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Results Indicator: The SSIP is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable, multiyear plan with a focus on improving results for children with disabilities.

For an overview of the indicator, including explanation of the measurement, please access the SPP/APR modules: [SPP/APR Basics, What you Need to Know](https://dasycenter.org/spp-apr-basics-what-you-need-to-know/). For more detailed information please access the current [FFY Part C SPP/APR Package](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/grantees/#SPP-APR,FFY20-25-SPP-APR-Package). The Measurement Table language is also included at the beginning of the indicator in the SPP/APR template/platform.

What to Know About this Indicator

* The SSIP is intended to help states strengthen their infrastructure and build the capacity of early intervention programs and LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain evidence-based practices that lead to improved results for infants, toddlers, children, and their families.
* States developed their SSIPs in three phases. In Phase I states analyzed data and in Phase II they wrote their SSIP plans. In Phase III, states began implementing and evaluating their SSIPs.
* As a result of the data analyses, states developed a State-identified Measurable Result, also referred to as the ‘SiMR’ that must be a child and/or family level outcome and must include a defined measurement.
* This indicator is a results indicator and states set rigorous targets based on data analysis and stakeholder engagement.

Multiple SIMR targets can be used for the SSIP.

General Tips

* Review and respond to information included in the sections “OSEP Response” and “Required Actions” from the previous year’s APR for this indicator. Include the state’s response in " Prior FFY Required Actions" section for the SPP/APR reporting platform.
* Ensure that all information is entered into the appropriate fields in the platform.
* Check that your numbers exactly match the OSEP pre-populated/auto-calculated numbers.
* Exclude extraneous information that may cause confusion or create additional questions for the reader.
* Check that all required links work and consider having an external source to do the check.

If more than two SiMR targets are used Include all required information in the narrative for the additional targets that don’t fit in the data table.

1. Data Analysis

1A. State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| 1. Identified the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR) |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated whether the SiMR had changed since the last SSIP submission (*yes/no*) |  |  |  |
| *If yes-* |  |  |  |
| 1. Described system analysis activities conducted to support changing the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Listed the data source(s) used to support the change of the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Described how data were analyzed to reach the decision to change the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the role of stakeholders in the decision to change the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated whether a subset of the population from the indicator was used (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model) (*yes/no*) |  |  |  |
| 1. *If yes,* described the subset of the population from the indicator |  |  |  |

Tips (SiMR)

* Update or revise improvement activities, the Theory of Action and/or Evaluation Plan as needed when the SiMR has changed.

1B. Changes to Theory of Action

| **Were the following completed?** | **Yes** | **No** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * 1. Indicated whether the theory of action was new or revised since the previous submission *(yes/no* |  |  |  |
| * + 1. If yes, described the changes and updates to the theory of action |  |  |  |
| * 1. Provided a link to the current theory of action regardless of whether or not it changed |  |  |  |

Tips (Changes to Theory of Action) Tips (SiMR)

Update or revise the Theory of Action as needed when changes to the SiMR, improvement activities and/or Evaluation Plan are made.

1C. Historical Data

| **Were the following completed?** | **Yes** | **No** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * + - * 1. Indicated whether two targets for measurement were used (*yes/no*)(*Option 1 is for one target in the Targets table, Option 2 is for two targets*) |  |  |  |
| Verified or changed baseline year when using either one target or two targets |  |  |  |
| Verified or changed baseline data when using either one or two targets |  |  |  |
| Verified accuracy of or changed targets for current FFY and future FFYs when using either one or two targets (*Pre-populated - End target for FFY 2025 must demonstrate improvement over baseline data*) |  |  |  |

Tips (if baseline or targets changed)

* Change both the baseline year (FFY) and the baseline data in the “Historical Data” section if baseline changes. Baseline can be changed to reflect the current FFY or a prior FFY.
* Record the baseline data so it is consistent with the state’s data for that FFY as reported in the “Historical Data” section or in the ”Current FFY Data” section. Do not round up or round down the numbers (e.g., use 89.52% not 90%).
* Describe how stakeholders were involved in the decision to keep or change baseline and/or targets. Include the kind of information/data was shared to inform their input (e.g., trend data, improvements in data quality issues, state initiatives impacting the data). Include this information in the “Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input” section unless information specific to changing baseline and/or targets for this indicator is included in the “Introduction” and the stakeholder engagement information is checked to repeat for each indicator.
* Describe the justification/reason(s) for resetting baseline and/or targets in the “Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input” section unless information specific to changing baseline and/or targets for this indicator is included in the “Introduction” and the stakeholder engagement information is checked to repeat for each indicator. Reasons for changing baseline most frequently impact comparability of data across FFYs, such as changes in state data collection tools, methodology, or data source. Reasons for changing targets should reflect such things as improved data quality, change in baseline, initiatives or state priorities impacting indicator data.

