PART C FAMILY SURVEY GUIDE

GUIDE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES USING FAMILY SURVEY DATA

Mid-South Regional Resource Center

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Foreword:

For a long time, states have been surveying parents/families in both the Part B and Part C programs. This effort to receive feedback from parents/families was mostly focused on satisfaction with services. After the introduction of parent/family outcomes in the State Performance Plan (SPP), states turned to surveying for impact. The focus changed from satisfaction to perception of effectiveness, that is, did the parent/family perceive that they benefited from the services they received, and if so, in what ways and to what extent? With the introduction of Indicator 4, outcomes for *families* were established and states were required to determine to what extent these outcomes have been attained.

Determining the impact of early intervention services on Family Outcomes is more challenging than determining family satisfaction with services. The attention turned to ways states could gather the data. Two TA centers funded by OSEP supported the states with regard to measuring family outcomes. The National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) and the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) each developed a survey instrument for parents to rate the extent they perceived that a range of family outcomes had been achieved. Because each state has discretion to choose or develop its own survey instrument, a number of states developed their own.

This Guide is intended to help states use the findings from their respective surveys to improve services, no matter what survey instrument is used. The intent is to answer the questions, "What do the results mean?" and "How can we use that information to improve?"

This Guide is not an effort to improve response rates to state surveys. Great attention has been given to improvement activities pertaining to the process. It is important to have valid and reliable data before interpretation and use. However, with the adoption of one of the instruments from the national centers and with the attention given to state-developed surveys, it appears that good data are being gathered. Thus, for most states, it is time to move forward with the interpretation and use of the data. In fact, it is important that states move forward or the value of the work done to establish family outcomes will be lost and frustration with the process may weaken the effort.

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Acknowledgements:

James Henson, MSW
Author
Mid-South Regional Resource Center
Human Development Institute
University of Kentucky

Consultant:

Batya Elbaum, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Teaching and Learning
School of Education
University of Miami
Coral Gables, FL

Reviewers:

Pam Roush
Part C Coordinator
WV Birth to Three

Sarah Robinette
Data Analyst
WV Birth to Three

Sharon Canterberry
CQI Coordinator
WV Birth to Three

Alice Ridgeway
Data Manager
CT Birth to Three

Kathleen Lynch
Senior Research Associate
Partnership for People with Disabilities
Virginia Commonwealth University

Rich Lewis
Director
Mid-South Regional Resource Center
Human Development Institute
University of Kentucky

Harold Kleinert
Director
Human Development Center
University of Kentucky

Carmen Sanchez
Education Program Specialist
Office of Special Education Programs

Tancy Vandecar-Burdin
Associate Director
The Social Science Research Center
Old Dominion University

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Introduction:

This Guide proposes six steps:

Step One: Analysis of Data

Analysis of Data in Step One helps identify and understand the data. For Indicator 4, data are being gathered through survey methods. These methods differ greatly from state to state and the survey instruments also differ. Some states do a census, where all families are surveyed, and some states sample. Some states do a mass mailing, centralized, often with a contractor; some states hand out the survey locally, and there are a number of other approaches. Some states use instruments developed by OSEP funded projects, such as the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring and the Early Childhood Outcomes Center. Other states modify these products or develop their own. As stated above, this guide is not intended to address issues with survey methods, but to address improvement by using the data from the surveys. Because there are critical differences in the multiple instruments, the analysis is different for each instrument. But understanding the data is essential to effective improvement planning.

Step Two: Interpreting the Data to Select Needs

With a good understanding of the data, the needs become evident. However, all the needs cannot be addressed, so in Step Two the selection and prioritization occurs.

Step Three: Identify Program Practices from the Needs

The methods used to address the needs are program practices. In Step Three, it is recommended that for each priority need, practices are identified.

Step Four: Identify Improvement Activities & Action Steps

There is a lot to consider when identifying improvement activities. These activities are the system interventions you will take to improve services. In Step Four, key considerations are recommended. As part of these considerations, you are encouraged not to develop improvement activities for this Indicator in isolation. These activities should be incorporated into the full system improvement effort.

Step Five: Incorporate into the SPP/APR

After the recommended considerations for development of improvement activities in Step Four are followed, Step Five incorporates the results directly into the SPP/APR.

