's internal infrastructure.

## NE-B: Focus on Infrastructure

Increase collaboration within the Department of Education.

- Establish deeper understanding of work and responsibilities of each office
- Support the work of the accountability initiative (AQuESTT)
- Ensure clear, consistent messages to districts



# Oklahoma

Ginger L. Elliott-Teague, Ph.D.

- Director of Data Analysis, Special Education
- Roles & Responsibilities:
  - SSIP Coordinator for Parts B & C
  - Part B & C Data Manager (Shared position with colleague)



OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF  
**EDUCATION**  
— CHAMPION EXCELLENCE —



## OK-B: SIMR

As measured by: Percentage increase in students passing the 3<sup>rd</sup> grade annual reading assessment.

## OK-B: Improvement Strategies

- Data system updates
- Monitoring for performance
- Parent & district training on accommodations & assistive technology
- Parent engagement & training on early literacy EBPs
- Professional development on early literacy EBPs



## OK-B: Focus on Infrastructure

- Data system updates
  - Part C data system will be integrated into the Part B data system at the state level.
  - Every child will automatically be assigned a “state testing number” (STN) when they enter SoonerStart, beginning December 1, 2016.
    - This unique number will stay with the child until they graduate or age out of Part B services.

# Question for State Panel

How will you know if your infrastructure improvements are being implemented as planned?



# AZ-C: Using the ECTA System Framework

Jump to:	<span style="background-color: #f08080; padding: 2px;">GV</span> <span style="background-color: #90ee90; padding: 2px;">FN</span> <span style="background-color: #90ee90; padding: 2px;">PN</span> <span style="background-color: #ffff00; padding: 2px;">AC</span> <span style="background-color: #9370db; padding: 2px;">QS</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">PV</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">DG</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">SE</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">SD</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">DU</span> <span style="background-color: #add8e6; padding: 2px;">SU</span>											Wrap Text		Narrow Rows		Total # of Elements	# of Elements in this QI with RATING...				# of Elements in this QI with PRIORITY...		
	Quality Indicator	Rating	Priority	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	Low		Medium	High					
<b>PN (Personnel/Workforce)</b>					<b>QI Rating</b>																		
1	A cross sector leadership team is in place that can set priorities and make policy, governance, and financial decisions related to the personnel system.	4									8		2	5	1								
2	There is a written multi-year plan in place to address all sub-components of the CSPD.	4									6			6									
3	State personnel standards across disciplines are aligned to national professional organization personnel standards.	4									4			4									
4	The criteria for state certification, licensure, credentialing and/or endorsement are aligned to state personnel standards and national professional organization personnel standards across disciplines.	6									5			2	3								
5	Institution of higher education (IHE) programs and curricula across disciplines are aligned with both national professional organization personnel standards and state personnel standards.	4									5		2	3									
6	Institution of higher education programs and curricula address early childhood development and discipline specific pedagogy.	4									6		3	3									
7	A statewide system for inservice personnel development and technical assistance is in place for personnel across disciplines.	4									8		1	7									
8	A statewide system for inservice personnel development and technical assistance is aligned and coordinated with higher education program and curricula across disciplines.	4									3			3									
9	Comprehensive recruitment and retention strategies are based on multiple data sources, and revised as necessary.	3									3		2	1									
10	Comprehensive recruitment and retention strategies are being implemented across disciplines.	4									5		2	3									
11	The evaluation plan for the CSPD includes processes and mechanisms to collect, store, and analyze data across all subcomponents.	5									5		1	2	2								
12	The evaluation plan is implemented, continuously monitored, and revised as necessary based on multiple data sources.	4									4		1	3									



## ME-C: Data Collection and Reporting

**If** CDS enhances the capacity of the state-wide data system to collect and report comprehensive data on child indicator results

**then** necessary data will be available for monitoring, evaluation, and improvement planning on child outcomes

**then** Maine will increase the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills by the time they turn three or exit the program.


