

Appendix 06—Accountability Strand Tracking and Reporting Implementation and Evaluation Data for State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

I. State: Arizona

II. Part B: **Part C:**

III. SSIP Leadership Team Members, Role and Organization Represented

Name	Position/Role	Organization/Agency
Maureen Casey	Interim Assistant Director; Part C Coordinator	Arizona Department of Economic Security/Division of Child and Family Engagement (ADES/DCFE)
Mike Worley	Business Administration	ADES/DCFE
Kathy Coloma	Accountability Lead	ADES/DCFE
Jenee Sisroy	Acting Program Administrator	Arizona Early Intervention Program (ADES/AzEIP)
Annie Converse	Continuous Quality Improvement Coordinator/Data Manager	ADES/AzEIP
Lisa Casteel	Fiscal Projects Coordinator	ADES/DCFE
Alicia Sharma	Continuous Quality Improvement Coordinator/Professional Development	ADES/AzEIP
Docia Rojel	Dedicated Trainer	ADES/AzEIP
Tina Johnson	DDD EIU Administrator	Division of Developmental Disabilities (ADES/DDD)
Tanya Goitia	DDD EIU Program Specialist	ADES/DDD
Teri Nichols	DDD EIU Program Specialist	ADES/DDD
Barbara Schrag	Director of Early Childhood Programs	Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB)
Laura Hocknull	Supervisor/Hearing Impaired Specialist	ASDB

IV. State-Identified Measurable Result

Arizona will increase the percent of children who exit early intervention, in identified regions, with greater than expected improvements in their social relationships (Summary Statement 1 of Outcome A).

V. Improvement Strategies (list all)

Accountability Improvement Strategy 1 (A1): ADES/AzEIP continues to develop a high quality comprehensive data system to collect and use it to identify root causes of implementation challenges.

Accountability Improvement Strategy 2 (A2): ADES/AzEIP provides training and TA to support EIPs to use data for decision-making.

VI. 1. SSIP Improvement Strategy and Evaluation Details

A. Improvement Strategy

A1: Enhance the statewide system of professional development (PD) to increase early intervention providers’ knowledge of social-emotional (SE) development, development of functional SE Individualized Family Support Plan (IFSP) outcomes/objectives/strategies, and implementation of the IFSP using evidence-based practices.

A2: ADES/AzEIP provides training and TA to support EIPs to use data for decision-making.

B. Key State Improvement Plans or Initiatives That Align With These Improvement Strategies

C. Improving Infrastructure and/or Practice

1. Is this improvement strategy intended to improve one or more infrastructure components? If so, check all that apply.

Governance	<input type="checkbox"/>	Accountability	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Professional development	<input type="checkbox"/>
Data	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Quality standards	<input type="checkbox"/>	Technical assistance	<input type="checkbox"/>
Finance	<input type="checkbox"/>				

2. Is this strategy intended to directly improve practices? Yes No

D. Intended Outcomes

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description/Improvement Strategy
Short-term	EIP practitioners collect and input valid and reliable data to determine if children are making sufficient progress (<i>Improvement Strategy A1</i>)
Short-term	EIP Leaders consistently analyze programmatic data to ensure compliance with IDEA and child outcome data to determine effectiveness of EIP (<i>Improvement Strategy A1</i>)
Short-term	EIP Leaders make program level improvements across agency lines and assess fidelity of implementation of TBEIS practices (<i>Improvement Strategy A1</i>)
Short-term	EIP practitioners collect and input valid and reliable data to determine if children are making sufficient progress (<i>Improvement Strategy A2</i>)
Short-term	EIP Leaders consistently analyze programmatic data to ensure compliance with IDEA and child outcome data to determine effectiveness of EIP (<i>Improvement Strategy A2</i>)
Short-term	EIP Leaders consistently assess fidelity of implementation of TBEIS and implement program level improvements across agency lines (<i>Improvement Strategy A2</i>)
Intermediate	Families receive necessary supports and services, in a timely manner to assist them to increase the quality of parent-child interactions to support their child to engage and participate in everyday activities (enhance their confidence and competence to support their child’s social emotional development)
Long-Term	SiMR: Increase the percent of children who exit early intervention, in identified regions, with greater than expected improvements in their social relationships (Summary Statement 1 of Outcome A).

