The Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR): Part C Indicator Measurement Table describes the focus of the SSIP Phase II–Plan as:

“The focus of Phase II is on building state capacity to support Early Intervention Service (EIS) programs and/or EIS providers with the implementation of evidence-based practices (EBPs) that will lead to measurable improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) (SIMR) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.”

The Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) and Annual Performance Report (APR): Part C Indicator Measurement Table (subsequently referred to as the Part C Indicator Measurement Table) defines three components which must be included in the April 2016 submission of the SPP/APR Indicator C-11 and B-17, the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) including:

1. Infrastructure Development;
2. Support for EIS Programs and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
3. Evaluation

The SSIP Phase II Process Guide describes the steps needed to accomplish the work of the three components of Phase II. Thus, the SSIP Phase II Process Guide is organized according to the following sequential phases of work to be done, rather than by the three components.

1. Kicking off Phase II
2. Developing the improvement plan
3. Developing the evaluation plan
4. Communicating the plan

Throughout The SSIP Phase II Process Guide the term “the plan” refers to the set of activities, steps, and resources described in the Part C Indicator Measurement Table.

The three components are included throughout the sections of the SSIP Phase II Process Guide.
Figure 1: The components included in Phase I and Phase II of the SSIP and the connection between the Phases

Figure 1 shows the link between Phase I–Analysis and Phase II–Plan and the connections among the components of Phase II. Phase II should be integrally connected to Phase I–Analysis and Phase
III–Implementation and Evaluation. The theory of action (ToA) developed in Phase I will drive Phase II and lay out the work to be completed in Phase III. Many states are taking steps to install some of the system changes, like enhancements to the professional development system, that are most critical to supporting the improvement strategies identified in the SSIP. Although these implementation activities are required under Phase III and not Phase II, beginning to install them early in the process may be critical to meeting future timelines. States also are likely to make changes to the Phase I ToA and improvement strategies, in order to align the work to the most recent knowledge of state strengths, challenges, and capacity, and they will need to document the reasons for these changes. As states begin the installation of activities to improve the infrastructure in Phase II, they should track the activities, including the start date and progress, to ensure that they can accurately report and evaluate all activities they completed under the SSIP.

Timeline for Submission to OSEP

Figure 2 shows the timeline for submission of each Phase of the SSIP to OSEP and provides a brief description of the content included in that Phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 – FFY 2013</th>
<th>Year 2 - FFY 2014</th>
<th>Years 3-6 - FFY 2015-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivered April 2015</td>
<td>Due April 2016</td>
<td>Due February 2017- 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase I: Analysis**
- Data Analysis
- Description of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity
- State-identified Measureable Result (SIMR)
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies
- Theory of Action

**Phase II: Plan**
- Multi-year plan addressing:
  - Phase I Content/Updates
  - Infrastructure Development
  - Support for EIS Program and/or EIS providers in Implementing Evidence-Based Practices
  - Evaluation Plan

**Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation**
- Reporting on Progress including:
  - Phase I and Phase II Content/Updates
  - Progress toward short- and long-term outcomes
  - Revisions to the SPP and evaluation data to support decision

States will submit Phase II SSIPs through GRADS360 using a process similar to that used for Phase I according to OSEP requirements.
Stakeholder Engagement in Phase II

In the Part C Indicator Measurement Table OSEP stressed the importance of stakeholder engagement throughout the SSIP process. Some considerations related to engaging stakeholders in kicking off the Phase II plan include:

- Reengage stakeholders to the work of Phase II based on the status of Phase I of the SSIP and the purpose of the SSIP.

- Use multiple opportunities and formats (e.g. websites, newsletter, state conferences) to share information about the development of Phase II of the SSIP with stakeholders and create opportunities with stakeholders so they can share information with their communities.

- Consider the "messaging" for the participating local programs. Are the messages co-created? How will the state garner their support? If the state selected subsets of programs having low performance to achieve the SIMR, how will the state garner programs' support without focusing on the negatives that prompted their inclusion in the state’s efforts?

- If the state uses planning or implementation teams, engage stakeholders not included on these teams in a discussion about how they would like to get information, provide input into planning, and discuss potential implications for future learning.
What States Need to Submit as a part of SSIP Phase II

Excerpted from: *Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool.*

**Updated Data**

In its FFY 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, due yearly February 2016 through February 2020, the state must provide updated data for the specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and those data must be aligned with the SIMR(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFY 2014 through FFY 2018 SPPs/APRs, the state must report on whether or not it met its target.