Step Six: Relate to Survey as a Whole

When something is taken apart and the focus is on specific elements, there is a tendency to lose sight of the whole. It is important to dissect the survey item by item and to work on its parts, but it is also important to understand how all the parts contribute to the total.

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Step One: Analysis of Data

The approach to analyzing the data will differ for each instrument, so the analysis step will be divided into Sections according to specific instruments.

Section 1: NCSEAM Survey Instrument

A. Understanding the survey:

The family survey developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM) includes two rating scales. The 22-item Impact on Family Scale (IFS) measures the extent to which early intervention helped families achieve positive outcomes, including the three outcomes (a, b, c) specified in Indicator 4. This is the scale that provides the data necessary to report on Indicator 4. The 25-item Family-Centered Services Scale (FCSS) measures the quality of family-centered services provided to families. This is an optional scale that may be administered in conjunction with the IFS in order to obtain additional data to guide program improvement. The state has the latitude to substitute items in the IFS from a pool of questions and maintain the same level of reliability if the state adheres to the protocols for selection.

IFS:
Impact on Family Scale

FCSS:
Family-Centered
Services Scale

After a state has administered the survey and the completed survey forms have been collected, the raw data (i.e., families' responses to each item) are analyzed. NCSEAM's recommendation is that the analysis be conducted in two steps. The first step is to do a measurement analysis using the Rasch measurement framework to determine levels of response, and the second step in the analysis is to calculate the percentage on the OSEP Indicator.

The Rasch analysis yields an individual *measure* for each respondent, similar to an individual score on an assessment. It also yields a *calibration* for each individual item. Estimating item calibrations is a standard practice in developing and validating assessment tools. The central concept is this: Just as individual *respondents* to the IFS differ in the extent to which they have achieved positive outcomes as a result of early intervention services, individual IFS *items* differ in the amount of impact that is required for them to be accomplished. For respondents, higher measures indicate that more positive outcomes have been achieved; for items, higher calibrations indicate that greater impact is required in order for the item to be accomplished. The key is to consider the relationship of the individual respondent measure to the calibration of the item. To understand this relationship further, three characteristics must be examined.

Measure:
Score calculated through analysis.

Calibration:
A set of gradations that show positions or values.

1. Use of the respondents' IFS measures

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

a. Interpretation of individual measures:

The IFS was scaled so that usable measures range from 200 to 800. This is the range of values given to the measurements. The scale was also set so that when a person's measure is equal to a particular item calibration, it means that the person had a 95% likelihood of agreeing with that item. In other words, we can be very confident that a person with a measure of 539, which matches the calibration of the item for "Early intervention services helped me and/or my family know about my child's and family's rights concerning early intervention services," has accomplished the outcome represented in that item. We can be similarly confident that the respondent has accomplished the outcomes represented in all the items with calibrations *lower* than the respondent's measure. Therefore, with some certainty, when a respondent's measure matches the graduated value or calibration, the item has been accomplished and the need has been met.

b. Relationship of measures to the Indicator:

How high does a respondent's measure have to be for us to know that early intervention helped that person's family achieve some particular outcome? In order to answer this question for each outcome in Indicator 4, NCSEAM convened a national group of stakeholders who set a separate standard for each of the Indicator 4 outcomes. For "know their rights," the stakeholder group established a measure that matched the calibration of the item related to family's rights. This became the cut-score for determining the percent of families who report that early intervention helped them know their rights, as seen in the individual measure example above. The percent that a state reports on this indicator is *the number of families with a measure of 539 or above, divided by the total number of families who provided data, times 100.* A similar process was used to set the standards for the other two family outcomes that serve as accountability indicators. Similar formulas yield the percent on the other two indicators. This is the second step in the analysis phase, using the data to calculate the percentage for the OSEP indicator.

2. Use of the item calibrations

Item calibrations provide information on the relative agreeability of different items. Higher agreeability (lower item calibrations) can often be translated into greater ease of accomplishment. In general, items with higher calibrations are more difficult to achieve. This information can be helpful, as illustrated below, in targeting items for improvement activities.

3. Use of the distribution of responses to individual items

a. Consideration of the distribution:

Examining the distribution of responses to individual items can be helpful. In particular, states may wish to examine (a) the percentage of responses in all categories of agreement and (b) the percentage of responses in the two strongest categories of agreement (strongly agree, very strongly agree).