E. Improvement Plan

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive data system	X		1. Defining the data system elements required to analyze timely and accurate data entry	Business Analyst, SMEs Data Manager	ADES/AzEIP	December 2015 through April 2016	Representatives from the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD), the Arizona Schools for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB) and select program contacts were involved with assessment and development of the Business Requirements for the new Data System.	Status: Completed. Evidence: Meeting minutes and Business Requirements for new data system	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive data system	X		2. Documenting business requirements	Business Analyst, SMEs	ADES/AzEIP	June 2015 through September 2015	Representatives from DDD, ASDB and program contacts contributed to the assessment and development. The EIP State Leaders meeting was used to present to a larger stakeholder group and get feedback.	Status: Completed June 2015 through September 2015 Evidence: AzEIP I-Teams Assessment, Project Charter, DaSy System Framework Self-Assessment	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive data system (continued)	X		3. Ensure business requirements are in alignment with DaSy System Framework	Business Analyst, SMEs Data Manager	ADES/AzEIP	September 2015	DDD, ASDB, EIP State Leaders	Status: Completed September 2015 Evidence: DaSy System Framework Self-Assessment	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
	X		4. Approval of final business requirements	LA staff	ADES/AzEIP	October 2015	DDD, ASDB, EIP State Leaders	Status: Completed October 2015 Evidence: Final Business Requirements	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
	X		5. Decision about how to proceed with data system	ADES/AzEIP, ADES leadership Approval, Budgetary expenditure approval, Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA) final approval of expenditure	ADES and ADOA	December 2015 through April 2016	ADOA, ADES Leadership	Status: Completed December 2015 Evidence: Final Business Requirements	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive	X		6. Development/enhancement of comprehensive data system	Dependent on decision above, may include procurement of	ADES/AzEIP	Jan-16 through June 17		Status: In Progress Evidence: Salesforce	Barriers: LA staff developed business requirements to build a new data system and upon completion of first steps, ADES decided to move forward with a department-wide data system.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
data system (continued)			(additional sub-steps for securing vendor if Leadership Team approves, etc.)	a vendor or enhancement of a current available ADES data system		October 2016 through September 2017		Scope of Work, User Acceptance Testing Agreements, and project planning documents	Actions to Address Barriers: AzEIP was chosen to be one of the first phases of the roll-out due to the groundwork completed with exploring previous off the shelf data system solution Adjustments: Timelines for this step were modified to allow for final development with a stakeholder user group and user training. Implications of Adjustments: Data system is scheduled to be fully launched by September 1, 2017.
	X		7. In interim, continued enhancement and fix of existing system	Business Analyst and ADES/DTS I-TEAMS developers	ADES/AzEIP, ADES/DTS	October 2015 through June 2016	AzEIP continues to partner with ASDB, DDD and ADES/DTS for continuous improvement of the current system	Status: Completed Evidence: Implementation of Agile improvements, DDD Eligibility request automated 10/2016, Users required to enter Insurance Consent No Reason 9/2016	Barriers: AzEIP has limited ability to implement major enhancements due to system infrastructure limitations. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP team consults with DTS along with DDD and ASDB to ensure the most important changes take effect and focus energy on developing the new system to avoid similar issues or limitations. Adjustments: None Implications of Adjustments: Not Applicable
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive data system (continued)	X		8. Implementation of reporting metric for timely and accurate data Implementation of Child Contract Report to support providers in	Report finalized and moved to production	ADES/AzEIP, ADES/DTS	July 2016		Status: Completed January 2016 Evidence: Child Contract report sent to all EIPs weekly, because report	Barriers: Team identified several data quality issues with the timely and accurate data report. The team decided to go with a report that will pull all children that are open in an EIP with several data elements that are often updated late. This replaced the timely and accurate data report and analysis of timely and accurate data continues to be a manual process for the team.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
			identifying current data issues					for timely and accurate data would not meet needs this report was implemented instead.	<p>Actions to Address Barriers: Development of a new report that would support EIPs with identifying common errors and also support them with projecting deadlines and general data analysis for their programs.</p> <p>Adjustments: Change to a different report.</p> <p>Implications of Adjustments: Since the beginning of the weekly child contract reports programs have been much more able to quickly assess and identify data entry concerns on an ongoing basis. Though this report is not able to meet all needs of timely and accurate data analysis, it has helped EIPs and the Lead Agency (LA) to make enormous strides in data entry and compliance analysis.</p>
A1.1 Development or enhancement of comprehensive data system (continued)	X	X	9. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training		ADES/AzEIP	Oct 2016		<p>Status: Completed</p> <p>Evidence: notes from AzEIP Planning Meeting</p>	<p>Barriers: The AzEIP team was not able to proceed with original plan. A new report was developed to include many of the necessary components for evaluating timely and accurate data but as a snapshot for EIPs to use internally.</p> <p>Actions to Address Barriers: Developed a Child Contract report to help EIPs identify data issues and trends.</p> <p>Adjustments: Adjusted the report and ensured weekly reports sent to EIPs.</p> <p>Implications of Adjustments: EIPs have easier access to data on a regular basis. This has had an impact on data quality and a significant reduction in missing data elements across the state.</p>
A1.2 Ensuring entry of timely and accurate data	X	X	1. Conduct Needs analysis and Review results to determine areas	Data Stakeholder Group, EIP State Leaders	ADES/AzEIP	June 2015		<p>Status: Completed June 2015</p>	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
			where staff have challenges with the data collection and entry process					Evidence: Development of Data Quality Session Guide	
	X	X	2. Conduct data quality sessions to improve practitioners adherence to entering timely and accurate data	Locations, DDD Liaisons	Data Manager	July 2015 through September 2015		Status: Completed July 2015-September 2015 Evidence: Enrollment in courses, Data Quality Session Guide, Participant Registration	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
	X	X	3. Identify EIP Data Managers to include in process improvement activities	State COS Materials	EIP State Leaders, Data Stakeholder Group	July 2015		Status: Completed July 2015-September 2015 Evidence: each EIP identified an EIP Data Manager as per Chapter 8 Policy.	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A1.2 Ensuring entry of timely and accurate data (continued)	X	X	4. Clarifying role and responsibility of program data managers/stewards	AzEIP Data Policy, EIP Data Policies	Data Manager, Data Stakeholder Group, EIP State Leaders	July 2016		Status: Completed July 2016 Evidence: Revised	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
								Chapter 8 Policy effective July 2016	
