

2013 UCEDD Annual Report Highlights

Initial Outcomes Measures – These new data points were developed by the Annual Report Workgroup, and tested by the Pilot Test Workgroup, both of which included UCEDD Directors and Data Coordinators as well as AIDD and AUCD staff. The intention is to collect data that demonstrates the broader impact of UCEDD efforts.

- Initial Outcomes Measures data are collected in the activity records for interdisciplinary pre-service prep, community training, technical assistance, and direct/model services (clinical and other). Standard questions to collect data throughout the year are identified in the data dictionary. *You'll want to be aware of these, and collect data throughout the year.*
- Initial Outcomes Measures data for demonstration services and research are not collected in the activity record, but instead will be entered directly in the annual report. *You'll want to be aware of this, and gather information accordingly throughout the year to enter directly into the Annual Report.*
- Initial Outcomes Measures are not identified (i.e., not needed) for continuing education or information dissemination.

Consumer Satisfaction Measures – There is a change in the standard questions to collect consumer satisfaction data; the wording of the question changed to reflect the change in response options to maintain consistency with responses for Initial Outcomes Measures.

- Standard questions for consumer satisfaction measures are identified in the data dictionary. *You'll want to be aware of these, and collect data throughout the year.* (The measures themselves have not changed, and are outlined in the current OMB-approved UCEDD Annual Report template.)

Trainee Data – A new data point is added to collect the primary language of trainees and document in the trainee main record. Standard language for this question was also developed by the Annual Report Workgroup and tested by the Pilot Test Workgroup. *You'll want to be sure the trainee main records for current trainees are updated accordingly.*

FAQs about the 2013 UCEDD Annual Report

1. Under Interdisciplinary Pre-Service Preparation, what is the number of UCEDD interdisciplinary training programs and the number of discipline specific training programs?

This will be the total number of activities, which has historically been reported in the annual report, except now they will be categorized by discipline-specific or interdisciplinary. These activities are categorized as discipline-specific or interdisciplinary in the activity record, where the Center makes a selection in the drop-down options for the question: "Discipline of Course or Class". There is not a discipline-specific core function. In the new logic model, AIDD requests data on discipline-specific AND interdisciplinary training programs, within the interdisciplinary pre-service prep core function.

If OTHER is selected, Discipline name must be provided:

Trainees Total	<input type="text"/>
Other Classroom Students	<input type="text"/>
Professionals & Para-Professionals	<input type="text"/>
Family Members/Caregivers	<input type="text"/>
Adults with Disabilities	<input type="text"/>
Children/Adolescents with Disabilities/SHCN	<input type="text"/>
Legislators/Policy makers	<input type="text"/>
General Public/Community Members	<input type="text"/>
TOTAL PARTICIPANTS:	<input type="text"/>
*Discipline of Course or Class	<input type="text"/>

A blue arrow points to the dropdown menu in the 'Discipline of Course or Class' field.

2. Under Interdisciplinary Pre-Service Preparation, does number of training events refer to events aside from the interdisciplinary or disciplinary specific training programs?

No.

3. Under Interdisciplinary Pre-Service Preparation, although the first item is number and type of UCEDD trainees trained in the DD field, the last item asks for number of students trained – how does this differ from the first output measure?

Not all students count as intermediate or long-term trainees. In the interdisciplinary pre-service preparation activity record, there is a data field for "types and numbers of participants" where other options are available to identify. The counts here will inform this output measure.

4. Do the initial outcome measures also refer just to the area of emphasis we have selected (as do the consumer satisfaction measures)?

The initial outcomes measures are NOT specific to an area of emphasis, but are to be reported on all activities.

