**ECO INSTITUTE**

**MAY 25-26 OR 27-28, 2010**

**PROCESS AGENDA**

**PRESENTERS:**

Kathy Hebbeler, SRI, Early Childhood Outcomes Center

Robin Rooney, National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center, Early Childhood Outcomes Center

Kim Carlson, Asst. Director/619 Coordinator, Office of Early Learning and School Readiness, Ohio Dept. of Education

Dennis Sykes, Director, The Early Childhood Quality Network, The Ohio State University

Cheryl Johnson, Director of User Services/communications, Center for Special Needs Populations, The Ohio State University

***Purpose of the Institute: In 2011, ODE will publically report the outcome measures for each district. Outcome measures will be reported using two summary statements. The Early Childhood Outcomes Institute for Data Analysis will prepare participants to market the effectiveness of preschool special education and plan for meaningful continuous improvement.***

**DAY ONE (times: 10-4:30)**

| TIME  | TOPIC | PRESENTER | PROCESS/FOCUS | Handouts |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9:00 | Registration and Institute Packet | Cheryl | * Participants are required to sign in/out each day
* Participants complete form for stipend
* Participants sign off to receive data set on hard copy
 |  |
| 10-10:15 | Welcome/introductionsHousekeeping | Dennis/Cheryl | * Introduction of presenters
* Overview of participants (agency, responsibility, attended last year; level of comfort with ECOSF; level of comfort with data analysis)
* Restrooms
* Check in/out process
* Hotel information
 | ESCs and DD representatives may receive multiple district hard copies on behalf of district |
| ***Understanding the summary statements*** |
| 10:15-12:00 | Review the OSEP categories in relationship to the outcome areas and rating scale**Summary Statements**Intent of the outcome areasOSEP reporting categoriesDevelopmental trajectories | Kathy and Robin | * Critical background and where to find more info (Talking Points)
* Review

Why measure outcomes?Why these outcomes? Why not domains?Overall goal of ECSE: Participation* Data collection

Use the “ECO reference card” that identifies the outcomes, rating definitions, decision tree, conversation starters and OSEP categories and relationship to ratings (ECO reference card)Activity 1: Culminating statements—match ratings with description of child’s functioning (COSF ratings with statements)* Developmental trajectories

 OSEP CategoriesWhat is a trajectory? Why do we care about them? (Developmental trajectories)Activity 2: Converting COSF rating combinations to OSEP categories (COSF to progress categories)* Presentation of summary statements and calculations

The need for summary statements to set targets1. Summary Statement 1: percentage of children who changed developmental trajectory
2. Summary Statement 2: percentage of children who left the program functioning like same age peers

Activity 3: Participants calculate the two summary statements for Ohio and for national data (summary statement worksheet and ‘a-e’ progress data for worksheet)Table discussions -- any surprises? Thoughts about the meaning of the summary statements?Activity 4: Review Summary Statements with fake data for 10 local areas (handouts with dummy data) | 1) Talking Points2) ECO reference card3) COSF ratings with statements4) Developmental trajectories5) COSF to progress categoriesEach district will have a hard copy of their own child outcomes data with number and percent of children reported in progress categories a –e. 6) Summary statement worksheet7) A-E progress data for worksheet8) Summary statements with fake data |
| 12-1 | Lunch | Cheryl |  |  |
| ***Monitoring the data used for public reporting*** |
| 1-1:4545 m | Overview of State Data | Kim | * 2 years worth of data for each outcome
* District comparison to state aggregates
 |  |
|  | Baselines for the State Performance Plan | Kim | * State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children approved
* Requirements of SPP
 |  |
|  | Assessment requirements and rationale(GGG, ASQSE; ECOSF) | Kim | * Why data are collected 2x/year
* Informing instruction/program—points in time for curriculum adjustment overall/supplements needed
* Fidelity of processes
* Why 2 sources standard for ECOSF
 |  |
| 1:45-2:3030 m | Optional version of ECOSF/policy | Kim | * Revision to allow for checking what sources but only writing a supporting evidence statement and any areas that need watched (where info is not consistent)
* For next year- more with regional trainers
 | 9) COSF option |
| 2:30-2:45 | Break |  |  |  |
| 2:45-3:0015 m | Access to District Data | Kim | * Data will be in Data Warehouse next year for public
* Not raw data or child level but reports or element choice as set by ODE- demographic variables/analysis
* ODE will take next year to work on separate district access to district data in Warehouse and reports
* Districts can pull reports from local data systems
* Be sure data are same as submitted in EMIS- cross check
* EMIS data are what will be publically reported
 |  |
|  | ODE Web  | Kim | * Show where resources are available on ODE Web and links
* How it connects to the PSE Administrative Guide as reference include policy papers for assessments)
 |  |
| ***How much confidence do we have in the data? Fidelity in implementation impacts outcomes reporting*** |
| 3:00-4:0060 m | Survey results on fidelity and implementation | Dennis | * Summarize salient points as agreed regarding each section
 |  |
| ***First blush at analyzing district data*** |
|  | Give homework assignment | Kathy and Robin | Review district data (homework)* Are a categories same across classrooms?
* Are disability categories represented across a-e? or predominately in one category?
* Are children represented in the same category across all outcomes (all ‘a’ or all ‘e’) or are there differences for each child by outcome?
 | 10) Homework |