- Part C SPP/APR Collection Tool
- Part C Indicator Measurement Table

**Components**

**Phase II Component #1: Infrastructure Development**

1a) Specify improvements that will be made to the state infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

1b) Identify the steps the state will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the state, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start, and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

1c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

1d) Specify how the state will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other state agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.
Phase II Component #2: Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

2a) Specify how the state will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

2b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

2c) Specify how the state will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other state agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

Phase II Component #3: Evaluation

3a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

3b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

3c) Specify the methods that the state will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).

3d) Specify how the state will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the state’s progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Phase II Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the state needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP.
Kicking Off SSIP Phase II

The first step in getting started on Phase II is identifying who will do the work, what they will do, and when and how they will do the work. Planning up-front facilitates clear communication with state staff and stakeholders about the types of work they will be expected to do and the time commitment they are making. States can chose to complete the work through a number of structures, one of which is to develop or use existing teams to plan and oversee implementation. As teams are created it is important for states to be intentional about how stakeholders are actively involved in the work. If teams are used to complete the work of Phase II, defining the purpose and membership of the team and processes they will follow will make the teams more efficient and avoid miscommunication. Four key concepts from Implementation Science will be integrated into this part of the SSIP Phase II Process Guide including: State Leadership Team, Implementation Team, Feedback Loops, and Terms of Reference.

Step 1. Review and address OSEP’s recommendations for improving Phase I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure work is aligned to OSEP’s expectations for the state.</td>
<td>Feedback from OSEP state contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2. Identify the activities and timelines described in Phase I that need to be completed during Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that sufficient progress is being made on the activities identified in Phase I.</td>
<td>There are no resources listed for this step.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 3. Review the requirements for Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Align planning and deliverables to the requirements OSEP described.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 4. Generate an initial Gantt Chart listing the work to be done in Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Create a visual of the activities and timelines required to complete Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have a tool to track state progress toward completing Phase II.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSIP Phase II Gantt Chart Template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 5. Identify a staffing structure and those responsible for completing Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identify the team or teams that will be responsible for completing Phase II of the SSIP (State Leadership Team, Implementation Teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete initial planning of how those teams will coordinate (Linked Teams).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify staff with expertise and interest to support the evaluation design and make sure the team or teams that are completing the planning have access to these staff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AI Hub Module 3: Implementation teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Integrated Stage-Based Framework for Implementation of Early Childhood Programs and Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Guide to Statewide Implementation, Scale-up, and Sustainability of Recommended Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Leadership Team Benchmarks of Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 6. Describe the role of stakeholders in Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Ensure that various viewpoints and expertise will have a role throughout the development of Phase II.  
• Identify the people who need to be invited to participate.  
• Ensure that stakeholders are involved in creating the activities and undertaking relevant pieces of the plan. | Leading by Convening  
Circles of Involvement |

Step 7. If state uses a State Leadership Team and Local Implementation Teams, invite team members to participate in Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Alert potential team members to the need for a time commitment.  
• Establish the group that will need to be moved through orientation to Phase II. | State Leadership Team Benchmarks of Quality |
### Step 8. Ensure stakeholders and planning team members have an active role in Phase II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increase stakeholder understanding of the findings and conclusions of Phase I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase the active role of stakeholders for Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase understanding of the requirements of Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase focus of stakeholder discussion on the key requirements of Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase stakeholder engagement in actively planning for Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have an expectation that stakeholders will share these ideas with their networks and bring back relevant ideas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting Ready for Phase II of the SSIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developing the Improvement Plan

"Planning is what you do before you do something, so that when you do it, it is not all mixed up."

~ Christopher Robin to Winnie the Pooh (A.A. Milne)

This section describes the steps in developing an improvement plan. While there are many ways that a state may choose to develop a written improvement plan, this guide provides the basic steps in improvement planning. A state may complete the steps in a different order, or add or eliminate steps and should use this resource in a way that fits state needs.

During Phase I of the SSIP, states reviewed their data at all levels, assessed their current infrastructure, and developed Coherent Improvement Strategies and a Theory of Action that specifies how the State-Identified Measureable Result (SIMR) will be achieved. Now it is time to put this all into action! An improvement plan for Phase II will provide the details needed to achieve the expected outcomes and make progress toward achieving the state’s SIMR.

