

Author Full Name : Julianne Horntvedt**Received Date :** 08/11/2021 12:12 PM**Comments Received :**

. Overall, we recognize that despite spending hundreds of hours each year collecting and reporting on our impact, ACL continues to struggle to find the data and results they need to share our collective impact. First, we would encourage ACL to direct its evaluation team to work with Councils to identify the type of information that aligns most closely with the DD Act's identified charge for DD Councils in order to elevate that type of information and data at the top of each PPR report, as well as throughout the document. Additionally, we have identified these potential areas to streamline/change to both reduce time and elevate impact:

- Systems Change Performance Measures

- o We are unclear how quantifying the Systems Change Performance Measures is used by ACL to demonstrate Council efficacy. Instead of being asked to quantify the number of practices, could there be a narrative section in which Councils could list promising practices, evidence-base practices, statutes, policies, and procedures created or improved?

- o It is challenging to show the cumulative path to systems change. Often a great deal of work has been done that is not reflected in the PPR. Would it be possible to have a way to indicate this progression through benchmarks, such as "being considered by the state," "introduced as a bill", "public hearings held", "budget proposal", "wavier changes considered," etc.? The ability to list efforts and then check off their stage of development would be quicker for Councils to quantify.

- o The Systems Change Performance Measures 2.1 and 2.2 are confusing, possibly redundant, and sometimes difficult to differentiate (2.1: # of efforts that led to improvement of practices, policies, procedures, statute or regulation changes; 2.2: # of council efforts that were implemented).

- Two Self-Advocate and Family Member Performance Measures on advocacy seem redundant. Can these be combined?

- o 2.1 and 2.2: Percent of self-advocates and percent of family members who report increasing their advocacy as a result of Council Work

- o 2.4: Percent of self-advocates and family members who are participating now in advocacy activities

- Other area of redundancy: evaluation/data is requested in all of the following sections: Section III: Evaluation Activities and Results; Section IV: Goal Overviews; and Section IV: State Plan Implementation Progress Report (the "Progress Reports" subsections for each objective). Can this be reduced?

- In the "Outcomes achieved" section in the objectives section, Councils can only indicate Yes or No. This is not reflective of the way this work gets done. Could a "partial" option be added that councils can select and then expand on in the narrative section?

- What section does ACL refer to most often and what information is most useful? If we know this, we can focus our comments on how to share this information with them.

- If ACL's needs to shift because of a current administration or attention to a new focus area (e.g. COVID/public health), please put those areas of interest in the PPR: not as a required section but as an optional section where Councils can share knowledge/information about the topic of interest.

- If ACL wants to know which councils or how many councils are working on a specific area (such as youth leadership or supported decision-making), can checkboxes for these topics be added for councils to indicate this? The checkboxes for the performance measures are too broad to capture work on specific