5. **Part 1.a states that we have a “workplan” in the five year plan and describes how it should be set up. I assume most if not all UCEDD included a “workplan/timeline” with specific quarterly targets in their reconpeting submission. The first red paragraph under 1.a. says that "application guidance requires the UCEDD to provide quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved for each function or activity in such terms as the number of people to be served and the number of activities accomplished." Is this to guide those who did not submit such an appendix with their reconpete? And if we didn't specify in our 2008-2013 grant the number of people that would be served or the number of activities that would take place as part of an activity/objective, how do we report on this for the 2013 report?**

The workplan is submitted with the core grant application every 5 years. A revised workplan can be submitted with the continuation application, if revisions are needed. See FAQ #7 below. AIDD recognizes that the workplans developed in the core grant applications will vary across the network, and may also not exactly meet the guidance that was in the UCEDD program announcement for core grant applications. The first red paragraph is meant to re-orient folks to that part of the program announcement, so they have a frame of reference for the workplan that is being discussed. If your current workplan does not meet the guidance, you should still report progress on your current workplan as it is written (i.e., if you did not specify the number of people served or number of activities in your workplan, then you will not report progress on these in Part 1a of the 2013 annual report).

6. **For Part 1.a, does it mean that we should re-submit the detailed work plan/timeline document originally submitted again as an appendix to the annual report? OR should we make a modified work plan based on changes to the plan since it was submitted? Also, must the projections be monthly or quarterly? In our 2008-2013 grant, we assigned time periods for completing each objective, but they are all at least a one year time period, if not the whole five year grant cycle. Going forward will we be asked to break down each objective by quarterly goals?**

The guidance we have from AIDD is that the workplan progress report should follow the workplan that was submitted – in whatever form it was submitted. The project officers will be looking at your original core grant application, and want to see progress based on the workplan you submitted with that. You should add a section for “progress” to your workplan, and will upload it as an attachment in the annual report. In essence, yes, this means the detailed work plan/timeline will be resubmitted, with this additional section.

The annual report is not an appropriate place to make modifications to your workplan; it is a place to report on progress. Workplan modifications should be done with the next core or continuation application, whichever comes next for you. Please see FAQ #7 for more information on this.

Guidance for the workplan can be found in the program announcement (archived here: <http://www.aucd.org/template/page.cfm?id=518>). Here is the current guidance: “Provide quantitative monthly or quarterly projections of the accomplishments to be achieved for each function or activity in such terms as the number of people to be served and the number of activities accomplished.” If your workplan does not follow this guidance, it can be modified with the next application. Again, the annual report is not the place to modify the workplan. It is appropriate to report progress on your workplan *in whatever format your workplan currently exists*. Variation across Centers is anticipated.

- 7. Can Part 1.a be arranged as a table (taking the goals/objectives/activities table for each core function from the reconpeting application and adding a column for progress)? It seems like they may be asking for that PLUS a narrative report. But, it may be that the better place for the table of goals/objectives/progress belongs in part 1.b.**

For this section of the annual report, you can include the original workplan and simply add sections or columns (depending on whether you used a narrative or table format for the workplan) to address progress.

If your Center is concerned that the workplan that was submitted doesn't actually follow the guidance as closely as you like, it can be revised in the continuation application or the next core grant application. However, it is not recommended to jump in that direction quite yet. This is a new reporting process that everyone will be getting used to, and AIDD will use this first year (2013) as a "baseline." They do intend to look at their own guidance – for both the core grant and the annual report – based on what they receive this first year. So for now – stick to your workplan, as is, and report on that in 2013.

- 8. Part 1.b.: the results of the evaluation plan are actually reflected in the "column for progress" described above, so maybe the table better fits here?**

Part 1b is addressing the overall evaluation plan for the UCEDD, not the evaluation that might be involved in each project or activity. Your evaluation plan should focus more on your overall UCEDD's impact on state systems change, rather than progress in individual activities. This is the whole, not the parts that make up the whole. Again, there will be variability in how UCEDDs report this, and clarifications are likely to come next year after AIDD sees what they receive this first time around. Guidance for this evaluation plan also exist in the program announcement: <http://www.aucd.org/template/page.cfm?id=518>.