See the following resources for more information on justifications for resetting baseline and targets:

* + [Target Setting Guide](https://dasycenter.org/target-setting-guide/)
  + [OSEP’s Universal TA for FFY 2020-2025](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/Universal-TA-for-FFY-2020-2025-SPP-APR.pdf)

IDEA SPP/APR User Guide

* + - [Part C](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#program/spp-apr-resources)
    - [Part B](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#program/spp-apr-resources)

1D. FFY SPP/APR Data

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provided the numerator description |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided the denominator description |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of prior FFY data(*Pre-populated*) |  |  |  |
| 1. Entered numerator for current FFY |  |  |  |
| 1. Entered denominator for current FFY |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of prior FFY data |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of current FFY target(s)(*Pre-populated*) |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of current FFY data (*Auto-calculated by dividing numerator by denominator*) |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of status regarding meeting or not meeting target(s) (*Auto-calculated by comparing current FFY data to current FFY target*) |  |  |  |
| 1. Verified accuracy of slippage statement(s) (*Auto-calculated using OSEP’s definition of slippage - see IDEA SPP/APR User Guides:*  * [Part C](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#program/spp-apr-resources) * [Part B](https://osep.communities.ed.gov/#program/spp-apr-resources)) |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided reasons for slippage, if applicable, including if using two targets |  |  |  |

Tips (description of SiMR numerator and denominator and how SiMR data are collected and analyzed)

* Use the same descriptors of the numerator and denominator of the SiMR in the SPP/APR data table as described in other APR Indicators if the SiMR data is the same data reported in another indicator.
* Include all required information in the narrative for the additional targets that don’t fit in the data table if more than two SiMR targets are used.

Use or modify the same description of how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR and written in another SPP/APR indicator if the SiMR data is the same data reported in another indicator

1E. Data Source and Data Quality

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Provided the data source for the current FFY data |  |  |  |
| 1. Described how data were collected and analyzed for the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated whether additional data were collected (*i.e., benchmark, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR) (*yes/no*) |  |  |  |
| 1. *If yes,* described additional data |  |  |  |
| 1. Identified general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period (yes/no) |  |  |  |
| *If yes-* |  |  |  |
| 1. Described data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data |  |  |  |
| 1. Described actions taken to address data quality concerns |  |  |  |
| 1. Identified data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period *(yes/no)* |  |  |  |
| *If yes-* |  |  |  |
| 1. Described impact on data completeness, validity, and reliability |  |  |  |
| 1. Explained how COVID-19 specifically impacted data collection for this indicator |  |  |  |
| 1. Described steps taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection |  |  |  |

Tips (reporting additional data that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR)

Consider including in the section on additional data that demonstrate progress toward the SiMR such data as percent of families reporting they are better able to support their child’s social emotional development; number of providers/teachers who have reached fidelity in implementation of EBPs; data on number of provider/teacher trainings, etc.

2. Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

2A. Changes to Evaluation Plan

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Indicated whether the evaluation plan was new or revised since the previous submission (yes/no) |  |  |  |
| *If yes-* |  |  |  |
| 1. Described changes and updates to evaluation plan |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a rationale or justification for changes |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a link to current evaluation plan |  |  |  |
| *If no* |  |  |  |
| 1. Described how data support the decision not to revise the evaluation plan |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided link to current evaluation plan |  |  |  |

Tips (Changes to Evaluation Plan)

Update or revise the Evaluation Plan as needed when changes to the SiMR, improvement activities and/or Theory of Action are made.

2B. Infrastructure Improvements

| **Were the following completed?** | **Yes** | **No** | **Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Summarized each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period |  |  |  |
| 1. Described the short-term or intermediate outcomes (as related to one or more areas of a systems framework e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period. |  |  |  |
| *Include:* |  |  |  |
| 1. A description of the measures or rationale used by the state and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement of the infrastructure outcomes |  |  |  |
| 1. An explanation of how these strategies that support system change for achievement of the SiMR , sustainability of systems improvement, and/or scale up |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated whether new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies were implemented during the reporting period? *(yes/no)* |  |  |  |
| 1. *If yes,* Described each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each new strategy |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a summary of next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period |  |  |  |

Tips (Infrastructure Improvements)

* Include data in the description of the achievement of infrastructure related outcomes to demonstrate how the state and stakeholders determined the outcomes were achieved.