	X	X	5. Use of reporting metric for timely and accurate data (for determinations) Use of Child Contract reports for timely and accurate data and increased data quality.	Report finalized and moved to production	ADES/AzEIP, ADES/DTS	Jul 2016		<p>Status: Completed January 2016</p> <p>Evidence: Weekly reports sent to EIPs statewide, improved timely data entry.</p>	<p>Barriers: The AzEIP team was not able to proceed with original plan for a timely and accurate data report. Additionally, the team worked on a compliance scorecard but due to internal structural changes and losing key staff the project is still in progress. The team continues to use current reports and some manual processes for determinations.</p> <p>Actions to Address Barriers: AzEIP team sends Child Contract report to help EIPs identify data issues and trends; LA Staff identify trends and support programs with developing countermeasures to improve data accuracy and timely entry; AzEIP is moving forward with a new data system to alleviate some of the current limitations for the next reporting period.</p> <p>Adjustments: LA Staff is continuing with previous process until new data system is implemented.</p> <p>Implications of Adjustments: LA Staff will need to continue a somewhat manual process for data review and have worked on the new data system to ensure limitations are addressed moving forward.</p>
A1.2 Ensuring entry of timely and accurate data (continued)	X		6. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training	Report finalized and moved to production	ADES/AzEIP , EIP State Leaders	September 2016		<p>Status: Completed; new policy went into effect July 2016</p> <p>Evidence: Chapter 8 Policy in effect; increased</p>	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
								timely data entry.	
A1.3 Increase Family Survey response rate.	X		1. Identify different timeframe (e.g., April) to have families complete the family survey.	Cycle 3 IMA Participants	ADES/AzEIP, ICC	November 2015		Status: Completed November 2015 Evidence: ICC Stakeholders Meeting notes.	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
	X		2. Identify which families to have complete the survey (e.g., families who have had an IFSP for at least 6 months, those without transfers between programs).	ADES/AzEIP, Report	ADES/AzEIP, ICC	February 2016		Status: Completed February 2016 Evidence: Family Survey Memo, ICC Meeting Notes	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A1.3 Increase Family Survey response rate. (continued)	X		3. Have ICC families prepare communication to accompany the family survey.	ICC	ICC, ADES/AzEIP	February 2016		Status: Completed February 2016 Evidence: Family Survey Memo, ICC Meeting Notes	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A1.3 Increase Family Survey response rate. (continued)	X		4. Analyze Data received	ADES/AzEIP, Report	ADES/AzEIP	April 2016- November 2016		Status: Completed in timeframe Evidence: Memo regarding preliminary	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
								results May 2016, Family Survey Data	
	X		5. Implement Survey distribution and collection process Statewide	ADES/AzEIP, Reports, Service Providing Agencies, EIP State Leaders, Data Stakeholder Group	ADES/AzEIP	Feb 2017 February 2017- April 2017		Status: In Progress Evidence: Family Survey Memo for field.	Barriers: There are several new staff in the AzEIP office that need to be supported in implementing statewide. Additionally, because of changing office locations the staff needed to get new materials with the new address. Actions to Address Barriers: Barriers have been addressed by the team by extending the timeframe of scaling up to statewide. Description of Adjustments: Adjusting the timeline due to infrastructure changes with new staff and physical move of the office. Implications of Adjustments: The delay will support the team with putting elements in place to ensure successful statewide implementation.
A2.1 Professional Development for EIP leaders and practitioners to look at data for accuracy and use it for decision-making and program improvement (Need to see value in data - importance of accurate record keeping as well as	X		1. Determine how to support EIPS to use data to drive program improvement	Locate existing or develop new training including learning objectives and assessment	OPD resources for development, AzEIP SMEs	January 2016 through June 2016		Status: Completed Evidence: Data Quality Sessions with EIP leaders	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
how it can help you in your practice)									
A2.1 Professional Development for EIP leaders and practitioners to look at data for accuracy and use it for decision-making and program improvement	X		2. Provide coaching and follow-up (e.g., data stakeholder group)	Data Stakeholder Group	ADES/AzEIP , Service Providing Agencies	January 2016 through June 2017		<p>Status: Completed with Cycle 1 and as needed with other programs</p> <p>Evidence: Huddle call notes, reports, site visits with Cycle 1 participants, Informational meeting regarding data April 2016</p>	<p>Barriers: Every program had an opportunity for a data quality session with the LA Data Manager however coaching was limited to Cycle 1 participants due to the great need of those EIPs to close continuing noncompliance and to the internal DES structural changes.</p> <p>Actions to Address Barriers: The LA Staff chose to focus on the EIPs that would have the greatest initial impact for overall data quality and coaching.</p> <p>Description of Adjustments: Started coaching sessions/huddle calls with an initial pilot of 1/3 of EIPs statewide and with others as requested or needed.</p> <p>Implications of Adjustments: The LA team experienced many structural changes during implementation of coaching for data quality sessions. However, with lessons learned from huddle calls and countermeasures the LA team has been able to provide TA to other programs and consider ongoing focused TA sessions through webinars for all programs and intensive TA for programs with higher need. The course of the data quality support TA has also lead the LA team to consider multiple communication methodologies of general TA in addition to a tiered approach to TA support.</p>
A2.1 Professional Development for EIP leaders and practitioners to		X	3. Lead Agency provides EIP level reports on schedule	Revised Reports	ADES/AzEIP, ADES/DTS	March 2016		<p>Status: Completed January 2016</p>	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
look at data for accuracy and use it for decision-making and program improvement (continued)			responsive to EIP needs					Evidence: Weekly Child Contract Reports and Child Outcome Summary (COS) data Reports sent to EIP Leaders	
	X		4. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training	Data reflecting training participation and resulting changes	ADES/AzEIP, Data Stakeholder Group	August 2016 through June 2017		Status: In Progress Evidence: Reports tied to site visits	Barriers: Internal DES structural changes and LA Staff turnover; Actions to Address Barriers: LA Staff has been working closely with TA center's staff to identify other states' methods of accountability and performance based contracting for the 2018 contract renewal. LA Staff have implemented a streamlined process of accountability for EIPs with low data quality and overall performance using a tiered approach. Additionally, evaluation and analysis continues to be partially manual therefore the LA Staff is working through a data system change to address these barriers. Description of Adjustments: LA team is working to improve and streamline TA processes surrounding data analysis. Implications of Adjustments: LA team will be able to more quickly identify trends and coach EIPs surrounding data and compliance.
A2.2: Implement COS Training	X		1. Review COS Modules and state COS materials	COS Modules	ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	June 2015 through August 2015		Status: Completed August 2015	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
								Evidence: COS module agreement with DaSy and ECTA center	
A2.2: Implement COS Training	X		2. Identify what needs to be modified in the COS modules to meet state needs	COS Modules	ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	Jun 2015 through Aug 2015		Status: Completed August 2015 Evidence: COS module agreement with DaSy and ECTA center	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.2: Implement COS Training	X		3. Modify/Adapt COS modules to address state needs	COS Modules	ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	June 2015 through August 2015		Status: Completed August 2015 Evidence: COS module agreement with DaSy and ECTA Center, COS module pilot launch	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.2: Implement COS Training	X		4. Piloted first 3 COS Modules		ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	June 2015 through August 2015		Status: Completed August 2015 Evidence: Pilot Course Rosters for trainings 8/3/15 & 8/12/15	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