A table displaying these two percentages for each IFS item can be a useful starting point in selecting the state needs for the development of improvement activities. This table is often provided by the contractor if the analysis is subcontracted. For each selected item, the table below provides the

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

item's calibration, the percent of responses in the two strongest categories of agreement, and the percent of responses in all three categories of agreement.

TABLE 1			
Item Calibration (Note: Item calibrations are estimated through the same Rasch analysis that yields results for individual respondents.)	**Item**	**% Strongly Agree/Very Strongly Agree**	**% Agree, Strongly Agree, Very Strongly Agree**
A number indicating the position of the item on the measurement scale. Items that are most agreeable are at the lower end of the scale; items that are least agreeable are at the higher end of the scale. It takes a greater amount of impact of early intervention services on the family to result in agreement with items higher up on the scale than with items lower on the scale.	Items on the IFS are statements that express an objective. Items on the IFS include, but are not limited to, items expressing content directly relevant to one of the three APR Indicator 4 outcome statements.	Percent of responses in the top two categories of Agreement (i.e., responses of Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree combined)	Percent of responses in any of the three categories of Agreement (i.e., responses of Agree, Strongly Agree and Very Strongly Agree combined)
Example 565	Feel that I can get the services and supports that my child and family need.	51%	91%

b. Interpreting levels of agreement

Although a simple "agree" response is on the "agree" side of the response scale, it is a very weak response. If we ask a family in an interview whether early intervention helped them understand their child's special needs, and they respond with "Yeah … I guess so," it would likely be marked as an "agree" response because it was not a "disagree." In order to be sure a family has achieved an outcome, we need more than simple "agree" responses to items on the scale that relate to that outcome. A response of "strongly agree" or "very strongly agree" would suggest much greater confidence that the family had actually achieved the specified outcome.

If we look at the response choices in a little different way, we can understand the importance of primarily focusing on the responses that are in the categories expressing a higher level agreement than a simple "agree." Consider the options as:

◘	◘	◘	◘	◘	◘
1	2	3	4	5	6
Awful	Bad	Naa	So-so	Good	Wow!

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

This view indicates the nature of the response. A response that is “So-so” represents a “lukewarm” level of agreement. For example, you might ask a friend how he liked the restaurant he went to last night. If the friend responds “okay,” you are not certain if he liked it or if he disliked it. You can tell very little from a lukewarm answer. When considering the percentages of agreement, it is important to understand that the “Good/Wow” levels have greater value, while the “So, so” and below answers provide some understanding as well. The Rasch analysis, the first step in the analysis process, accounts for the levels of response through weighting. This perspective adds to a greater understanding of family response.

B. **Factors to consider in using survey data for selecting items to target for improvement activities:**

1. Have confidence in the data:

If the state has administered the survey with fidelity, then the data should be regarded as reliable data that can be used to develop improvement activities. If there is still doubt or frustration over gathering the data, then there will be little confidence in the work on improvement. In this process, you will identify where families perceive that needs have been met. Celebrate this and use this to further the state’s understanding of how this was accomplished and where other work needs to be done. Use the data you have.

2. Relationship to indicators:

The state may consider focusing on items that relate most closely to the three Indicators. For Indicator 4A, know rights, there is one item that most directly relates to this outcome: “know about my child's and family's rights concerning Early Intervention services”, which is Item 44 in the NCSEAM sample survey (due to the latitude for states to substitute other items, item numbering may differ for each survey). For the other two outcomes in Indicator 4, states may vary in the item selected as most closely relating to that outcome.

There are also items that relate indirectly to the Indicators. For example, “Get the services that my child and family need” indirectly relates to know rights. Then there are items where the relationship to the Indicator is not clear (for example, “Improve my family’s quality of life”). These items might be considered as “other” items. However, all items have a combined intent and addressing one of the “other” items addresses the intent of the whole.

