FFY 2019 Indicator B-17/C-11 Annual Performance Report (APR) Optional Template

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). (Please limit your response to 785 characters).

Hawai‘i’s SiMR for Demonstration Sites is Child Outcomes, Summary Statement 1: “Hawai‘i’s eligible infants and toddlers with disabilities will make greater than expected growth in social-emotional skills (including social relationships) by the time they exit early intervention” was established in Phase 1 of the SSIP and has not changed.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission?

No

If “Yes”, provide an explanation for the change(s), including the role of stakeholders in decision-making. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Not applicable.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Baseline Data: 49.28%

Has the SiMR target changed since the last SSIP submission? No

FFY 2018 Target: 50.00% **FFY 2019 Target**: 50.00%

FFY 2018 Data: 96/174=55.17% **FFY 2019 Data:** 123/217=56.68%

Was the State's FFY 2019 Target Met? Yes

Did slippage[1] occur? No

If applicable, describe the reasons for slippage. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Not applicable.

[1] The definition of slippage: *A worsening from the previous data AND a failure to meet the target.* The worsening also needs to meet certain thresholds to be considered slippage:

1. For a "large" percentage (10% or above), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 1.0 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 32.9%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator X are 32% and the FFY 2018 data were 33.1%.
2. For a "small" percentage (less than 10%), it is considered slippage if the worsening is more than 0.1 percentage point. For example:
   a. It is not slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 5%.
   b. It is slippage if the FFY 2019 data for Indicator Y are 5.1% and the FFY 2018 data were 4.9%.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? No

If "Yes", describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

Not applicable.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? Yes

If "Yes", describe any data quality issues specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

While the State requires Programs to ensure their data is complete and valid and reliable prior to submitting their data to the State, it was discovered that not all children that exited during the period had complete COS ratings. As a result of the missing data, the State developed and implemented a monthly data checklist that must be completed prior to submitting their data to the state.

For Initial COS Ratings, the assigned staff must ensure that COS ratings are completed and entered into the data system prior to the initiation of services. Prior to submitting monthly data to the State, the Program must run the Child Outcomes Report for the respective month to review their initial COS data. If there are any blanks for date completed, the Program Managers must follow-up with the assigned Care Coordinator to determine why the COS Ratings were not completed. If the COS ratings were completed but not entered into the data system, the data will be entered prior to submitting to the State. If it was not completed, the Program must indicate why it was not completed so the Program Manger can track, determine trends, and work with staff on meeting the requirement.

For Exit COS Ratings, prior to submitting monthly data to the State, the Program must run the Child Outcomes Report for the respective month to review their exit COS data. If there are any blanks for date completed, the Program Managers must follow-up with the assigned Care Coordinator to determine why the COS Ratings were not completed. If the COS ratings were completed but not entered into the data system, the data will be entered prior to submitting to the State. If it was not completed, the Program must indicate why it was not completed so the Program Manger can track, determine trends, and work with staff on meeting the requirement.

Complete initial and exit COS ratings are identified as a priority area and monitored by the State. Programs are issued findings if they have incomplete data. Data must be provided as well as strategies to address the issue as part of their Corrective Action Plan process.

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? No

If data for this reporting period were impacted specifically by COVID-19, the State must include in the narrative for the indicator: (1) the impact on data completeness, validity and reliability for the indicator; (2) an explanation of how COVID-19 specifically impacted the State's ability to collect the data for the indicator; and (3) any steps the State took to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on the data collection. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

Not applicable.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Section B: Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? Yes

If "Yes", please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

The Theory of Action was updated to accurately reflects the short-term outcomes identified and revised in the Logic Models to provide clarity and to align the activities with the outcomes. There were no changes made for the Monitoring and Accountability (M & A) strand since Phase 1 of the SSIP; however the following changes were made to the Professional Development (PD) and Technical Assistance (TA) and Fiscal strands since the last SSIP submission.

