**Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan - Phase III**

*Phase III submissions should include:*

*• Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.*

*• Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.*

*• Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.*

**A. Summary of Phase 3**

*1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SiMR.*

*2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.*

*3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.*

*4. Brief overview of the year’s evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.*

*5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.*

The state’s SiMR (page XX), Theory of Action Graphic (page XX), and logic model (page XX) included under Phase I and Phase II of this report remain unchanged.

The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year and described further in the attached Evaluation Plan Progress Tracking tool include:

• scaling up the training of providers in Activity Based Teaming (ABT),

• revising the statewide IFSP form and process to align with ABT,

• developing a unified message about what Birth to Three supports will look like to support the SiMR,

• rolling out a medical messaging plan to referrals sources,

• contracting to modify the Birth to Three website,

• finalizing the draft State Plan Amendment (SPA), and

• contracting with a vendor to bill third party payers and families to support ABT.

The specific evidence-based practices that have are being scaled up include coaching as a style of interaction, natural learning environment practices, and a primary provider approach.

The wording was changed for one intermediate outcome (PD-IT-1) in the evaluation plan. With stakeholder input, the state determined that the fidelity checklist would be used as the basis for a more in depth quality self-assessment and the milestones for that new process were added.

A detailed tracking document that helps the lead agency measure progress on the evaluation plan is attached and includes the year’s evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes as well as changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

**B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP**

*1. Description of the State’s SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.*

*2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.*

The implementation of the State’s SSIP was outlined in an evaluation plan during Phase II and the extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities is attached including what has been accomplished, which milestones were addressed, and whether the intended timelines were followed. Stakeholder input is described throughout the review of each outcome.

The ICC subcommittees align with the implementation strands in the logic model so each ICC meeting was an opportunity to inform EIS providers, families and other agency stakeholders about progress on the outcomes. The state using social media and a blog to communicate with a wider audience and EIS provider meetings are held quarterly. At these meetings providers have a voice and whenever possible that are directly involved in decision making.

**C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes**

*1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements*

*2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SIMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path*

*3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP*

When available, for each outcome in the evaluation plan progress tracking tool the state reports how it monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of its activities including how the measures align with the theory of action, the data sources used, a description of baseline data when applicable, procedures and timelines for collecting the data and how the management and analysis of the data were used to assess progress toward achieving the intended improvements. Early in the process of change much of the data is qualitative or baseline is still being collected.

Improvements to the state infrastructure, how the data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies and informed next steps in the SSIP implementation is addressed under each outcome in the evaluation plan tracking tool. Planned modifications to intended outcomes when applicable are also addressed under each outcome including when available the data that related to the changes. How stakeholders were informed about the the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and how they had a voice in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP is also addressed.

**D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SIMR**

*1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results*

*2. Implications for assessing progress or results*

*3. Plans for improving data quality*

The primary concern for the quality of the data related to the SiMR remains as was identified in Phase I and is how the state measures actual changes in the behavior and knowledge of parents as a result of early intervention. To help address this, the Assistant Part C Coordinator is co-chairing a taskforce for the Infant Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) with the Early Childhood TA Center (ECTA) to review family outcomes data quality and to make recommendations about using the existing data and transforming what is collected to better reflect outcomes for families.

As this is a long term project and it is still early in process of change, the state will continue to report progress on implementing the activities in its evaluation plan and will continue to use the NCSEAM family survey data to address progress towards its SiMR until a better alternative is developed.

During FFY16 the state received TA from the DaSy Center about including its IFSP in the Part C Data system and a methodology was developed to link the results from the quality self-assessment (how the state measures the implementation of the evidence based practices) to planned service data, actual services delivered, as well as child outcome and family survey data.

**E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements**

*1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up*

*2. Evidence that SSIP’s evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects*

*3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR*

*4. Measurable improvements in the SIMR in relation to targets*

Within the summary of each outcome on the evaluation plan progress tracking attachment, changes to the infrastructure that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up are addressed. For most outcomes it is too early in the process of change to report evidence that the SSIP’s evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects. However, outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SIMR are each addressed in detail.

**F. Plans for Next Year**

*1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline*

*2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes*

*3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers*

*4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance*

The review of each outcome in the State’s evaluation plan progress tracking tool includes additional activities to be implemented next year including data collection, measures, anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers as applicable.

Connecticut has a long history of active engagement with national TA centers and seeks this support on an ongoing basis. Currently, Connecticut is participating with the Early Childhood Personnel Center (ECPC) and on two NCSI Cross State Learning Collaboratives; Family Outcomes and Results Based Accountability (CLSC-FO and CSLC-RBA). In addition the Part C coordinator is the president of the Infant Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) and the Assistant Part C Coordinator is co-chairing the Early Childhood TA Center (ECTA) and the Infant Toddler Coordinators Association (ITCA) task force on family outcomes data.