3. Relationship to Mean:

The state may consider focusing on items whose position on the measurement scale is close to the mean (midpoint) measure for the state. That is, if the state mean on the scale is 550, then one could begin the application process by identifying those items that have calibrations around 550. These are items with which families are largely expressing confident agreement (“Good/Wow”). Items higher up on the scale are being achieved less consistently, and therefore represent good targets for improvement efforts. At the same time, the content of items located lower on the scale should not be neglected. The fact that a large percentage of families is expressing strong or very strong agreement with these items does not mean that ALL families share this view. Even for items with very high percentages in the “Strongly Agree/Very Strongly Agree” categories, there are still families that are expressing “lukewarm” agreement, or even disagreement. Improvement related to these items can come from ensuring even

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

greater consistency of service delivery, such that each and every family experiences the most positive outcome possible in each outcome area.

4. Type of Impact

The state may consider priority items based on how the items cluster around the type of impact on the family. The items tend to cluster around:

- Family's relationship with child/working with child (within family)
- Family working with system (with early intervention programs and other agencies)
- Family and community (with community)

In reviewing the items, a correlation can be seen of each item to one of these types of impact. Selection may be based on area of weakness pertaining to one of these types. Certainly, the improvement activity is strongly influenced by each of these types of impact.

Section 2: Early Childhood Outcomes Center's Family Outcomes Survey (FOS)

For states using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center's Family Outcomes Survey (FOS), please access "An Analysis Guide for Understanding Family Survey Data" at http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/index.cfm . This Guide will provide help in analyzing the results of the FOS and in understanding how to use those results to develop improvement activities.

For states not using the FOS, Please Note: The ECO Guide has suggestions for analyzing survey data that are applicable to all instruments. See below.

In addition to helping states in the analysis of the FOS, the ECO Guide provides additional guidance in analysis of survey data that is applicable to all survey instruments. You are encouraged to access the ECO Guide to consider the following ECO Guide items for understanding survey results and for the use of those results in the development of improvement activities:

4. Are there differences in the achievement of family outcomes across local programs?

5. Are there differences in attainment of family outcomes for different kinds of families?

6. Are there differences in which families are achieving family outcomes that are related to a characteristic of their child?

7. Do families who receive different kinds of services report different levels of attainment of family outcomes?

8. Are family outcomes related to child outcomes?

9. Are families reporting higher levels of family outcome attainment over time?

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Analysis from other surveys can be added here.

Step Two: Interpret the Data to Select Needs

Development of improvement activities is predicated on the idea that improvement activities are necessary in order to meet needs. Through the analysis there is a greater understanding of the data results on each of the items and in total. Step Two helps states to understand what the items say about needs and encourages focusing on the areas of most critical need by using the data results.

A. Understand How Need is Identified:

Before we can focus on critical needs, we must understand how a need is identified in the family survey process. The survey is constructed by linking the experiences of families to a set of statements, the survey items. The items on the survey were chosen because they represent meaningful experiences of the families. The items can be considered desired experiences, an outcome/objective, or a results statement. The items can also represent a need when the desired experience is not attained.

Therefore, the items on the survey are needs met or not met to some degree. For example, the item "be able to evaluate how much progress my child is making" is clearly an objective, but the degree the objective is perceived as being met indicates a level of need. Similarly, the question "How much does your family understand about your child's development?" is asking for a perception of the level of family understanding which can be translated into a level of need. For the purposes of identifying the most critical needs and setting priorities for improvement, the items on the survey are considered needs.

Need:
To require; to want; to be necessary to have or to do.

See SELECT NEEDS EXERCISE *attached.*

B. **Select Priority Needs:**

Select the priority needs based on the survey data. Using the considerations identified above, select needs from your state's survey report and cut and paste them into Table 2.

If SELECT NEEDS EXERCISE *has been done, move priority items from Exercise Chart to Table 2*

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Step Three: Identify Program Practices

A. What is a program practice?

A program practice is something being done to meet the need. For example, for the need that reads "Be able to tell if your child is making progress?" think about practices that are related to this desired outcome. The practices may be:

- Interpretation of assessments
- How often assessments are performed
- Feedback to family

We generally think of practices as being related to disciplines in the program. For example, the speech/language pathologist interprets the assessments and provides feedback to the family on progress. These activities are examples of working methods that therapists and those in various other disciplines, such as service coordinators, may perform. When you begin to develop improvement activities, there may be confusion in trying to distinguish a practice from an improvement activity (see definition on page 13). Improvement activities, when performed as intended (with fidelity), are designed to either discontinue a current practice that isn't working, established a new practice, or improve a current practice. In the Table 1 below, for "know my child's/family's rights," an example of a practice includes "introducing an explanation of rights as a component of the IFSP". This could be considered a new practice or an improvement activity for the IFSP process.