- 9. In order to better understand how information flows from NIRS to the annual report template, I have opened the template every once in a while after we have entered new activities, etc. into NIRS. I assume this is just fine to do.**

Sure, it's fine to open this template. Just know that the 2013 UCEDD Annual Report template is not yet developed in NIRS. We will be developing this in the next few months, before your annual report is due. If you open the annual report in NIRS, it will be the old template, but opening the current version may help you understand how and where the data all fits.

- 10. Since I am fairly new to the annual report process, can you tell me if I have the right idea about what "autopopulates" from our NIRS data into the UCEDD Annual Report template?**

We have developed the Annual Report Guidebook (found on the NIRS Resources page) to help folks understand where the annual report is populated from NIRS data fields. This will be updated with this new annual report template, once it is finalized in NIRS. If you put the current guidebook together with the document showing where all the measures in the New Logic Model can be found in NIRS, then you've got it all.

11. In the old version of the template, in order for a product to be “counted” it needed to be linked to an information dissemination activity. Is that true in the new template?

The data is requested differently in this new report template – the previous template requested data on products “developed and disseminated” and now those two activities are reported on separately: Number of products developed and Number of products disseminated.

For the Number of Products developed, Products do not need to be linked to Information Dissemination Activities. But to report on the Number of Products disseminated, Products will still need to be linked to Information Dissemination Activities. To create this link, first add the Product record, then add/edit an Activity with the core function of Information Dissemination, and select “link to existing product”.

12. What are the restrictions on putting inservice and continuing education under Interdisciplinary Pre-Service Preparation? In the past I have seen these items go under with Interdisciplinary OR Community Service. Is there ONE way or is AIDD open to the UCEDD choosing whether to put the training under inservice or continuing education?

In the core functions of the DD Act, [Continuing Education](#) falls under Interdisciplinary Preservice Preparation. However, AIDD realizes that it truly is a different activity, much more closely identified with Community Services: Training. When entering data into NIRS, the [Continuing Education/Community Training](#) core function is what should be selected for Continuing Education activities where CEU’s or their equivalents are offered.

Regarding [inservices](#) (community trainings), if they are training for professionals and para-professionals in the field where CEU’s are not offered, then they meet the definition of Community Services: Training and are entered into NIRS the same as what is described above.

There are 2 questions in the [Continuing Education/Community Training](#) activity record that differentiate the two activities:

- Are continuing education credits offered?
- Are certificates of completion or CEUs (or their equivalents) offered? (select "yes" for Continuing Education; select "no" for Community Training)

A response of “Yes” to one or both of these questions means the activity will count toward Continuing Education in your annual report. Otherwise, it will count toward Community Training. The definitions are in the NIRS activity record, data dictionary, logic model, and definitions document.

13. Since in NIRS Continuing Education and Community training are grouped, would it be acceptable to create a goal for our next core grant for 'Continuing Education and Community Training' combined and a separate goal for 'Pre-service preparation'? The question stems from how we have historically written these goals but also from the 2012 UCEDD RFP which combined interdisciplinary 'pre-service training and continuing education', placing 'community training' with community service.

The RFP (i.e., program announcement) is using the language that is in the DD Act, where preservice training and continuing education are part of one core function. AIDD also recognizes that continuing education is more similar to community training. Regarding how to group them in the application, it’s best to follow the guidance in the program announcement. You could also consider

separating each individually as in the logic model. But it's also helpful to keep in mind that the core applications are reviewed by a panel of colleagues, professionals in the field, and self-advocates...and deviations from the exact template in the program announcement might be misunderstood by a reviewer who doesn't work in a UCEDD.

14. I need some guidance on how to interpret the provided definition for "regular ongoing trainings." The definition from the logic model and the data dictionary is: Trainings that are (1) conducted with a cohort of participants over a series of sessions and/or (2) one-time trainings that reoccur with regular frequency. It is the wording after (2) that I am not sure how to interpret:

- a. Is it a cohort of participants attending one-time trainings that reoccur? Or anyone?
- b. What is considered "regular frequency"? Once a month? Once a quarter?