A2.2: Implement COS Training	X		5. Approval from DES for COS modules	DES/Office for Personnel Development	ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	June 2015 through August 2015	DES Training Department	Status: Completed August 2015 Evidence: Training Course Approval form.	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.2: Implement COS Training		X	6. Practitioners to complete COS modules	EIP Participants		August 2015 through June 2016	ASDB, DDD	Status: Completed Evidence: Training Roster (data to include below: 262 participants)	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.2: Implement COS Training		X	7. Establish inter-rater reliability for providers for each program		ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	June 2016 through December 2016 March 2017- March 2018		Status: In Progress Evidence: Providers trained in COS Modules, increased quantity of ratings.	Barriers: Many providers needed a training or a refresher course on COS ratings to ensure all were starting from the same baseline. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP office hired a full time trainer to ensure all providers have access to the training. The AzEIP trainer has trained 262 participants in the COS modules since August 2016. Description of Adjustments: The timeline is adjusted to ensure all participants have the same training and to allow the LA Staff and stakeholders to do some analysis and planning to implement. Implications of Adjustments: The timeline adjustment will allow for more preparation and time to implement.
A2.2: Implement COS Training		X	8. EIP practitioners determine if individual children are making sufficient progress	Child Outcome Summary Reports		June 2016 through June 2017		Status: In Progress Evidence: Increased number of	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
								providers received COS module training, Increased quantity of COS exit ratings.	
A2.2: Implement COS Training (continued)	X		9. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training	ADES/AzEIP, ODP, SME, EIP State Leaders	ADES/AzEIP , EIP State Leaders	March through August 2016	DaSy Center, ASDB, DDD, First Things First	Status: Complete Evidence: SiMR Summit reviewing COS data; Increase in reporting on children exiting program	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.3: EIP leaders analyze child outcomes at a programmatic level to determine effectiveness of EIP		X	1. EIP Program leaders review a selection of COS Forms to determine accuracy and consistency of ratings to further identify issues	Selection of completed COS Forms from several practitioners	ADES/AzEIP, Service Providing Agencies	August 2016 through February 2017 May 2017- March 2018		Status: Not yet initiated Evidence:	Barriers: Changes in AzEIP and state leadership prevented team from implementing in a timely manner. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP team is adjusting timelines for some activities to ensure implementation happens as intended. Description of Adjustments: Timeline is adjusted. Implications of Adjustments: The timeline adjustment will allow for more preparation, stakeholder involvement and time to implement.
A2.3: EIP leaders analyze child outcomes at a programmatic level to determine effectiveness of EIP	X		2. Using data from item 1 identify key COS /assessment practices that need to be implemented	COS competencies /practices reflection tools	ADES/AzEIP, EIP State Leaders	October 2016 through October 2017 May 2017- March 2018		Status: Not yet initiated Evidence:	Barriers: Changes in AzEIP and state leadership prevented team from implementing in a timely manner. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP team is adjusting timelines for some activities to ensure implementation happens as intended.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
									Description of Adjustments: Timeline is adjusted. Implications of Adjustments: The timeline adjustment will allow for more preparation and time to implement.
A2.3: EIP leaders analyze child outcomes at a programmatic level to determine effectiveness of EIP		X	3. Progress monitoring	EIP State Leaders, TBEIS Providers	Service Providing Agencies, ADES/AzEIP	October 2016 through October 2017 May 2017- March 2018		Status: Not yet initiated Evidence: Not yet initiated	Barriers: Changes in AzEIP and state leadership prevented team from implementing in a timely manner. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP team is adjusting timelines for some activities to ensure implementation happens as intended. Description of Adjustments: Timeline is adjusted. Implications of Adjustments: The timeline adjustment will allow for more preparation, stakeholder engagement and time to implement.
	X		4. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training	Data - reflecting training participation and resulting changes	ADES/AzEIP , EIP State Leaders	October 2016 through October 2017 May 2017- March 2018		Status: Not yet initiated Evidence: Not yet initiated	Barriers: Changes in AzEIP and state leadership prevented team from implementing in a timely manner. Actions to Address Barriers: The AzEIP team is adjusting timelines for some activities to ensure implementation happens as intended. Description of Adjustments: Timeline is adjusted. Implications of Adjustments: The timeline adjustment will allow for more preparation, stakeholder engagement and time to implement.
A2.4: Revising transition policies and training to ensure that EIP Practitioners meet Transition Requirements and	X		1. Revised Transition Policies and Technical Assistance	ADES/AzEIP Staff	ADES/AzEIP	July 2015		Status: Completed July 2015 Evidence: Chapter 4 revision, Public Comment, IGA with Arizona	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
document in data system								Department of Education regarding transition.	
A2.4: Revising transition policies and training to ensure that EIP Practitioners meet Transition Requirements and document in data system	X		2. Revise Transition Training, TA and guidance materials	ADES/AzEIP , ODP, SME	ADES/AzEIP /OPD/SMEs /EIP State Leaders	July 2016 Completion June 2018		<p>Status: Completed initial work by April 2016, Transition TA and guidance in process</p> <p>Evidence: Transition Timeline Guidance Document, Revised IFSP Document, Site Visit Materials</p>	<p>Barriers: Upon analysis of overall CSPD system and in attempt to streamline the LA Staff chose to update guidance materials and provide TA due to limitations of LA Staff capacity and in anticipation of a dedicated training being hired for AzEIP.</p> <p>Actions to Address Barriers: Included transition training in the overall Standards of Practice (SOP) Training to ensure additional support from the shared DES Office of Professional Development and in order to streamline rollout of all SOP training updates. Until the full training is rolled out the LA Staff focused on developing TA and guidance materials.</p> <p>Description of Adjustments: The LA Staff has adjusted timeline for revisions to TA and guidance materials.</p> <p>Implications of Adjustments: Transition training, TA and guidance materials will be consistent and rolled out with all other Standards of Practice to streamline the information being provided to the field and utilize available DES supports and resources.</p>
A2.4: Revising transition policies and training to ensure that EIP Practitioners meet Transition Requirements and	X	X	3. Evaluating effectiveness of revised policies and training	ADES/AzEIP, ODP, SME, EIP State Leaders	ADES/AzEIP /OPD/SMEs/EIP State Leaders	August 2016 through August 2017 August 2018		<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Evidence: increased compliance statewide for Transition</p>	<p>Barriers: Upon analysis of overall CSPD system and in attempt to streamline the LA Staff chose to update guidance materials and provide TA due to limitations of LA Staff capacity and in anticipation of a dedicated training being hired for AzEIP.</p> <p>Actions to Address Barriers: Roll transition training into the overall Standards of Practice (SOP) Training</p>

