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Workshop Objectives

• Discuss incorporating RDA into general supervision systems
• Update on RDA principles
• Gain knowledge of resources available to support RDA – ECTA Framework
• Gain knowledge about other States’ approaches to RDA
• Network to share ideas for monitoring based on results
What we focus on is what improves.
Figure 1: Components of General Supervision

- State Performance Plan
- Policies, Procedures, and Effective Implementation
- Integrated Monitoring Activities
- Fiscal Management
- Data on Processes and Results
- Improvement, Correction, Incentives & Sanctions
- Effective Dispute Resolution
- Targeted Technical Assistance & Professional Development
IDEA 2004 – “Focused Monitoring

• Primary focus of federal and state monitoring:
  – “Improving educational results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities”; and
  – Ensuring States meet program requirements “with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities.” (Section 616)
OSEP Results Driven Accountability

• **RDA** represents a **shift** from compliance-based monitoring **to** an accountability system based on differentiated monitoring and support.
OSEP Vision for RDA

- All components of an accountability system will be aligned in a manner that best support States in improving results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families.
Components of RDA

• State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) measures results and compliance.

• Determinations reflect State performance on results, as well as compliance.

• Differentiated monitoring and technical assistance supports improvement in all States, but especially low performing States.
State to Local Determinations

- Federal to state determinations **now include** results data (child outcomes and assessment data)
- States are **not required to include** results indicators in their state to local determinations
- Some states include **family outcomes results** in their local determinations – who does?
- Some states include **child outcomes results** in their local determinations – who does?
- What **other results data** do you include in your state determinations rubric?
Features Needed to Incorporate Results in Monitoring Systems

• **Building Capacity of State Staff**: acquiring a different skill set for results monitoring

• **Active Engagement**: involving LA, EI programs, and stakeholders in the work

• **Transparency**: creating and sharing monitoring system, tools, sharing in advance, etc. with stakeholders, not a “gotcha”

• **Front Loading TA**: providing EI programs with upfront training and skills prior to monitoring to allow for impact on results

• **Qualitative Data Collection**: collecting more than just compliance data by using interviews, observations or other sources needed to inform the why of quantitative data
Features Needed to Incorporate Results in Monitoring Systems

- **Root Cause Analysis**: to understand the problem represented in the data
- **Improvement Planning**: addressing the root cause and improve the results — not just about correction of noncompliance
- **Selection for Differentiated Intervention**: providing tiers and tiered cycles of monitoring and interventions based on data or findings
- **Incentives (Rewards, Sanctions towards Accountability)**: supporting sustainability and accountability
Discussion

• Are there other important features of RDA that you would add?
What does a state need to put into place in order to encourage, support, require local implementation of effective practices?

Good outcomes for children with disabilities and their families

Available from: [http://ectacenter.org/sysframe](http://ectacenter.org/sysframe)
The purpose of the ECTA System Framework is to guide state Part C and Section 619 Coordinators and their staff in:

- Evaluating their current systems
- Identifying potential areas for improvement, and
- Developing more effective, efficient systems that support implementation of evidence-based practices
ECTA System Framework

- **Products:**
  - **Components** (e.g. accountability and quality improvement, finance, workforce/personnel, governance) and **subcomponents** of an effective service delivery system
  - **Quality indicators** scaled to measure the extent to which a component is in place and of high quality
  - Corresponding **self-assessment** for states to self-assess (and plan for improvement)
  - **Resources** related to each component of the system framework
Accountability and Quality Improvement

Planning for Accountability and Improvement
- Planning based on data and commitment to outcomes (n~7)
- Details of plan (n~6)

Collecting and Analyzing Performance Data
- Adequate information available (n~9)
- Data based decisions (n~5)

Using Results for Continuous Improvement
- Communication and public reporting (n~5)
- Strategies to support improvement (n~9)
- Enhance capacity (n~4)

Monitoring and Quality Improvement
Subcomponents=3 (QI~7, QE~45)
How Can We Use this Component?