In the PD & TA Strand, the first short-term outcome of "EI programs will have the team structure necessary to implement EBPs (PSP Approach to Teaming) was moved to the Fiscal strand as a step for it's activity as it is related to staffing infrastructure and requires funding. The short-term outcome: "EI providers will report improved quality implementation of EBPS (coaching model in natural learning environments) to support SE development" was split into the two revised short-term outcomes to address SE development and EBPs: (1) EI providers will understand the SE competencies needed to support SE development of infants and toddlers and (2) EI providers will understand the EBPs for delivering EI services.

In the Fiscal strand, a new short-term outcome was added since telepractice (TP) has scaled up Statewide: EI providers will use TP data for improving the use of telepractice in providing EI services.

Refer to Attachment A for the revised Theory of Action.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? Yes

If "Yes", describe each <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space).

There were no changes to the three broad improvement strategies; however, new activities were implemented.

Since Sheldon and Rush's training contract ended for the PSP Approach to Teaming and Coaching model in Natural Learning Environments, the State needed to develop it's own training for scale up and sustainability purposes. The PD and TA Implementation Workgroup identified an infrastructure improvement activity to capture the work being done: Develop and implement training on EBPs (PSP approach to teaming and coaching in natural learning environments) for scale up and sustainability.

The guidelines, forms, handouts and training to support the following components of the PSP approach to teaming: Family Support Team Meetings; PSP Selection; Joint Visit Planning; and Coaching Practices were revised based on feedback and were scaled up statewide to all EI providers. The State also established a system to provide on-going TA to programs statewide regarding the implementation of the components of the EBPs.

The revised short-term outcomes described in Section B, page 6 of this document, have not yet been achieved. The State will be working with national TA providers to revise the SSIP evaluation plan to capture progress of intended outcomes.

The M & A Workgroup completed the following activity: Develop and implement the training on "Using COS Data for Program Improvement" and met the performance indicator that "All (100%) of Demonstration Site Program Managers received the training."

No short-term or intermediate outcomes were achieved during the reporting period.

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy that the State <u>continued</u> to implement in the reporting period, including the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space).

The PD & TA Workgroup continues to implement the Mentoring Plan which supports coaching with fidelity in all Demonstration Sites. Revisions were made based on feedback from State and Program level mentors. The State did not scale up the mentoring plan statewide due to lack of resources that were exasperated by COVID-19 Pandemic. Therefore, an activity/step was added to the Fiscal Staffing workgroup to address the infrastructure needed to implement the Coaching model that requires mentors as part of the fidelity process.

The activity to "Develop and implement training plan for providers that addresses the SE competencies and EBPs" was completed. However, the State determined that this activity required two parts: SE competencies and EBPs for clarity purposes. These areas were revised, and new steps identified to support scale up and sustain the two areas. To date new steps to address SE competencies have not been implemented. Steps to address EBPs were implemented by revising the PSP Approach to Teaming and Coaching model in Natural Learning Environments training to focus on identified components of the PSP to teaming and coaching practices. Revised training was implemented statewide, and a statewide on-going TA system was established to provide programs support on the implementation of EBPs components

The M & A Workgroup continues to work on the steps to support the activity to “Develop and implement a monitoring process to improve implementation of the COS process”. The COS monitoring tool was developed, and training was provided to identified mentors. The COS monitoring plan is being implemented in all Demonstration sites. The steps needed to “Develop and implement training module on using COS data for program improvement” were completed except for revising the Corrective Action Plan (CAP) process. The CAP process assists Programs with identifying root causes, developing strategies to address the root causes, and using data to demonstrate improvement.

No short-term or intermediate outcomes were achieved during the reporting period. PD & TA short-term infrastructure outcomes related to SE Self-Assessment were discontinued and not achieved because the data previously gathered was not meaningful in determining progress.

The Fiscal strand short-term infrastructure outcome "EI programs will have sufficient staff and services to implement EBPs and supports to children and families" was not achieved. The performance indicator for the short-term outcome that "Each Demonstration site provide timely services by achieving 100% for APR indicator 1" was not met as only one program met the 100% target while the other programs' had a decreased from FFY 2018 due to staff vacancies.