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
document in data system								Planning Meeting; data quality sessions for EIPs and coaching for Cycle 1.	to ensure additional support from the shared DES Office of Professional Development and in order to streamline rollout of all SOP training updates. Until the full training is rolled out the LA Staff focus on TA and supporting programs with data analysis surrounding transition. Description of Adjustments: The LA Staff has adjusted timeline for full rollout of transition training. Implications of Adjustments: Transition training will be consistent and rolled out with all other Standards of Practice to streamline the information being provided to the field and utilize available DES supports and resources.
A2.5: EIPs develop, document and apply specific Data Entry and Use Procedures		X	Require EIPs to create local data procedures between TBEIS Contractors, DDD Unit and ASDB Program		LA staff EIP Leaders	Develop: February 2015–December 2016 Update Annually as needed		Status: Completed Evidence: Ch. 8 Revised policy requirement; EIP Data Policies submitted to LA office	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.6: EIP Leaders consistently analyze programmatic data to ensure compliance with IDEA and child outcome data to determine effectiveness of EIP		X	1. EIP Data Managers and leaders analyze local data to identify trends and make improvements.		EIP leaders and EIP Data Managers	January 2016 through June 2017		Status: In Progress Evidence: Decreased missing data on compliance reports, Child Contract reports	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

Activities to Meet Outcomes	System Level		Steps to Implement Activities	Resources Needed	Who Is Responsible	Timeline (projected initiation & completion dates)	How Other LA/SEA Offices and Other Agencies Will Be Involved*	Status and Evidence	Implementation Notes: Barriers, Actions to Address Barriers, Description of Adjustments, Implications of Adjustments
	State	Local							
A2.7: Increase use of available data to drive improvements in program performance at all levels <i>(Infrastructure Improvement)</i>	X	X	Refine Reports Schedule report distribution, Provide TA on Reports link to improving practices Blend with existing Lean transformation Implement Scorecard metrics	“Child Contract Report” updates SSRS Server TA Meetings LA Staff to complete DES/Office of Lean Transformation trainings	AzEIP Data Manager AzEIP CQIC Staff DDD Liaison Staff EIP Program Leaders Individual Practitioners	February 2016 - Ongoing		Status: Completed January 2016 Evidence: Child Contract Reports sent weekly to EIP Leaders, Data from APR	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.
A2.8: Update AzEIP Data Policy to support needs of the program <i>(Infrastructure Improvement)</i>	X		Review existing Data Policies (Chapter 8) Obtain Stakeholder Feedback Create proposed changes – post for public comment Submit final version with Application Implement final changes.			Review by Aug. 2015 Draft proposed changes by Jan 2016 Public Comment January 2016 – March 2016 Submit final version April 2016 Effective July 2016		Status: Completed July 2016 Evidence: Chapter 8: Data Collection and Reporting policy updated and approved.	Activity implemented as intended with no barriers encountered. No changes or adjustments were made to this activity or timelines.