You are encouraged not to labor over this point. There may be some crossover. However, it is recommended that you think first of the practice because *the practice is the performance that requires improvement.* In another example, "cope with stressful situations", ask, what can help the family cope? For our purposes, something done by the interventionist, or the program in general, that is a new effort or an effort that may require improvement to help cope with stress is a practice. See more examples in Table 2 below.

> Practice:
> A working method or set of working methods, performance or action that is the focus of improvement activities.

NOTE: For states using the NCSEAM IFS survey and who have administered the FCSS, there are twenty-five "practices" already identified; there is a correlation between these items and the IFS items. For example, the item "My family was given information about the rights of parents regarding services" on the FCSS is a practice that addresses "Know about child's and family's rights concerning Birth to Three services" on the IFS. By having results from both surveys, there is an opportunity to compare the percentage of agreement on a basic practice to the agreement on impact on need. There is also the opportunity to evaluate the practice over time by looking at the results of the subsequent years' surveys. It is suggested that the state using the FCSS select practices from the FCSS that address the identified priority needs where available. All of the outcomes are not addressed in the FCSS.

B. Identify Program Practices:

For each priority need, identify key practices that, if effectively implemented with fidelity, would accomplish the outcomes. Insert these practices into Table 2 aligned with the priority needs that have been selected. By doing so, you will have established practices that can lead to the development of improvement activities.

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

TABLE 2		
INDICATOR	**NEEDS**	**PRACTICES**
Know Rights	Ex. Know about my child's and family's rights concerning Birth to Three services.	○ Given information about the rights of parents regarding services. ○ Explanation of rights as component of IFSP. ○ Program orientation brochure.
Communicate Child's Needs	Ex. Understand the roles of the people who work with my child and family.	○ Clearly defined roles. ○ Family orientation.
Help Child Develop & Learn	Ex. Be able to tell if your child is making progress.	○ Interpretation of assessments. ○ How often assessments are Performed. ○ Feedback to family.
Others	Ex. Feel that my family will be accepted and welcomed in the community.	○ Family introduced to other supportive providers at transition meeting. ○ Family visits community settings to identify supports & establish relationships.

Step Four: Develop Improvement Activities & Action Steps

Now that the practices have been identified, place the practices in Table 2 into Table 3 and develop Improvement Activities for each.

A. Considerations for Development of Improvement Activities:

1. Queries about practices:

   As improvement activities are considered for each practice, it is recommended that the following questions be asked:

   - What would make the practice more memorable to parents?
   - What are some concrete things that would contribute to parents saying the practice helped?
   - For good/wow rated items, what is it about the existing practices that caused families to respond to the items with a response of Strongly Agree or Very Strongly Agree?
   - For the so-so rated items, what are the present practices and how can they be improved?

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Improvement Activities:
A description of how the state will improve performance for each indicator, including activities, timelines, and resources.

2. Perspective Logic Model:

When you are developing improvement activities for each practice in need of improvement, you might also consider using a type of logic model (see Table 3 below). This particular model, or approach, allows you to consider each activity in relation to five perspectives, or contexts. For example, improvement activities may need to occur on the federal or state level. Regulatory interpretation, policy refinement, and funding mechanisms would be good examples. There may be a need for improvement activities in training or technical assistance to improve the knowledge and skills of personnel. In addition, it may also be desirable to consult the state Interagency Coordinating Council, local parent groups, representatives of various disciplines, and other colleagues in creating and designing improvement activities. Consider improvement activities from the "Transformation Zone" (Fixsen, Blasé, Horner, & Sugai, 2009) which includes the multiple levels, contexts and perspectives required to address the improvement needs effectively, comprehensively and sustainably.

Perspective Logic Model:
A framework, graphically depicted,
showing differing viewpoints and contexts.

TABLE 3

Federal & State Level Requirements, Policies, Practices, Resources	**Personnel Knowledge, Skills, Training…**	**Local Level Policies, Practices, Resources…**	**Child/Family Contexts, Needs, Abilities, Resources…**
	Ex. Educate new staff to the importance of parent involvement in the IFSP process.	Ex. Media involvement in the annual family appreciation banquet.	Ex. Include and exemplify the importance of participation in the IFSP process in family training.