The State will work with national TA team to revise the evaluation plan to ensure relevant data is being collected to assess progress towards achieving the outcomes. The new/revised steps to support the continuing activities will allow the State to focus its’ efforts in achieving the intended outcomes.

Provide a description of how the State evaluated outcomes for each improvement strategy and how the evaluation data supports the decision to continue implementing the strategy. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The status of infrastructure performance indicators (PI) not reported as completed in the previous APR SSIP submission are described below by strands.

The PD & TA PI: "85% of all providers in the Demonstration Sites complete the SE Competency Self-Assessment prior to the training, 6-months and 1-year after the training and annually thereafter." Data analysis has not been meaningful for providers and the PD & TA workgroup. Therefore, the SE Competency Self-Assessment was eliminated, and focus shifted to implementing the PSP approach to teaming and Coaching model. The State will explore and revise/adopt SE competencies that align with National and State competencies.

Fiscal PI: "90% of all positions in each Demonstration Site are filled." The data collected via the staffing list provided by Programs fluctuated over time and the PI was not met. The State determined that the staffing infrastructure to implement the PSP approach to teaming and coaching model is needed to align with intended outcomes. The State will need to determine the number of teams necessary for each program to successfully implement the PSP Approach to teaming and coaching model. This may impact the number of staff needed.

"Staffing plan addresses 100% of applicable staffing needs identified in the staffing survey." The two applicable areas (1) Sustainable Financing and 2) Recruitment and Retention Strategies recommended by the Staffing Surveys are addressed in the Staffing Plan; therefore, the target of 100% was met. The State proposed and stakeholders agreed to discontinue the Staffing Plan because sustainability financing will be addressed in the new steps that will identify and implement the teaming structure for the PSP approach to teaming and the coaching model. A process for EI programs to access providers specializing in behavioral support will be included. The new Recruitment and Retention strategies step will identify and disseminate effective recruitment and retention strategies.

"100% of Demonstration Site providers will deliver a minimum of one TP service per quarter." The PI was met by Demonstration Sites and neighbor island EI Programs (Scale Up Cohort 1). Due to COVID-19 Pandemic, TP was scaled up statewide and guidelines, trainings, and equipment were provided to all EI Programs. Programs reported on use of TP on a monthly basis. As of April 2020, this PI was met at 100% statewide and TP will continue as a service delivery method.

M & A PI: The PIs that were met: 1) "85% of providers in the Demonstration Sites will complete the COS Self-Assessment." 96% of providers completed the COS Self-Assessment. 2)"100% of Demonstration Sites will implement the monitoring process." 100% of Demonstration sites implemented the monitoring process.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space)**:**

The State anticipates that by implementing the revised activities and steps identified below will support progress towards achieving the intended outcomes.

The PD and TA Implementation Workgroup will be focusing on: 1) revisiting SE competencies to align with National competencies and State initiatives; 2) Identifying and/or providing training related to SE competencies; 3) Continuing to provide TA to programs related to PSP approach to teaming and coaching in natural learning environments; and 4) revisiting coaching fidelity process. T

The Fiscal Staffing Implementation Workgroup will focus be focusing on: 1) Identifying and implementing the team structure necessary to implement the PSP approach to teaming; 2) Identifying and implementing the team structure necessary to implement the coaching model in natural learning environments; 3) Developing a process for EI programs to access providers specializing in behavioral support; and 4) Identifying and disseminating effective recruitment and retention strategies.

The Fiscal TP Implementation Workgroup will be focusing on: 1) Determining TP data collection and how programs will use the date for program improvement; 2) Revise TP guidelines and training based on feedback; and 3) Explore TP training resources (i.e., videos).

The M and A Implementation Workgroup will be focusing on : 1) Continuing to pilot the COS fidelity process; 2) Analyzing the COS Self-Assessment data to identify training needs; 3) Developing a training module on "Using the Developmental Milestones to Support the COS Process"; and 4) Explore revisions needed to the Corrective Action Plan process to include using COS data for program improvement.

The State anticipates attaining the one remaining short-term outcome in the M & A strand: EI program managers will have the access and skills needed to use COS data for program improvement. 100% of Demonstration Site program mangers reported that they have access to the COS data and 80% of Demonstration Site program managers reported they have the skills needed to use COS data for program improvement.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Did the State implement any <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices?