Improvement planning is an organizational management activity that is used to:

- Set priorities
- Focus energy and resources
- Ensure that internal and external stakeholders are working toward common goals
- Establish agreement on intended outcomes/results implementation

Planning occurs all the time, both informally and formally. Effective improvement planning is intentional and provides an opportunity to assess the current status, determine if what is being done needs to be done, and decide where to go in the future. Improvement planning involves setting priorities, assessing internal and external resources, and engaging all interested parties in defining the activities, desired outcomes, and implementing/revising improvement strategies as needed to achieve the SIMR.

In Phase II, developing the written plan will provide states with the structure and detail needed to achieve the SIMR through implementation of the improvement strategies. Including stakeholders, key partners, and staff in this process ensures that all perspectives are represented. The evaluation measures provide the feedback needed to track progress and make needed adjustments.
The improvement plan must address improving the infrastructure and how the state will support EIS programs and/or EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices. It should include the following:

- Activities and steps that will be implemented, who is responsible, and according to what timelines
- Resources needed for each activity
- Leverage points and partners from within the lead agency and other initiatives and agencies
- Communication strategies and stakeholder involvement
- How identified barriers in the infrastructure will be addressed
- How activities will be implemented with fidelity
- Procedures for monitoring the plan's implementation and strategies, timeframe for plan evaluation, and modifications, if needed, to ensure progress toward desired outcomes is achieved.

Improvement Plans answer the following questions:

- **Where are we now?** Use this opportunity to review the current environment and clarify the vision, mission, and purpose.
- **Where are we going?** Think ahead several years to assure consistency and alignment with the direction the organization is headed.
- **What will achievement of the SIMR look like?** Identify the expected short, intermediate, and long-term outcomes that will result from achieving the SIMR.
- **How will we get there?** Lay out the road to connect current activities with future desired goals. Develop an improvement plan with clearly defined activities.
- **How will we know we've been successful?** Determine benchmarks of success. Develop an evaluation plan that leads to improving and adjusting the activities to ensure a dynamic and responsive process is in place to achieve the SIMR and the intended outcomes.

Other questions to consider include the following:

- What actions or changes will occur?
- Who will carry out these changes?
- When will the changes will take place, and for how long?
- What resources are needed to carry out the activity (e.g., staff, funding, supplies)?
- How will the improvement plan be communicated to stakeholders, the public, providers, and families?
- How will input be provided to make needed adjustments to the improvement plan?
Step 1. Convene the core staff and/or stakeholders responsible for the written plan. Core staff/stakeholders responsible for the written improvement plan might represent various levels of the system and offer expertise in a broad range of areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Develop a process for collecting and compiling information for the improvement plan.</td>
<td>Planning Guide to Statewide Implementation, Scale-up, and Sustainability of Recommended Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify fiscal and human resources available for planning and/or implementation of the SSIP.</td>
<td>An Integrated Stage-Based Framework for Implementation of Early Childhood Programs and Systems (see p. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DIY Committee Guide: Strategic Plan Step 5: Writing Your Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2. Determine timeline and responsibilities for developing the written improvement plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Develop a timeline to ensure submission to OSEP by April 1.</td>
<td>AI Hub Activity 5.2: PDSA Who am I?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Assign responsibility for completing assignments.</td>
<td>SSIP Phase II Gantt Chart Template</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3. Establish the process for developing the improvement plan, including meeting schedule, agenda format, and a format for documenting and sharing decisions made in planning meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that information provided to planning groups is consistent.</td>
<td>Community Tool Box: Chapter 8, Section 5: Developing an Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure that information needed for the written improvement plan is collected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 4. **Determine how stakeholders, staff, and partners will be engaged and organized to provide input for the improvement plan.**

**Purpose**
- Ensure that stakeholders, staff, and partners actively engage in developing the improvement plan.
- Provide clear expectations on how improvement plan will be developed.
- Assign responsibility for completing assignments.

**Resources**
- Leading by Convening: Ensuring Relevant Participation

---

Step 5. **Determine communication protocols to coordinate communication (for the internal group actively engaged in developing the improvement plan) at all levels during the planning process.**

**Purpose**
- Ensure that communication occurs across all levels.
- Ensure that all members working on developing the improvement plan are in communication loop.