Application:

Would the same training offered monthly across multiple regions throughout the state be considered a regular ongoing training? (Note, the audience would be different at each training.)

(1) Trainings that are conducted with a cohort of participants over a series of sessions are trainings that involve a series of sessions with the same cohort of participants.

(2) One-time trainings that reoccur with regular frequency are trainings that are offered at regular intervals, but the participants may differ, so not the same cohort each time (but the same content). There is no specific definition for "regular frequency" – that is up to you and what would be considered regular frequency for activities at your Center.

Basically, the main difference between the two choices is (1) the same cohort of participants (with possibly different content between sessions) vs. (2) the same content (but different participants). The example provided – the same training offered monthly across multiple regions throughout the state with a different audience at each training – appears to meet the criteria for "regular ongoing training."

15. Where in NIRS would I enter a webinar that I was a speaker on?

It depends on what you want to report and to what funder. For UCEDD reporting to AIDD, it's probably best to enter it as a TA or Training Activity, as you find appropriate. For LEND reporting to MCHB, you can enter it either as a TA/Collaboration Activity or a Product. It's up to your Center and what you'd prefer to report to MCHB. Speaking on a webinar might be best entered as a TA/Collaboration Activity, but it is your decision based on what you want to report.

If you decide to report the webinar in the same manner for both the UCEDD and the LEND, you can create just one UCEDD/LEND Activity or Product record. But if you decide to report the webinar differently for the UCEDD and the LEND, then you can create separate records, but just be sure to select only one Program type for each record, as appropriate.

There is no specific guidance on how to report webinars. In terms of Products, the best category to enter them under is Web-based Products.

16. Under TA activities, we have quite a few activities with the same state agencies representatives in attendance. If we utilize a survey to obtain feedback, we would be re-surveying the same individuals many times over. Do we need a certain percentage of responses?

There is no response rate required for the Initial Outcome Measure.

17. I need better definitions of Technical Assistance so that I can train people on the difference between it and Technology Assistance.

Technical Assistance is defined as “direct problem-solving services provided by UCEDD faculty/staff to assist individuals with developmental and other disabilities, families, programs, agencies, or other entities in improving their outcomes, services, management, and/or policies. Examples of improvements include, but are not limited to:

- Enhanced resources
- Enhanced services
- Strengthened networking of public and private entities across communities
- Increased awareness of evidence-based practices
- Enhanced capacity to assess current practices in relation to evidence-based approaches
- Identification of policy changes needed within the area of emphasis”

While Technology Assistance focuses on technology and equipment, Technical Assistance encompasses a variety of problem-solving services aimed at assisting organizations who serve or impact people with disabilities and their families. These problem-solving services may include technology assistance, but their purpose is much broader.

18. What core function does technical assistance provided to people with disabilities and their families fit under?

Based on the new definitions, TA provided to people with disabilities and their families is now to be entered under Other Direct/Model Services, not TA. Other Direct/Model Services are defined as “specialized non-clinical services delivered with the intention to enhance the well-being and status of the recipient and not for testing new practices and may be integrated with training, research, and/or dissemination functions.” One of the examples provided with the definition is: “providing technical assistance directly to individuals with developmental disabilities and their family.”

19. What are good examples of statewide systems change? What are good examples of improvement in measures of collaboration?

Statewide systems change might involve policy, program, or funding changes at the state level. Examples include the adoption of Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) as the standard for disciplinary practices in school systems, or policy and funding decisions by the state Medicaid and DD offices to close institutions in the state to serve people in the community.

Measures of collaboration are qualitative rather than quantitative information relating to the collaborative efforts of the DD network in the state (UCEDD, P&A, and DD Council) working together on one or more issues. Improvements might include better identification of policy or program issues where each partner has a clearly defined role in affecting systems change, program development, and the like. Examples are available in *DD Network Collaboration: A White Paper on State-level Experiences*, a report available online at <http://www.aucd.org/docs/urc/DD%20Network%20Collaboration-A%20White%20Paper%20on%20State-level%20Experiences%20FINAL.pdf>.