No

If "Yes", describe the selection process for the <u>new</u> (previously or newly identified) evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

Not applicable.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Provide a summary of the <u>continued</u> evidence-based practices and how the evidence-based practices are intended to impact the SiMR. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

As identified in Phase II of the SSIP, the State committed to implement the PSP approach to teaming and the coaching model in natural learning environments. During FFY 2016, the State secured services from M'Lisa Shelden and Dathan Rush, nationally recognized trainers of the PSP Approach to Teaming and Coaching Model in Natural Learning Environments. The training incorporated natural environment practices, parent responsiveness and child learning, all of which are key to SE development.

The PSP approach to teaming builds in the EBP of building parent capacity (e.g., resource-based capacity-building practices, responsive caregiving practices) using coaching practices. It focuses on supporting and strengthening parents' and other caregivers' abilities in interacting with their child in ways that support their child's learning and development within daily routines and activities and obtaining desired supports and resources. Using this approach will naturally support the child's SE development.

The PD and TA Implementation Workgroup identified an EBP activity to capture the work being done: Implement EBPs (PSP approach to teaming and coaching model in natural learning environments).

The following steps were implemented to address the activity of "Implementing EBPs.

1. Develop an implement guidelines and forms to support the PSP approach to teaming.
2. Develop and disseminate family handouts regarding the PSP Approach to Teaming and Coaching Model in natural learning environments.

Describe the data collected to evaluate and monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)***:***

The State uses coaching logs, adapted from Shelden & Rush to evaluate progress on practice change regarding coaching with fidelity. The provider completes the coaching log in preparation for their mentoring session to debrief about the coaching log and identify a plan of what to focus on for the next coaching opportunity that will be logged. The mentor completes the Coaching Log Summary Form after each session. When six (6) sessions are complete, the mentor determines fidelity status using the fidelity criteria established by Shelden & Rush. The Mentor debriefs with the provider and determines next steps: 1) Practicing fidelity: move to quarterly maintenance schedule or 2)Fidelity in process: continue with coaching logs until practicing with fidelity.

As of June 2020 regarding coaching with fidelity: 68% (28 providers) are practicing fidelity; 23% (10 providers) are expanding fidelity; and 14% (6 providers) are beginning fidelity. An additional 38 providers are "in process" and 15 providers resigned during this period. The data shows 9% improvement since the last reporting period.

A TP Survey for EI Providers and a TP Survey for Families were developed and distributed statewide to all EI providers and families. Survey responses were received from 121 providers and 331 families. Overall, feedback form providers and families were positive.

The COS monitoring plan is also used to evaluate progress on practice change regarding implementing the

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.

Describe the components (professional development activities, policies/procedures revisions, and/or practices, etc.) implemented during the reporting period to support the knowledge and use of selected evidence-based practices. (Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space):

The guidelines, forms, handouts and training to support the following components of the PSP approach to teaming (Family Support Team (FST) Meetings; PSP Selection; Joint Visit Planning; and Coaching Practices) were revised based on feedback and were scaled up statewide to all EI providers. The process of coaching with fidelity was not scaled up statewide due to lack of resources; however, it continues in Demonstration Sites.

The Quality Assurance Specialists provide TA support to programs statewide. They observe FST meetings for each assigned Program once a quarter and are piloting a FST Observation tool that includes all components of the PSP Approach to Teaming. They debrief with the Program Manager and add items if needed to a TA Action Plan.

The FST meetings and Joint Visit Planning meetings are billable activities to support the infrastructure needed to implement the PSP approach to teaming.

