

**Scale for Assessing State Implementation of   
a Family Experiences and Outcomes Measurement System**

## Background

A valid and reliable understanding of family experiences and outcomes is essential for state agencies and local programs to improve services and supports for children and families. Building a high-quality state system for collecting, reporting, and using data is a complex undertaking that can extend over many years. To assist states in this process, the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Center has identified key components of a high-quality measurement system and developed a self-assessment tool. The self-assessment is intended to assist states in developing a measurement system that captures various aspects of family outcomes and experiences, such as the benefits that families receive from program participation, family satisfaction with services, perceived helpfulness of the services, and family involvement with the service delivery system.

The family experiences and outcomes self-assessment was developed through collaboration with staff in a number of state agencies. It parallels the self-assessment for the child outcomes measurement system framework that also was developed by the ECO Center. To learn more about the child outcomes measurement system framework, please visit our website (<http://ectacenter.org/eco/pages/frame_dev.asp>).

## Use of the Self-Assessment

The self-assessment provides a quantitative scale for determining the current status of a state’s measurement system. It was developed to encourage and support state efforts to improve the state measurement system. The purpose of the self-assessment is for state and local Part C and Section 619/Preschool programs to

* evaluate their current family experiences and outcomes measurement systems,
* identify areas in need of improvement, and
* provide suggestions on how to improve the system.

We encourage states to use the self-assessment as part of an ongoing strategic planning and program improvement process. If completed openly and frankly, the self-assessment process will result in valuable discussions about the status of the measurement system along with ratings that provide a numeric profile of the system.

Ideally, the self-assessment should be completed by a group of knowledgeable stakeholders including staff and beneficiaries of the program. States will need to assemble the appropriate stakeholders, which might include established workgroups or task forces. Family members with different kinds of experiences with the system also should be involved with the self-assessment process. Additional sub-groups or members may be needed to provide input on completing selected components of the self-assessment, so that those most involved in a given quality indicator can help assess those aspects of the system. For example, data managers should be included in the stakeholder group to assess the implementation of data analysis, and local program administrators should help assess their use of data to improve outcomes.

Reflecting a well-functioning measurement system, the self-assessment addresses many aspects of data collection, reporting, and analysis. States can approach the completion of the self-assessment in different ways. States may decide to work through the self-assessment section by section over a period of time or begin with one or more component(s) of the tool. Some states have started the process by choosing a component related to an area in which they need guidance. Other states have begun with an area in which they have devoted much time and many resources in order to confirm that they are on the right track and have not overlooked any critical details. Although state agency staff who oversee the measurement of family experiences and outcomes are likely to lead this process, an established workgroup or task force also may help implement the self-assessment process and prioritize how they use the results to improve the measurement system. The self-assessment might also be used on an annual basis to evaluate progress and plan and prioritize improvements to the system.

## Completing the Self-Assessment

The self-assessment consists of seven broad **components** with 15 **quality indicators** (see page 1 for an overview). Each quality indicator is composed of several **elements** that constitute performance on that indicator. Progress toward full implementation is measured on a 7-point scale, where 7 means full implementation of the quality indicator. The scoring system was intentionally set up so that each element under a quality indicator holds equal weight and importance; all elements are seen as essential to the overall measurement system.

The self-assessment can be completed either electronically or using a paper and pencil version. The directions below were written specifically for the electronic version, our recommended approach.

The self-assessment consists of a Profile page and several pages for each of the quality indicators. The Profile page provides a summary of state implementation at the point in time when the self-assessment tool was completed. Scores entered on each quality indicator page are automatically transferred to the Profile page.

1. On the Profile page, enter the date of the review for the first quality indicator being reviewed. The indicator number will take you to that quality indicator page.
2. For each quality indicator, read the set of elements that make up that indicator.
3. For each element, type the evidence describing the states activities related to that element. The box will expand as you type. When you have completed entering the evidence, press tab, or click on the next box.
4. Based on that evidence, select one of the following for the element:
   * NY = Not yet
   * IP = In process
   * FI = Fully implemented/achieved
   * DK = Don’t know
   * NA = Not applicable\*

\*Only a few of the elements have the option of scoring as “not applicable.”