**Resources**
- AI Hub Handout 8: Communication Protocol Worksheet

---

Step 6. **Establish protocols for communicating with key external stakeholders who are not actively engaged in developing the written plan.**

**Purpose**
- Ensure members of the internal planning team communicate about the improvement plan with other stakeholders in their agency.
- Ensure buy-in for implementation of the SSIP.

**Resources**
- Template for Strategic Communications Plan (see Step 3: Develop Messages)
Step 7. Review the state’s or program’s vision, mission, and purpose, if appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure alignment of SSIP with state or agency priorities.</td>
<td>Vision and Direction in Leadership Checklist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 8. Provide brief overview of the Theory of Action (TOA) and Improvement Strategies developed in Phase I. This may need to be repeated at each meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure planning team members are familiar with the TOA and Improvement Strategies.</td>
<td>State Theory of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep planners focused on how their work fits into the larger SSIP.</td>
<td>State Improvement Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State logic model, if developed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 9. Review and identify evidence-based programs, practices, or approaches that would be expected to positively impact the SIMR. This review will yield a set of practices, potential programs, or approaches and infrastructure improvements to be considered by planners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure program, practices, or approaches align with TOA.</td>
<td>DEC Recommended Practices &amp; Glossary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define the set of evidence-based programs, practices, or approaches to be considered by planning teams.</td>
<td>What Works Clearinghouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Define the activities to be completed to strengthen the infrastructure for improving practices, programs, or approaches.</td>
<td>A System Framework for Building High-Quality Early Intervention and Preschool Special Education Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 10. Review, discuss, and select potential practices or programs in relation to need, fit, resources— sustainability, strength of evidence, readiness for replication and capacity to implement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the practices selected are doable and a good fit.</td>
<td>The Hexagon Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offering our Best to Children and Families: Program-Wide Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 11. Determine the initial implementation sites for the installation of the evidence-based program or practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the initial sites are ready for installation.</td>
<td>The Hexagon Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure actions are included in the plan addressing capacity of installation sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 12. Identify short-term and intermediate outcomes that will need to be achieved to improve the long-term outcome (SIMR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure the improvement plan activities and steps are designed to achieve outcomes of the SSIP.</td>
<td>Recommended Resources for Planning to Evaluate Program Improvement Efforts (including the SSIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Link the improvement plan with the evaluation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 13. Select the format to be used to develop the written implementation plan (e.g., sample template, template of state choice).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Provide document for capturing information throughout the process of developing the written improvement plan.</td>
<td>Sample SSIP Action Plan Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 14. Develop the written improvement plan that identifies how the improvement strategies will be implemented to achieve the short-term, intermediate, and long-term outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure written improvement plan follows the guidance from OSEP for Phase II.</td>
<td>Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guide implementation of the SSIP work now and in future.</td>
<td>Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building an SSIP Evaluation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a High Quality Improvement Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(see slides 3-11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 15. Review the written plan to ensure that the activities are Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Relevant, and Timely (SMART).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the activities planned can be evaluated.</td>
<td>Benchmarks of Quality for Home-Visiting Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 16. Share the written plan with stakeholders, parents, providers, agency staff, and partners for their review and comment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure buy-in of staff, stakeholders, and partners.</td>
<td>There are no resources listed for this step.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step 17. Finalize the written plan.

**Purpose**
- Include a narrative summary of the Phase II development process and detailed improvement plan.

**Resources**
There are no resources listed for this step.

**Tips**
- **Planning may take several sessions.** Develop drafts for review and input from stakeholders at multiple points in the process.
- **An effective improvement strategy may require several actions and related activities to achieve full implementation.**
- **Remember to address infrastructure.** Identify how you will build on the strengths and address the weaknesses identified in Phase I of SSIP development.
- **Carefully consider the evidenced-based practices or approaches to be selected.** What practices or approaches will most effectively improve outcomes for children and families?
- **Consider evaluation and ways to measure change when developing the improvement plan.** How will you know activities are implemented with fidelity? How will you know the activities are making the expected difference?