3. System Improvement:

There are a number of improvement processes that have been developed within the TA & D network that may be considered by the participants as supports to the development of improvement activities for all the indicators. Each state approaches improvement activity development differently. Work on this Indicator should be consistent with the state process. In fact, depending on the approach, the improvement process used for other Indicators can be very helpful for this Indicator. One example is the State Systems Improvement Self-Assessment (SSIS). See www.ihdi.uky.edu/MSRRC for a copy. The SSIS suggests that as improvement activities are developed for each Indicator, the state takes a holistic approach to the system. As priority actions are designed, it is critical that State systems in their entirety are considered. To this end, the status of each practice needs to be determined and the agency should prioritize follow-up actions based on what is most important and requires the most immediate attention.

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

The SSIS provides a framework for system improvement. There are three system components and multiple sub-components and practices. Embedded in each of these is the evaluation of activities. With this systems view in mind, identification of improvement activities for this Indicator would be incorporated into the process of development of all improvement within the system. Applying this framework would be a good way to connect this work with all system improvement work and provide guidance for improvement activity development.

Note: The ECO "An Analysis Guide for Understanding Family Survey Data" *provides additional factors to consider in developing improvement activities using results for any survey instrument. You are encouraged to review that document for more ideas at* http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/index.cfm .

Also review,
"Effective Strategies for Increasing Family Involvement and Improving Outcomes in Early Intervention Programs", Indicator 4 of the State Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report for Early Intervention Programs-Part C of IDEA *By Daphne L.M. Worsham at*
http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/images/stories/WRRC/documents/researchbrief3-2009final.pdf

B. **Identify Improvement Activities:**

Identify the improvement activities and place them in Table 4 aligned with the appropriate practice. After identifying several improvement activities for each practice, then identify Action Steps. These are actions that will be taken to implement the activities. Supporting resources also can be identified in the Action Steps column.

The improvement activities should meet the requirements for the APR. They should not be too broad, such as "provide training," nor should the activities identify all the specific actions that will be taken. There is always a struggle between the level of specificity of the activities and the action steps. Do not labor too much on differences between improvement activities and action steps. Just insure that the entries in each column are stated clearly enough to implement the activities effectively. Finish the work with a time line and date, stating when the activities/actions will be conducted and completed. See the example below.

Use electronic version of Table 4 to incorporate Activities and Strategies. A clean copy found in Addendum B.

TABLE 4				
IND	**PRACTICES**	**IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES**	**ACTION STEPS**	**TIME LINE**
H E L P D E	Ex. Interpretation of assessments	Develop and use a functional approach to reporting assessment results.	State creates template for reporting assessment results to help local staff understand function vs. domain	May - August

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

V E L O P			reporting.	
	Orientation for staff on child development	Improve interventionist understanding of developmental norms	Staff take on-line course on typical child development	August - October

Step Five: Incorporate into SPP/APR

Table 4 may be incorporated into the SPP/APR for Indicator 4.

In addition to identifying the improvement activities in the SPP/APR, NA2 states must identify the source of the TA received and the actions taken by the state. The TA/Training resources needed (e.g., web-based tutorial) should be identified under Action Steps. In order to fulfill the requirements pertaining to TA reporting, you may utilize the MSRRC TA Planning & Documentation Chart to record these TA/Training resources and the necessary information (source & actions taken). A copy can be found at http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/content/view/526/463/ or can be obtained from the primary author.

Step Six: Relate to Survey as a Whole

Increasing the agreement by families on selected items related to the three OSEP outcome indicators will not only have the effect of improving the states' performance on these particular indicators, but is likely to improve other desirable outcomes. This is the case because the items in the scale are not independent, but instead are part of the larger picture of positive family outcomes. For example, a family with greater knowledge of their rights within the early intervention system may be more likely to seek out services that could be of benefit to their child and family. A family that actively inquires about available services and supports may be more likely to be given information on services available in the local community. Knowledge of services and supports available in the local community is the prerequisite to families' using such supports and services. Use of these supports and services may lead to fuller integration of the family into the community, connections with other families, and an increased sense of being welcomed and accepted in the local community.