F. Evaluation Plan

1. Evaluation of Improvement Strategy Implementation

Activity	How Will We Know the Activity Happened According to the Plan? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Methods, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator																				
<p>A1: ADES/AzEIP continues to develop a high quality comprehensive data system to collect and use it to identify root causes of implementation challenges</p>	<p>The ADES/AzEIP reviewed state data system against DaSy system framework quality indicators and completed self-assessment for relevant components identifying data use as an area of need for immediate need for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increased self-assessment rating on the DaSy Data System Framework on the Data Use components. 	<p>DaSy Data System Framework & Self-Assessment –Data Use components</p>	<p>Initial July – September 2015 Review and re-assess annually June 2018</p>	<p>Status: Completed Initial DaSy Data System Framework in June 2015</p> <p>Data: Baseline Data from System Framework</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1346 1078 1757 1438"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Data Governance and Management Quality Indicator Ratings (out of 7)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>QI Rating</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>3</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>7</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Data Governance and Management Quality Indicator Ratings (out of 7)		QI Rating		3		4		5		4		3		7		4		4		<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions:</p> <p>The AzEIP office staff identified areas of improvement through the DaSy Data System Framework Self-Assessment. Many of these areas were taken into consideration as business requirements were being developed to purchase a new data system. Due to the delay in the project and adjusted timelines the team will reassess progress at the end of implementation to identify areas of improvement and areas of growth that occurred during the timeframe.</p> <p>Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator:</p> <p>Performance data not yet available although baseline data is available for this reporting period.</p>
Data Governance and Management Quality Indicator Ratings (out of 7)																									
QI Rating																									
3																									
4																									
5																									
4																									
3																									
7																									
4																									
4																									

Activity	How Will We Know the Activity Happened According to the Plan? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Methods, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator
					<p>Notes: LA Staff decided to wait until changes in data system are completed to ensure measurement of progress of infrastructure changes as a pre-post measure.</p>
<p>A2: ADES/AzEIP provides training and TA to support EIPs to use data for decision-making (Data Quality)</p>	<p>AzEIP provided Technical Assistance to support EIPs to collect timely & accurate data as planned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of data collection technical assistance provided. 	<p>July 2015 – September 2015 Annually TBD based on identified needs</p>	<p>Status: Initial implementation completed. LA Staff continue this on an ongoing basis. Data: I-teams Data Quality Training Summer 2015: <i>Sessions beginning July 2015 and concluding September 2015</i> 31 sessions including a billing session 220 participants including providers and supervisors statewide. Data Quality Visits with Data Manager: <i>Sessions beginning January 2016</i> 9 Data Visits covering 27 of 41 EIPs. Data Manager Reviewed: Timely and Accurate Data, missing data, data procedures and improvement strategies.</p>	<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions: While beginning implementation activities LA Staff found that there was not a way to develop a report in I-teams to measure timely and accurate data. However, LA Staff developed another report and provided Data Quality sessions along with follow up TA and Data Quality Visits supporting EIPs with using the Child Contract Report to measure timely and accurate data. Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: Data training was implemented initially to ensure consistent data entry training for all providers. Once completed LA Staff continued to provide TA regarding data culminating in developing the Data Quality Visits and using a similar approach in Site Visits due to positive feedback from EIPs that participated in Data Visits.</p>
<p>A2: ADES/AzEIP provides training and TA to support EIPs to use data for decision-making (Infrastructure Development)</p>	<p>AzEIP provided training and TA to provide EIPs to use data for decision-making as planned.</p>	<p>Documentation of T&TA provided on using data for decision-making</p>	<p>July 2015 – September 2015 Annually TBD based on identified needs</p>	<p>Status: LA Staff began with I-teams Data Quality Training July-September 2015. This led to Data Quality Visits with the Data Manager and ultimately TA through the Summer SiMR Summit meeting to support SSIP regions in identifying local implementation plans to use data for decision making along with implementing evidence based practices. Data:</p>	<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions: The AzEIP staff received feedback from stakeholders during Data Quality Sessions that they would like more access to data on an ongoing basis. Data quality and reporting have improved over the past year however, some data is entered and stored in two systems when children are DDD eligible. Currently, the AzEIP and DDD teams are</p>