A professional development (PD) resource list is readily accessible for all EI providers through our google drive with numerous videos, articles, infographics, and websites to build and sustain providers knowledge and skills in implementing the PSP approach to teaming in natural learning environments and coaching practices, telepractice, child outcomes, and social emotional development to build the capacity of parent/caregivers to help their child learn and grow. Resources are gathered and reviewed by EI personnel from a variety of sources including: ECTA, Family Infant, Preschool Programs (FIPP), Virginia Early Intervention Professional Development (VEIPD), DEC Recommended Practices, various EI Communities of Practices, Military Families

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

The State shares information about the SSIP's implementation and evaluation activities and provides opportunities for stakeholders to participate in the development, implementation and evaluation of the SSIP at the following stakeholder events:

1. SSIP Leadership Team Meetings: The Leadership Team meets monthly to discuss the SSIP Action Plan & Progress Report, including the Evaluation Plan and provides feedback to Implementation Workgroups. Updates, including recommendations and/or discussion with TA providers are shared. The Leadership Team makes decisions so workgroups can proceed with implementing activities.

2. Demonstration Site Meetings: The State Leadership Team meets monthly with the Demonstration Site Program Managers to discuss implementation and evaluation of the SSIP. The Implementation Workgroup Co-Leads provide updates and obtain input/feedback on implementation activities, recommendations of changes that need to be made to existing guidelines, forms, processes, other resources that need to be developed as well as a review of the evaluation plan,including data collected and analyzed. Program Managers share progress and challenges with implementing the activities at the program level. The team makes recommendations on various implementation items that support the SSIP activities and provides input to various activities prior to Implementation Workgroups and/or SSIP Leadership making decisions.

3. Statewide Program Manager Meetings: The State meets quarterly with EIS Program Managers to share EI updates, provide TA, obtain input/feedback on items affecting the EI system. The SSIP is a standing agenda item; however, due to COVID-19, more frequent meetings were held and updates on the SSIP focused on SSIP activities that were scaled up statewide. The State has a process for Programs to ask questions or give feedback regarding implementation of procedures. The State responds to questions/feedback and updates applicable procedures and guidelines as needed.

4. Hawai'i Early Intervention Coordinating Council (HEICC) Meetings: The HEICC meets quarterly to discuss the EI system and how it can advocate and support EIS. The SSIP Coordinator provides an annual SSIP update presentation and the Part C Coordinator providers quarterly updates. The Part C Coordinator shares any questions and/or feedback from HEICC members with the SSIP Leadership Team. Members are encouraged to participate in the workgroups and the evaluation process.

5. Annual Early Intervention Broad Stakeholder Meeting (virtual this year): SSIP updates are provided and input/feedback obtained via ideaboadz on what has been and will be developed, implemented, and/or evaluated. Input provided to various activities were taken into consideration prior to Implementation Workgroups and/or SSIP Leadership making decisions.

7. Early Intervention SSIP Annual Briefs are disseminated and posted on the EIS website.

8. Stakeholders are also encouraged to participate in any of the implementation workgroups. A family flier

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities?

Yes

If "Yes", describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.
(Please limit your response to 1600 characters without space)*:*

Demonstration Site providers have expressed concerns regarding the coaching fidelity process. The process is time consuming and the mentoring responsibilities have been added to staff that have other existing job duties. The high staff turn over also contributes to mentors feeling overwhelmed.

As a result of the concerns expressed, the PD and TA workgroup will be exploring other coaching fidelity processes. The Fiscal Staffing Workgroup will be identifying and addressing the infrastructure needed to implement the PSP approach to teaming and coaching model and will continue to explore effective recruitment and retention strategies.

EI Programs have also expressed concerns regarding accessing behavioral support specialists as resources have been limited. The Fiscal Staffing Workgroup will be exploring avenues to access behavioral support specialists. To assist in this effort, the EIS Psychologist is now a member of the Fiscal Staffing Workgroup.

The Demonstration Sites have also requested training on SE development. The PD and TA workgroup will be revisiting the SE competencies and developing a system to address training needs. To support these efforts, the EIS Psychologist and Psychologist Assistant are now members of the PD and TA workgroup.

If applicable, describe the action(s) that the State implemented to address any FFY 2018 SPP/APR required OSEP response. (Please limit your response to 3000 characters without space):

Not applicable.

*Refer to SPP/APR Measurement Language for required information for Phases I-III including requirements for SiMR, baseline, targets, theory of action, and components of the implementation and evaluation plan.