NOTE: Outcomes are different than outputs.

* + Output: an activity or product (e.g., we trained 250 people).

Outcome: the impact of an activity or product (e.g., providers understand information from the training and are implementing it).

* Describe how the data collected through the SSIP evaluation led to either making changes or not making changes to the SSIP improvement activities and/or the evaluation plan.

Describe how the review of evaluation data and information from SSIP Phase I and Phase II (e.g., Theory of Action [TOA], improvement strategies/plan, SiMR, and evaluation plan) supports the next steps identified for the SSIP both for infrastructure activities and evidence-based practices

2C. Evidence-based Practices

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Listed the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a summary of each evidence-based practice |  |  |  |
| 1. Summarized how each evidence-based practice, and activities or strategies that support its use, was intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes |  |  |  |
| 1. Described data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change |  |  |  |
| 1. Described any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practice |  |  |  |
| 1. Summarized the anticipated outcomes of evidence-based practices to be attained during the next reporting period |  |  |  |

Tips (Evidence-based Practices)

* Consider including in the section related to additional data that support continued use of evidence-based practices (EBPs) such things as parent survey data on their child’s progress or the parent’s perception of their ability to support their child’s development and/or data on provider’s/teacher’s perception of their knowledge or comfort level in implementing the state’s EBPs, etc.
* Describe how the review of evaluation data and information from SSIP Phase I and Phase II (e.g., Theory of Action [TOA], improvement strategies/plan, SiMR, and evaluation plan) supports the next steps identified for the SSIP both for infrastructure activities and evidence-based practices.

Consider using fidelity measures that were developed by the purveyors of the EBPs to report data on fidelity of EBP implementation. If new fidelity measures need to be developed, ensure that the tool measures behaviors of providers/teachers in their interaction with children and families reflecting the implementation of the practices. It is important to recognize that a provider/teachers knowledge or comfort level in implementing EBPs are not implementation of fidelity measures. Measuring provider/teacher knowledge or comfort level can be useful additional information especially if these are measured after the provision of a training on EBPs but they are not measures of fidelity.

2D. Changes to Improvement Activities

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Described any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission |  |  |  |
| 1. *If changes to activities, strategies, or timelines were made --* included a rationale or justification for the changes |  |  |  |
| 1. *If no changes to activities, strategies, or timelines were made* -- described how the data from the evaluation supported this decision |  |  |  |

Tips (Changes to Improvement Activities):

* Describe how the data collected through the SSIP evaluation led to either making changes or not making changes to the SSIP improvement activities and/or the evaluation plan.

Make changes to the TOA and/or Evaluation Plan, as appropriate, when changes are made to the improvement activities.

3. Stakeholder Engagement

| Were the following completed? | Yes | No | Notes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Described stakeholder input related to the SSIP |  |  |  |
| 1. Described specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts |  |  |  |
| 1. Indicated if stakeholders expressed concern during engagement activities (*Yes/No*) |  |  |  |
| 1. Described how the state addressed stakeholder concerns |  |  |  |
| 1. Described additional implementation activities that the state intends to implement in the next fiscal year related to the SiMR |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities |  |  |  |
| 1. Describe newly identified barriers and steps to address these barriers |  |  |  |
| 1. Provided additional information about this indicator (*Optional*) |  |  |  |

Tips (Stakeholder Engagement)

* Consider tips on stakeholder engagement in the APR Introduction checklist when describing how stakeholders were involved in providing input on the SSIP.
* Consider strategies such as state leadership teams, local implementation teams, workgroups used to implement the SSIP when describing how the state engaged stakeholders in key improvement activities.
* Consider including activities such as sharing SSIP evaluation and implementation data with stakeholders and process used to obtain stakeholder input on the meaning of this data and whether changes to the SSIP were needed. Describe activities used to support stakeholders in providing input on modifications or additions to the SSIP, including changing the SiMR, improvement activities and evaluation plan.
* Describe activities used to build stakeholder capacity to engage in these discussions related to implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. Activities might include providing interpreter services for all communications and meetings, facilitating on-boarding of new parent stakeholders, developing materials and co-hosted meetings with parent representatives, providing a parent-focused training on data analysis and use, providing definitions for commonly used acronyms, and/or provided details on methods and measurement tools used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
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