By identifying specific items and focusing attention on *just* those items, it is easy to lose sight of the fact that improving each item truly contributes to the whole experience of positively impacting the family in meeting their needs. Remember how the survey is constructed. Individual IFS *items* differ in the amount of impact that is required for them to be accomplished. But each item is just a different degree of the same experience of positive family outcomes.

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Addendum A:

TABLE 2		
INDICATOR	**ITEMS**	**PRACTICES**
Know Rights		
Communicate Child's Needs		
Help Child Develop & Learn		
Others		

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Addendum B:

TABLE 4			
IND	**PRACTICES**	**ACTIVITIES**	**STRATEGIES**
RIGHTS			
COMMUNICATE			
HELP DEVELOP			
OTHER			

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Addendum C

PART C SURVEY GUIDE GROUP EXERCISE: SELECT NEEDS

INSTRUCTIONS

Provide the group with a report of the responses to the survey items and a copy of the Chart for Exercise.

Distribution of Responses:
Have group review table showing 1) percent from all categories of agreement and 2) percent from two strongest categories:

- Consider the differentiation between the two groups to determine if there is an item that may need attention.
  - If yes, have group rank.
  - If no, move on to next category.

Relationship to OSEP Outcomes:
Have each group member write into the Table the percent (score) from the report on the three items directly related to the OSEP outcomes. Ask the group:

- Do the responses for each item meet the state's target for each outcome?
  - If no, discuss if this should be a high priority for improvement activities. Then have group rank.
  - If yes, have group mark ranking. Discuss the ranking and reach consensus.

Have the group members identify the other items that relate directly or indirectly to these outcomes. Consider the responses. Ask the group:

- Should any of these items be considered for improvement activities?
  - If yes, have the group add the items to the chart, enter the score and rank. Discuss the ranking and reach a consensus.
  - If no, move on to the next category.

Relationship to the Mean:
Provide the group with the mean score. Have the group identify the items that cluster around the mean. Consider the responses. Ask the group:

- How do these items relate to the items above?
- Should any of these items be considered for improvement activities?
  - If yes, have the group add the item(s) to the chart, enter the score and rank. Discuss the ranking and reach a consensus
  - If no, move on to the next category.

Type of Impact:
Have the group members identify items that relate to each of the types of impact. Consider the responses. Ask the group:

- How do these items relate to the items above?
- Should any of these items be considered for improvement activities?
  - If yes, have the group add the item(s) to the chart, enter the score and rank. Discuss the ranking and reach a consensus.

Other Considerations:

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

Have group add any other needs that might be considered for improvement and write the rationale in Priority column.

Summary:
When complete, review rankings and consider the most highly ranked items as priorities. Be careful not to select a large number of items. Each item will have multiple activities and too many items can lead to a level of work that cannot be accomplished.

NEEDS SELECTION EXERICSE CHART

SURVEY ITEMS	SCORE	RANKING				PRIORITY
		1	2	3	4	
Distribution of Reponses:						
Relationship to OSEP Outcomes:						
Know rights						
Work with staff						
Know child's needs						
Relationship to Mean:						
Types of Impact:						
Family's relationship with child/working with child (within family)						
Family working with system (with early intervention programs and other agencies)						
Family and community (with community)						
Other Considerations:						

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.

References

Early Childhood Outcomes Center (2009), "An Analysis Guide for Understanding Family Survey Data" Available at: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/index.cfm

Fixsen, D.L., Blasé, K.A., Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (February 2009). Scaling up evidence-based practices in education. *Scaling-Up Brief, #1*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina, FPG, SISEP. Retrieved August 3, 2009 from http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~sisep/docs/SISEP_Brief_1_ScalingUp_2009.pdf.

Mid-South Regional Resource Center. (2008). *State systems improvement self assessment.* Lexington, KY: Jeanna Mullins. Available at: http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/images/stories/MSRRC/state%20improvement%20system%20oct%2021%2097-03doc.pdf

Western Regional Resource Center (2009), Worsham, Daphne L.M. "Effective Strategies for Increasing Family Involvement and Improving Outcomes in Early Intervention Programs" Available at: http://www.rrfcnetwork.org/images/stories/WRRC/documents/researchbrief3-2009final.pdf

This paper was supported by cooperative agreement H326R040004 with the US Office of Special Education Programs.