Activity	How Will We Know the Activity Happened According to the Plan? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Methods, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator
				<p>Data Quality Visits with Data Manager: See Above</p> <p>SiMR summit data: <i>August 2016</i> 42 participants attended the SiMR Summit including EIP leaders, Master Coaches, providers and stakeholders. Groups focused on local improvement strategies and using data for decision making on a local level.</p>	<p>working to avoid multiple data entry methods in the new data system.</p> <p><u>Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator:</u> Data reporting and access to data have improved significantly allowing local EIPs to analyze and begin using data for decision making. Much of the focus of this improvement strategy was on infrastructure development and with the launch of a new data system this will continue to be a focus as new reports and data fields are available.</p>

3. Evaluation of Intended Outcomes

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator								
Short term	EIP practitioners collect and input valid and reliable data to determine if children are making sufficient progress (Infrastructure)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do EIPs have follow policies/procedures to ensure the collection and timely and accurate entry of valid & reliable data? Do EIPs input higher quality of data? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increased # of EIPs have policies/procedures to ensure collection and timely and accurate entry of valid & reliable data. Increased timeliness and accuracy of data entered into state data system. Increased # and % of exit rating at end of Phase III. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> During monitoring visits, review and discuss documentation of EIP data collection and entry policies/procedures Data system reports 	Initiation: June 2016 Completion: End of Phase III	<p>Status: In Progress: Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 9 programs encompassing 27 EIPs had data quality TA visits (face to face or virtual) by AZEIP staff to support their understanding of data requirements <p>Exit Ratings Data:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1634 846 2024 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Baseline: FFY 2015 (July 2015-June 2016)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings</td> <td>68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.</td> <td>77%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.</td> <td>89%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Baseline: FFY 2015 (July 2015-June 2016)		Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings	68%	Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.	77%	% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.	89%	<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions: LA Staff adjusted performance indicator to align with outcome and demonstrate results of data quality sessions.</p> <p>Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: Overall statewide performance regarding timely and accurate data entry have increased due to the concentrated efforts by the data stakeholder group, LA Staff and agency partners like DDD and ASDB. The increased improvement efforts have led to collaboration in the development of the new data system.</p> <p>Adjustments: One performance indicator was removed and replaced by measuring the number and percentage of exit ratings to better reflect the impact of data quality efforts.</p> <p>Implication of Adjustments: The performance indicator was revised because data policies and procedures are already a required component of the local contracts.</p>
Baseline: FFY 2015 (July 2015-June 2016)															
Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings	68%														
Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.	77%														
% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.	89%														

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator								
						<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1631 337 2040 407">Preliminary FFY 2016 (July 2016-January 2017)</th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1631 407 1911 516">Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings</td> <td data-bbox="1911 407 2040 516">71%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1631 516 1911 625">Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.</td> <td data-bbox="1911 516 2040 625">76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1631 625 1911 764">% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.</td> <td data-bbox="1911 625 2040 764">93%</td> </tr> </table>	Preliminary FFY 2016 (July 2016-January 2017)		Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings	71%	Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.	76%	% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.	93%	
Preliminary FFY 2016 (July 2016-January 2017)															
Overall % of children exiting with Exit Ratings	71%														
Overall % of children enrolled for more than 6 mos.	76%														
% of children enrolled for more than 6 mos with Exit Ratings.	93%														
Short term	EIP Leaders consistently analyze programmatic data to ensure compliance with IDEA and child outcome data to determine effectiveness of EIP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are EIPs analyzing programmatic data to ensure compliance and child outcomes data to determine effectiveness of EIP? What % of EIPs are in compliance? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased self-assessment rating on Data Use component of DaSy Data System Framework self-assessment. (<i>Pre and Post Measurement</i>) Increased requests for T&TA sessions for using data for decision-making. An increased % of EIPs are in compliance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DaSy data System Framework & Self-Assessment - Data Use component (select specific indicators) Documentation of T&TA provided on using data for decision-making Compliance indicator data 	June 2016-End of Phase III	<p>Status: In Progress: Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIP leaders were supported through Data Quality sessions with the LA Data Manager January – March 2016. 100% of Cycle 1 monitoring programs (n=13) received a site visit to review individual corrective action plans, coaching and follow up calls, meetings and additional data quality TA Other EIPs received TA upon request. 	<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions: Trainings and TA sessions were offered to EIP leaders and providers but there still continues to be a lack of timely data entry in some indicators resulting in lack of compliance. Though there is some improvement this will continue to be a focus for measurement especially as a new data system is utilized.</p> <p>Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: Access to reports and data quality discussions have improved over the reporting period. There is improved awareness of data quality issues and some improvement in compliance.</p> <p>Notes: Timeline was adjusted to account for continuing need for compliance improvement and also to measure the progress during implementation of new data system.</p>								