Consider this challenge....

• Your state is planning to revise the current general supervision system to move from the strictly compliance focus of the last 20 years to one that includes program quality and improved performance. Local providers are very pleased about this shift, although express some worry about their responsibility and accountability for child outcomes improvement. There is also some general concern that maintaining the continuing requirements related to compliance will make this shift difficult to achieve given limited state resources.

• You could convene a group of relevant stakeholders and complete the Self-Assessment for the Accountability and Improvement Component.
Planning for Accountability and Improvement

Quality Indicator AC1:

Ongoing statewide planning for accountability and improvement at all levels is informed by data and reflects strong and commitment to positive outcomes for children and their families.
Quality Indicator AC1

• **Elements of Quality**
  a. Planning for accountability and improvement is **aligned** with the **vision**, **mission** and **purpose** of Part C or 619.
  b. An accountability and improvement plan is used to inform policy decisions and actions related to the accountability and ongoing improvement of the system.
  c. **Stakeholders** are engaged on an ongoing basis to inform development, implementation and revisions to the accountability and improvement plan.
  d. The accountability and improvement plan is readily available and **accessible** (e.g., other formats, languages) to the public.
Quality Indicator AC1

• Elements of Quality
  
e. State leadership ensures that each element of the accountability and improvement plan is executed in a timely, efficient and effective manner.

f. The accountability and improvement plan is aligned with and informed by other quality improvement initiatives within and across agencies.

g. The accountability and improvement plan is reviewed and revised as necessary based on how well the plan monitors the implementation and effectiveness of the system.
Consider how you can use the framework self-assessment to determine possible changes in your current general supervision system?
OSEP State Systemic Improvement Plan: A Conceptual Framework for Improving Results for Children with Disabilities
State SSIP Examples
Related to Results
Ensure Fidelity of EBPs

• Define requirements, mechanisms, and timelines for using fidelity assessments to monitor and support implementation of evidence-based practices
• Create leadership team that will review, analyze and evaluate implementation.
• Develop a monitoring protocol focused on fidelity of practice: data review, onsite chart review, policy and process review, make commendations
• Routine fidelity checks conducted on COS process within and across programs
Data

- Local, regional and state teams use data to monitor implementation, fidelity and rapid improvement cycles
- Improve process for gathering and measuring qualitative information in systemic fashion
- Ensure capacity to collect and use implementation fidelity data for state, regional and local decision making
- Local program leaders conduct simple data analysis on child outcomes data to improve program quality
- Develop stakeholder model for data sharing
- Stakeholders realize the value of identifying critical questions that can be answered from the data related to child and family outcomes
Monitoring Processes

- Revise current monitoring process to include results accountability utilizing the ECTA framework to inform the process.
- Review the current monitoring tools, data elements, and processes to determine their applicability to monitoring for results.
- Develop a system of accountability, incentives, and sanctions that promote evidenced based practices within a statewide provider network.
- Revise general supervision self-assessment tool and improvement plans to incorporate/align with program standards;
- Develop and implement a monitoring protocol to identify appropriate IFSP decisions related to outcomes and services.
Appoint a Facilitator to Discuss these Questions

Based upon this session, discuss your planned accountability work including any new ideas or changes you are considering?

1. What results accountability strategies activities are you planning?
2. What challenges are you facing? What have you done already and what are your lessons learned?
3. What questions do you have for your colleagues at your table related to their state accountability work?
Support for your work

- What supports from national TA centers do states need to incorporate RDA into the state system? eg. Type of support and method for delivery

Please fill out the note card (or two) and leave on the table.
Resources

• Visit the DaSy website at: http://dasycenter.org/

• Visit the ECTA website at: http://ectacenter.org/

• Visit the NCSI website at: http://ncsi.wested.org/resources/learning-collaboratives/
  • RBA Cross State Learning Collaborative – accepting Letters of Commitment this week!
  • Contact Ardith Ferguson at afergus@wested.org for more information
THANK YOU!
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