**Criteria for a good improvement plan:**
- **Aspirational:** Does the improvement plan reflect the current work? Are newly emerging opportunities and barriers addressed? Does it address the identified infrastructure issues and provide supports for implementation of evidenced-based practices?
- **Complete:** Does it list all of the action steps or changes to be sought at all levels of system (e.g., practitioner, district, local program, and state)? Does it include partnerships with other programs and agencies and leverage existing initiatives?
- **Clearly define responsibilities and timelines:** Is it apparent who will do what, by when?
- **Evaluate progress and make adjustments:** Does the evaluation plan address the process and impact of implementing improvement strategies?
SSIP Phase II Tools and Resources

The items below include the resources used in Phase II of the SSIP. The potential uses of each resource are provided.

**AI Hub Activity 5.2: PDSA Who am I?**

An activity that highlights the importance of PDSA cycles in data-based decision making and guides participants in reflections about team strengths and weaknesses.


**AI Hub Handout 8: Communication Protocol Worksheet**

This communication protocol worksheet links communication protocols among multiple programs for new or existing programs.


**AI Hub Module 3: Implementation Teams**

This module located on the Active Implementation Hub provides an introduction to implementation teams, including definitions, rationale, key functions, and best practices for establishing and maintaining these teams.

Retrieved from http://implementation.fpg.unc.edu/module-3

**Benchmarks of Quality for Home-Visiting Programs**

This worksheet provides benchmarks of a high-quality home-visiting program and a self-assessment tool.

Circles of Involvement

This is an exercise developed to identify key partners for implementing system changes. The version linked here includes instructions for use in a specific public health initiative. The most useful part of the document may be the definition of the Circles of Involvement. Consideration of all of the various types of stakeholders identified in the Circles of Involvement and the benefit they will bring to the implementation of the SSIP can improve the quality of stakeholder involvement. This process links to the Implementation Science recommendation that members of implementation teams should represent different perspectives and range across multiple levels of the system.


Community Tool Box: Chapter 8, Section 5: Developing an Action Plan

This site provides tips and guidelines for developing a strategic plan and organizational structure, from defining a vision to bringing about real change.


DEC Recommended Practices & Glossary

The DEC Recommended Practices provide guidance to practitioners and families about the most effective ways to improve the learning outcomes and promote the development of young children, birth through age 5, who have or are at risk for developmental delays or disabilities.

Retrieved from http://www.dec-sped.org/recommendedpractices

Developing a High Quality Improvement Plan

This presentation includes information about how VA Part C elicited membership for planning teams, how the team meetings are conducted, and how the teams are coordinated. This can be used as a model for developing a process.

Kicking off Phase II: Slides 11-23 are most relevant to staffing for planning.

Developing the Improvement Plan: Slides 3-11 are most relevant.

Retrieved from https://appam.certain.com/accounts/register123/air/events/pdconf/userfiles/0x1255388f65dDeveloping_a_High-Quality_Improv.pptx

DIY Committee Guide: Strategic Plan Step 5: Writing Your Plan

This guide gives a series of steps to help an organization plan its development strategically and outline its goals and aims.

Getting Ready for Phase II of the SSIP

This annotated PowerPoint provides an overview of Phase II focused on getting ready for Phase II of the SSIP. States can copy the slides into presentations that they are planning to kick off Phase II.


This interactive guide on the implementation stages includes information on forming a state leadership team to plan and oversee implementation and scaling up of evidence-based practices. Content is provided on the development of the state leadership teams that links to the activities included in kicking off Phase II.


The Hexagon Tool

The Hexagon Tool helps states, districts, and schools systematically evaluate new and existing interventions via six broad factors: needs, fit, resource availability, evidence, readiness for replication and capacity to implement.


An Integrated Stage-Based Framework for Implementation of Early Childhood Programs and Systems

This brief introduces key elements of effective implementation within an integrated, stage-based framework. This framework posits that (1) implementation happens in four discernible stages; and (2) three common "threads" or core elements exist across each of these stages.

Kicking off Phase II: Pages 5 and 6 include a useful summary of implementation teams. Included in the summary are: a definition of implementation teams, membership of implementation teams, relationships among teams, rational for using implementation team, and core competencies required of implementation teams.

Developing the Improvement Plan: The entire document is useful for this activity.

**Leading by Convening**

This book provides a framework for transforming the process between the State and the stakeholders for deeper change and sustainability. It includes tools to support various stages of these efforts.


**Leading by Convening: Ensuring Relevant Participation**

This document has tips for encouraging and supporting staff and stakeholder engagement.


**Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table**

The table describes the requirements for Phase II of the SSIP for Part B.

Retrieved from https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/4603

**Part B State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool**

The Part B SSIP Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool is based on the three components described in Phase II of the Measurement Table under Indicator 17 (Part B). Those components are 1) Infrastructure Development; 2) Support for LEA Implementation of EBPs; and 3) Evaluation. Phase II builds on the five components developed in Phase I. Phase II must be submitted by April 1, 2016 as part of the FFY 2014 SPP/APR. The Phase II components are in addition to Phase I content (including any updates).

Retrieved from https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/8823

**Part C SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table**

The table describes the requirements for Phase II of the SSIP for Part C.

Retrieved from https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/4604

**Part C State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool**

The Part C SSIP Phase II OSEP Guidance and Review Tool is based on the three components described in Phase II of the Measurement Table under Indicator 11 (Part C). Those components are 1) Infrastructure Development; 2) Support for EIS Programs and EIS Provider Implementation of EBPs; and 3) Evaluation. Phase II builds on the five components developed in Phase I. Phase II must be submitted by April 1, 2016 with the FFY 2014 SPP/APR. The Phase II components are in addition to Phase I content (including any updates).

Retrieved from https://osep.grads360.org/#communities/pdc/documents/8824
Planning Guide to Statewide Implementation, Scale-up, and Sustainability of Recommended Practices

This guide includes TA process documents and the implementation process, structures, and tools for planning and monitoring implementation used in ECTA Intensive TA for Implementing, Sustaining, & Scaling Up Evidence-Based Practices to Improve Child Outcomes.

Kicking off Phase II: The section on p. 6 provides an overview of the major structures of the RP2: Reaching Potentials through Recommended Practices Initiatives including:

- State Leadership Team
- Master Cadre of Training and TA providers
- Implementation and Demonstration Sites

Also useful are the sections related to the Planning/Installation Stage embedded under each of the major structures.

Developing the Improvement Plan: The entire document relates to developing the improvement plan.


Recommended Resources for Planning to Evaluate Program Improvement Efforts (including the SSIP)

This document provides a list of recommended resources to support evaluation planning for program improvement efforts, including the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/topics/ssip/plan_eval_program_improvement.asp

SSIP Phase II Gantt Chart Template

The Gantt Chart is a tool to track state planning activities with timelines.

Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/~docs/topics/ssip/ssip_phase_ii_gantt_chart.docx

State Leadership Team Benchmarks of Quality

The State Benchmarks of Quality is can be used by the State Leadership Team (SLT) to assess progress and plan future actions so that Recommended Practices (RPs) are available for providers and families statewide. Sections of this document are particularly useful in considering the structure and staffing of the state leadership team, including on pages 3-4.

A System Framework for Building High-Quality Early Intervention and Preschool Special Education Programs

The system framework guides coordinators and staff in successfully addressing state needs, then implementing evidence-based practices, and finally bringing about positive outcomes for children and their families.

Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/sysframe

Template for Strategic Communications Plan

This template provides guidance for the development of a strategic communication plan (see Step 3: Develop Messages).


Vision and Direction in Leadership Checklist

This checklist includes examples of steps leaders can take to help create a well-functioning and forward-thinking organization and to help practitioners feel a sense of belonging as they understand their purpose within the organization. The checklist can also be used as a self-evaluation by leaders at both state and local levels.

Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/decrp/LDR-3_Leaders_vision_direction.pdf

W.K. Kellogg Foundation Logic Model Development Guide

The State Benchmarks of Quality is can be used by the State Leadership Team (SLT) to assess progress and plan future actions so that Recommended Practices (RPs) are available for providers and families statewide. Sections of this document are particularly useful in considering the structure and staffing of the state leadership team, including on pages 3-4.

SSIP Phase II: Key Terms

Note: A full glossary of terms from Implementation Science prepared by the ECTA Center is available.

Evidence-Based Practices: "...for the early childhood field: Evidence-based practice is a decision-making process that integrates the best available research evidence with family and professional wisdom and values." (Buysse & Wesley, p.12) and "evidence-based practices can be defined as: Practices that are informed by research, in which the characteristics and consequences of environmental variables are empirically established and the relationship directly informs what a practitioner can do to produce a desired outcome." (Dunst, et al., p.3)


Feedback Loops: Feedback loops are communication processes used to gain input, analyze data and problem solve during the implementation process. Feedback loops are used among the State Leadership Team, Implementation Teams and Implementation Sites.


