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| POTENTIAL FEATURES NEEDED TO  ENHANCE YOUR MONITORING SYSTEM  TO INCLUDE RESULTS | |
| Building Capacity of State Staff~  to conduct results monitoring utilizing a different skill set | * LA and program staff understands the IDEA requirements, state policies and procedures and evidence-based practices in place. * Staff have skills to facilitate and support identification of issues and identify resources and supports to address the issues . * State staff enhances their coaching skills to support the team at the program/district level. * Staff can contextualize what they have done in the past with compliance and now work differently to be more results oriented (flexibility). * Program has internal professional development plan to build capacity of staff to focus on results. * Staff at all levels focus on coaching at system, program and practice level. * Staff is able to access, understand and use data to make informed decisions for program improvement. |
| Active Engagement ~  involves local programs and stakeholders in the work rather than just LA staff | * Stakeholders at all levels participate in program improvement * Results are communicated at all levels, feedback is welcomed. * Local programs/ districts coordinate improvement/monitoring activities and state serves as coach. * Local programs/districts work with state to develop monitoring process . * State provides supports and resources as needed. * Local programs/districts develop solutions with support/direction   from state as needed.   * Monitoring and improvement efforts support program improvement and are cohesive. |
| Transparency~  create and share monitoring system tools focused on results as well as compliance. | * Stakeholders from local programs/districts are included in decision-making about the monitoring system. * Monitoring tools focused on compliance and results are shared with local programs/districts in advance of monitoring. * Local programs/districts are provided with training/TA to understand the purpose and logistics of monitoring. * There is a culture in the LA and local programs/districts that monitoring is a collaborative and beneficial process, not a “gotcha”. * There are trusting relationships between local programs/districts and LAs to work together to solve the issues identified through monitoring for improved results. * There is greater shared understanding among LA, local programs/ districts and other stakeholders of evaluation results and their use in monitoring for results. |
|  |  |
| Front Loading PD/TA~  provides local programs/districts with upfront training and skills prior to monitoring to allow for impact on results | * State staff helps build capacity within the local programs/districts to make real time corrections. * Content shared in ongoing meetings throughout the year build on expectations for all local programs/districts. * Frequency of PD/TA is varied depending on local program/district needs and performance. * State staff support local programs/districts in problem solving to determine areas of need, benchmarks and expectations. * Have ongoing conversations with local programs/districts around program results and impact on results indicators. |
| Qualitative Data Collection~ | * Qualitative analysis is used to determine the story behind the numbers, including: case studies, surveys, interviews, focus groups, observations, etc. * SSIP evaluation data provide context for results * LA and local staff quantify the qualitative * Data informed decisions support the differentiation of supports and intervention for local program/ district * Data are used to support root cause analysis and provide an explanation to involve key partners * State and local staff use the data to “Tell the story” * Differentiated PD/TA is designed and offered based upon data * Staff use a problem-solving model with a high level of trust * Staff are trained in both data collection and data use |
| Root Cause Analysis~  to fully understand the problem represented in the data | * State staff provides TA around root cause analysis to local programs/districts. * Current data are used that are specifically tied to the “issue”. * Discussions include a variety of stakeholders and the appropriate personnel who are matched to the issue. * Analysis considers the impact of other programs, and current environment. * Looks beyond early intervention program to the broader early care and education system. * Training, coaching, modeling and guidance documents are available to support local programs/districts. * There is an ongoing measurement system to ensure that the process is working. * Feedback is used to make adjustments or refinements to the process and guidance materials. |
| Improvement Planning*~*  to address the root cause and improve the results – not just about correction of noncompliance | * Evaluation of SSIP results as part of the improvement planning. * Monitoring activities include follow-up to delivered PD/TA so that it will help measure change in practice and outcomes. * Coaching of staff seen as a critical part of supporting improvement planning. * Locals understand and are using the data for program planning and improvement; have buy-in about the process and see it as helpful for them. * Improvement planning is based on root cause analysis. * Identification of strategies and activities to address root cause   and improve child and family outcomes. |
|  |  |
| Selection for Differentiated Intervention ~  tiers and tiered cycles of monitoring and interventions based on data or findings | * Local program/district interventions are differentiated based on need, which are collaboratively identified and addressed. * The interventions that are implemented in the local program/district are based on the identified needs. * LA and local program/district staff have a common understanding of the differentiated process. |
| Qualitative Data Collection~  to inform the why of the quantitative data and to tell the story of the results achieved. Focus on more than just compliance. | * Qualitative analysis is used to determine the story behind the numbers, including: case studies, surveys, interviews, focus groups, observations, etc. * SSIP evaluation data provide context for results. * LA and local staff quantify the qualitative. * Data informed decisions support the differentiation of supports and intervention for local program/ district . * Data are used to support root cause analysis and provide an explanation to involve key partners. * State and local staff uses the data to “Tell the story.” * Differentiated PD/TA is designed and offered based upon data. * Staff uses a problem-solving model with a high level of trust. * Staff is trained in both data collection and data use. |
| Incentives (Rewards, Sanctions toward Accountability)~ *to support sustainability and accountability* | * Incentives and necessary resources are in place to support local programs/districts sustainability of improvement strategies. * Local programs/districts with high levels of compliance and results are recognized/acknowledged. |