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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.
 |