Hexagon Tool: The Hexagon Tool can help states, districts, and schools appropriately select evidenced-based practices by reviewing six broad factors in relation to the program or practice under consideration.

**Implementation Drivers:** Implementation drivers are a framework for organizing the capacity and infrastructure that influences the successful implementation of a new innovation or practice. Drivers include capacity for promoting competency through professional development, leadership and organizational supports such as policy and procedures, funding, administration, data systems, etc. Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center. (2014). *Implementation Process: Glossary Terms.* Retrieved from http://ectacenter.org/implementprocess/glossary.asp#def-implementationdrivers

The Phase II plan should include the implementation drivers used to achieve short- and long-term SSIP outcomes. The National Implementation Research Network (NIRN) website provides detailed information about the types and uses of implementation drivers.


**Implementation Science:** The principles of Implementation Science (Fixsen, *et al.*, 2005) have been embedded into the design of the SSIP process and OSEP expects that states will use the principles in planning and implementing improvement strategies. The definition of the plan for Phase II from the *Part C State Performance Plan (SPP)* and *Annual Performance Report (APR): Part C Indicator Measurement Table* includes that the planning will be developed "with attention to the research on implementation." Throughout this document, we will introduce and embed key concepts of Implementation Science as they relate to the plan to be developed in Phase II. Included in each section are resources for readers to learn more about Implementation Science. Although all implementation frameworks (e.g. implementation teams, usable interventions, implementation stages, implementation drivers, and improvement cycles) need to be considered in Phase II, the implementation drivers are critical to address in the plan.


**Implementation Team:** Implementation Teams (also called Local Leadership Teams) provide active leadership at the regional or program level to manage the implementation efforts and support the people using the new innovation or practice. The teams engage in continuous communication and feedback with the State Leadership Team about the issues, successes, and needed resources to support successful implementation and expansion.


**Improvement Strategies:** A state’s improvement strategies outline the course of action in achieving the Theory of Action.

**Logic Model:** A logic model provides a systematic and visual depiction of the path to the State-Identified Measurable Result (SIMR).

**PDSA (Plan, Do, Study, Act):** An iterative, four-stage problem-solving model used for improving a process or carrying out change

**Plan:** A detailed proposal for doing or achieving something
State Leadership Team: (also called state management or state implementation team) is the group of individuals at the state level who manage the change effort by actively leading and providing the internal supports needed to move the selected innovation or practice through all the stages and steps of implementation.


Theory of Action (TOA): The TOA provides a general statement of the rationale for the state’s improvement strategies.

Terms of Reference: Terms of Reference describe a format for setting guidelines and expectations for team function, scope, and mission.

Usable Intervention: A usable intervention needs to be teachable, learnable, doable, and readily assessed in practice if it is to be used effectively to reach all students who could benefit.
Contributors to this SSIP Phase II: Process Guide

This SSIP Phase II Process Guide describes the requirements and a proposed process for developing a high-quality plan, and is intended to support states in designing a high-quality process for completing Phase II. The guide will be updated as content is developed and finalized.

The Process Guide was developed by a collaborative team from ECTA, DaSy, NCSI and IDC including:

Grace Kelley, ECTA/DaSy/ NCSI
Siobhan Colgan, IDC
Carolee Eslinger, IDC
Monica Mathur-Kalluri, NCSI
Anne Lucas, ECTA/DaSy
Cornelia Taylor, ECTA/DaSy/NCSI
Megan Vinh, ECTA/DaSy

The following additional individuals provided input into the content of the Guide:

Betsy Ayankoya, ECTA/DaSy
Jeanna Mullens, IDC
Linda Lynch, IDC
Kristin Reedy, NCSI
Joanne Cashman, NCSI

The contents of this guide were developed under cooperative agreement numbers #H326R140006 (DaSy), #H326P120002 (ECTA Center), #H373Y130002 (IDC) and #H326R140006 (NCSI) from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.

Project Officers: Meredith Miceli & Richelle Davis(DaSy), Julia Martin Eile (ECTA Center), Richelle Davis & Meredith Miceli (IDC), and Perry Williams & Shedej Hajghassemal (NCSI)