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data			Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator
						Compliance Indicator	EIPs 100% comp. FFY '14	EIPs 100% comp. FFY '15	
						1: Timely Services	2 of 15	4 of 13	
						7: 45 Day Timeline	10 of 41	11 of 41	
						8a: TPM	1 of 15	2 of 13	
						8b: PEA	1 of 15	2 of 13	
						8c: TC	1 of 15	2 of 13	
Short term	EIP Leaders consistently assess fidelity of implementation of TBEIS and implement program level improvements across agency lines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are EIPs implementing program level improvements? What % of supervisors report program improvement by using TBEIS fidelity assessment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decreased time frame on corrective action plans. Decrease in number of actions required in corrective action plans An increased % of supervisors report using TBEIS fidelity assessment in planning PD/program improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIP corrective action plans Supervisor survey? Supervisors collect data around use of fidelity tools 	Starting September 2016- September 2019	Status: In Progress Data is still being collected and evaluated. SiMR Summit Data: <i>August 2016</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 42 participants attended the SiMR Summit including EIP leaders, Master Coaches, providers and stakeholders. Groups focused on local improvement strategies and using data for decision making on a local level. Local Implementation Teams identified specific fidelity assessment tools to use in program. 			Data Quality Issues and Actions: The AzEIP team has focused on building infrastructure and supporting EIPs with general training to ensure success while scaling up this initiative. At this point all EIPs have access to and have been introduced through training to multiple fidelity tools. Local Implementation plans were developed by EIP participants in the Summer SiMR Summit in August 2016. The AzEIP team is developing a survey to measure the implementation of the plan and working with the EIPs to find ways to increase the use of fidelity measures. Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: Supervisors and Master Coaches identified tools from Master Teams' institutes and FIPP as major fidelity assessments currently in use. Teams were introduced to ECTA Center DEC RP tools and chose an area of focus for implementation.

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator
							Notes: Survey is being developed to measure progress in supervisor use of fidelity assessment tools. LA Staff are developing measures and will review with stakeholders to get feedback surrounding measures in survey.
Intermediate	Families receive necessary supports and services, in a timely manner to assist them to increase the quality of parent-child interactions to support their child to engage and participate in everyday activities (enhance their confidence and competence to support their child's social emotional development)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What % of families (in the SSIP regions) receive initial and new services in a timely manner? • What % of families in the SSIP regional report increase in the quality of their p-c interactions to support their child's participation in everyday activities? • What % of families report enhanced confidence & competence to support their child's S/E development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increased % of families receive initial and new services in a timely manner? • An increased % of families report EI services have helped my family make changes in family routines that will benefit my child with special needs. • An increased % of families report EI Services have helped my family do things with and for my child that are good for my child's development? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on report from ITEAMS • Family survey Questions 9 and 17 		<p>Status: In Progress</p> <p>Baseline Data: APR Indicator 1 (Timely Services) Data:</p> <p>84.96% Compliance Statewide. This is an increase of 10% over FFY 2014.</p> <p>Family Survey Data:</p> <p>EI services have helped my family make changes in family routines that will benefit my child with special needs. (Q9): 93.81%</p> <p>EI services have helped my family do things with and for my child that are good for my child's development. (Q17): 93.41%</p>	<p>Data Quality Issues and Actions:</p> <p>Additionally, the current family survey data and Indicator 1 data is from the APR and the team is unable to break it down to SSIP regions at this time. Family Survey reporting increased significantly with the pilot approach to survey delivery however, there are still limitations due to the low response rate.</p> <p>Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: Current measures are reflective of baseline data. Due to the increased response to surveys last year in April 2016, the AZEIP team expects to see a continued increase in response as Family Survey activities are scaled up to statewide implementation.</p>

Type of Outcome	Outcome Description	Evaluation Questions	How Will We Know the Intended Outcome Was Achieved? (performance indicator)	Measurement/Data Collection Method, Analysis	Timeline (projected initiation and completion dates)	Status and Data	Evaluation Notes: Data Quality Issues and Actions, Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator
Long term	SiMR: Increase the percent of children who exit early intervention, in identified regions, with greater than expected improvements in their social relationships (Summary Statement 1 of Outcome A).	Are more children exiting early intervention making greater than expected improvements in social relationships?	An increased % of children who exit early intervention, in identified regions, with greater than expected improvements in their social relationships (Summary Statement 1 of Outcome A).	COS data - Summary Statement 1 of Outcome A	February 2018	Status: In Progress SiMR Data: FFY 2015 APR data: Target: 72.01% Actual: 72.48%	Data Quality Issues and Actions: The AzEIP team has focused many improvement activities upon increasing timely data entry as well as improving the quality of the COS ratings. There have been significant improvements in these measures leading to an adjustment of targets for all Child Outcome Summary measures. Performance Status Related to Performance Indicator: There have been increases in the SiMR throughout the implementation of the SSIP. Many infrastructure activities were implemented and LA Staff expect to see continued improvements throughout Phase III implementation. Notes: The AzEIP team was able to adjust the targets for Child Outcomes due to the significant increase in reporting and in data quality. The new baseline year is measured in FFY 2014.