Strategies/Activities	Outputs	Proposed Initiation Date	Person(s) Responsible	Resources Needed	Outcomes	
					Short-Term	Long-Term
CDS will implement a new statewide data system that will improve data quality and allow necessary analyses of child outcome data	<p>Data system is developed and implemented (goes live July 1, 2016)</p> <p>Within 30 days of go-live, all staff receive training</p> <p>Within 30 days of hire all new staff receive training</p>	July 2015	SLT	<p>Contract with vendor to develop data system</p> <p>TA support from IDC</p>	<p>Accurate and timely data are entered by staff (surveys of staff, data quality checks)</p>	<p>High quality CO data are available</p> <p>Data is accurate and timely</p> <p>Staff use the data system to routinely correlate child outcome data with other program and demographic data to identify success, plan and evaluate improvement efforts</p>
<p>CDS will embed the COSF in the new data system, which will ensure that both entrance and exit COSFs are completed and received by the state office and significantly reduce the chances of human error</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Practitioners will complete the COSF at the IFSP team meeting to ensure that the scoring reflects input from the entire team</li> <li>- File reviews will be conducted to ensure that the scoring of the COSF accurately reflects the child's development</li> </ul>	<p>COSF is successfully embedded in the new data system</p> <p>Practitioners complete the COSF at the IFSP team meeting</p> <p>State identifies a tool for file reviews</p>	July 2016	QA Director	<p>Access to new data system</p> <p>Information on embedding outcomes in IFSP/IEP documents</p>	<p>COSF data reflect child development (regional leadership team(s) will conduct monthly reviews of 15% of entry and exit COSF)</p> <p>COSF data includes input from the entire IFSP team (regional leadership team(s) will conduct monthly reviews of 15% of exit COSF)</p>	<p>CO data are analyzed and used for monitoring, evaluation and program improvement</p> <p>COSF data are valid and reliable measures of child progress in the EI system (State will conduct file reviews to ensure accuracy)</p>

## NE-B: Assessing Infrastructure Implementation


- Review of Agendas – times met, who was involved, purpose/outcome of meeting
- Action Plan Evaluation
- Surveys
  - Staff: perception of ties with AQuESTT, reduction of silos
  - Districts: perception of consistent messaging, reduction of # of plans required
  - Stakeholders: perception of consistent messaging, level of engagement

## OK-B: Assessing Infrastructure Implementation

- Using standard process evaluation techniques, we will document activities and action items.
  - Timelines
  - Participants & participation
  - Goal achievement
- Questions
  - Did we do what we said we would?
  - Did we meet our goals on time?



Questions?



Send to: Everyone

Can you tell me about monitoring implementation through our infrastructure?

Send

Connected ●



# Question for State Panel

How might you assess the impact of your infrastructure improvements?



# AZ-C: Assessing Infrastructure Impact

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)
Short term	EIP practitioners develop collaborative partnerships with families, other team members, ECE community partners	Has the number of IFSPs that include collaboration with behavioral health and/or DDD ALTCs services/supports increased?	An increase of percentage of IFSPs that include collaboration with behavioral health and/or DDD ALTCs services/supports	Sampling of IFSP document strategies or services that are collaborative with behavioral health or DDD ALTCs. This may include use of Family Survey data or data	July 2016
Short term	EIP leaders consistently apply internal processes to support implementation with fidelity, which include Master Coaches, training and TA	Does the EIP have system of internal process to support implementation with fidelity?	An increase of percentage of EIPs who have processes that include Master Coaches within teams, training and TA	AzEIP Training Data demonstrates change in percentage of Master Coaches, training and TA data (including competency checks).	December 2016

# ME-C: Implementation Teams

Membership of teams will include representatives from:

- State Agency Leadership
- Regional Leadership
- Early Intervention Program Managers
- Early Intervention Practitioners
- Parents/ Family members
- Designated stake holders (ex. PIC, ICC)
- Early Childhood Special Education Program (619)



# ME-C: Implementation Teams

Responsibilities: Monitor and implement the specific actions and outputs identified

- Address the barriers identified in Phase I
- Develop work plans
- Implement activities and evaluation measures.

# ME-C: Implementation Teams

## Data and Reporting Implementation Team

- Will address the inability to disaggregate outcome data to determine if other indicator percentages are a contributing factor in improving results as well as the challenges in correctly completing the COSF


## NE-B: Assessing Infrastructure Impact

Districts report...


- Reduction in the # of improvement plans required
- Receiving the same messages/information regardless of which office within the department is contacted
- Spending more time on implementing improvement plans than developing them

## OK-B: Assessing Impact

- Measureable outcomes:
  - IEP team members will read and review early childhood IFSPs, creating better IEPs as a result.
- Measurements & methods:
  - In data system, will track how frequently IEP teams access IFSP information. (Baseline...)
  - Using focus groups and surveys (and possibly document review), will assess whether access to IFSP information produces better initial IEPs.



Questions?



Send to:

Connected ●



# Resources

- ECTA/DaSy System Framework and Self-Assessment:  
<http://ectacenter.org/sysframe/>
- NCSI Resources on State Capacity Building:  
<http://ncsi.wested.org/resources/tools-publications/>

# Evaluation of Today's Event

- You will receive a link to a short evaluation of this event from the Meadows Center, NCSI's external evaluator.
- Thank you for completing this short evaluation.
- We value your feedback!

# Wrap Up



# THANK YOU!

<http://ncsi.wested.org> | @TheNCSI

The contents of this document were developed under a grant from the US Department of Education, #H326R140006. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. Project Officers: Perry Williams and Shedah Hajghassemali. (November 2014)



Office of Special Education Programs  
U.S. Department of Education