DAY TWO (times: 8:30-3:00)

Time for checkout

| TIME (in minutes) | TOPIC | PRESENTER | PROCESS/FOCUS | Handouts |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 8:30-8:45 | Issues from Day One | Kathy and Robin |  |  |
| 60 minutes | ***Listening to your data: What are they saying?***  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | * EIA
* Discussion of homework
* What are we concluding?
* If SS released tomorrow, can you explain them to your boss? The public? The press?
 |  |
|  | Looking at the quality of your data |  | * Review of pattern checking
* Activity: Look at the patterns in their data
 |  |
|  | Getting your own answersKiller questionsData analysis: How your answer questions? |  | * Killer question – activity

Activity: Walk through an analysis with a question – folks use own data or the dummy data.Walk through analysis with a different question.  |  |
| 3:45-4:3060 | Patterns and trends in the data | Kathy | * Practice initially with dummy data
* Explanation by Kathy
* Small group/table discussion with discussion points
* Large group review
 |  |
|  | ***Program evaluation or data –informed program improvement*** |  |  |  |
| 20 | Comparison to national data | Kathy |  |  |
| 15 | Dummy DATA | Kathy |  |  |
| 20 | Inferences from the data | Kathy |  |  |
| 30 | Killer questions | Kathy |  |  |
| 30 | Models for analysis | Kathy |  |  |
| 30 | Looking for patterns/trends | Kathy |  |  |
| 20 | Variables and considerations in analysis | Kathy |  |  |
| 20 | Comparison of district to state aggregate | Kathy |  |  |
|  | Necessary change | Kathy | * Inferences for continuous improvement at program/class levels
 |  |
|  | ***Purpose: Review*** |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ***Purpose: Application of learning*** |  |  |  |
|  | DISTRICT DATA or another set of Dummy Data |  |  |  |
|  | Basic info analysis |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Trends/patterns notes |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ***Purpose: public reporting of results*** |  | Talking to the public and the media |  |
|  | Messages/summary statements |  |  |  |
|  | Relationship to ELPG |  |  |  |
|  | Marketing and public relations: meaningful descriptions |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | How can we help? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | QuestionsAnalysis – 1. Structured, playing with the dummy data.EIADiscussion re EIA of Summary statements, survey data, Ohio dataTalking to the public |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | AFTER INSTITUTE |  | ODE approved PD certificates mailed to all participants |  |
|  |  |  | Stipends provided to each participant |  |

Day 2: Using Data for Program Improvement

8:00 – 8:15 Issues from Day 1

8:15 – 9:00 Finding the Killer Questions

9:00 – 10:00 Preparing for Data Analysis

10:00 – 10:15 Break

10:15 – noon Working with Data

Noon – 1:00 Lunch

1:00 – 2:00 Finding Meaning in the Findings

2:00-2:45 Talking to the Public: Summary Statements

2:45 – 3:00 Wrap up