After making your selection, press tab or click on the next box you would like to populate.

1. When all the elements for the quality indicator have been scored, examine the overall score pattern, and assign a rating to the quality indicator based on the criteria below. Do not include ratings of “Don’t know” or “Not applicable.” Select the score from the menu and press tab. The rating score for the quality indicator will be transferred automatically to the Profile page.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation of Elements** | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| None of the elements are in process | 1 |
| Some of the elements are in process | 2 |
| All of the elements are in process | 3 |
| At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process | 4 |
| Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process | 5 |
| Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process | 6 |
| All elements are fully implemented | 7 |

1. Continue with the next quality indicator until all of the quality indicators have been rated.
2. You will need to save the file with a new name as you would any Word file (for example, “Time1\_April\_2012”).

## Using the Self-Assessment for Program Improvement

The self-assessment tool provides an overview of the current status of the development of the family experiences and outcomes measurement system in a state. When completed appropriately, ratings of 5 and higher on all quality indicators suggest the state has developed a fully functioning outcomes measurement system that is producing valid and reliable data. A low score on one or more quality indicators identifies less developed areas of the measurement system. A state will need to decide whether a low score on a given element is problematic and an area that needs to be addressed given its priorities and resources.

Once a state has completed one or more sections of the self-assessment, the state can use the information about the status of implementation to make a plan for improving the measurement system. The following steps may be useful in planning for how to improve the measurement system. The goal of improving the measurement system is to provide the state with more meaningful information to improve the service delivery system—which should ultimately lead to improved outcomes for children and families.

1. **Prioritize component(s) of the measurement system to focus on for improvement.** If the results of the self-assessment identify several components of the measurement system as needing improvement, a state might choose to prioritize areas for improvement based on the self-assessment results. State agency staff and the stakeholder groups that participated in completing the self-assessment could provide input into the prioritization process.
2. **Assemble the appropriate stakeholders to address the components needing improvement.** Along with the members of established stakeholder workgroups or task forces involved in completing the self-assessment, additional individuals or teams may be brought in for improvement planning related to specific self-assessment results. Family members with different experiences with the system should also be involved with the quality improvement process.
3. **Develop and implement a plan for improving your family experiences and outcomes measurement system.** Those elements of the quality indicator marked “not yet” can lay the groundwork for a “to do” list that will lead to improved outcomes measurement. As part of the stakeholder process, articulate the tasks that need to be addressed in order to move the elements to “in process” and, eventually, “fully implemented.”
4. **Establish and maintain a continuous cycle of improvement.** A continuous cycle of improvement includes a schedule for working through all components of the self-assessment, a schedule for reassessing each component as improvement plans are implemented, and the annual review of your family experiences and outcomes measurement system for evidence that the system is improving. Documenting and providing evidence that system improvement activities are complete is one aspect of a formative assessment of the improvement process.
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**State Profile of the Family Experiences and Outcomes Measurement System**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Quality Indicator Rating** | **Date of Rating (MM/YY)** |
| **Purpose** | | |
| [1.](#qi01) State has articulated purposes(s) of the family experiences and outcomes measurement system. | **-** | / |
| **Data Collection and Transmission** | | |
| [2.](#qi02) Data collection procedures are carried out efficiently and effectively. | **-** | / |
| [3.](#qi03) State’s method for entering, transmitting, and storing data is effective and efficient. | **-** | / |
| **Analysis** | | |
| [4.](#qi04) State identifies accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. | **-** | / |
| [5.](#qi05) Local programs identify accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. | **-** | / |
| [6.](#qi06) State agency analyzes data in a timely manner. | **-** | / |
| [7.](#qi07) Local programs analyze data in a timely manner. | **-** | / |
| [8.](#qi08) State agency ensures completeness and accuracy of data. | **-** | / |
| **Reporting** | | |
| [9.](#qi09) State agency interprets, reports, and communicates information related to family experiences and outcomes. | **-** | / |
| [10.](#qi10) Local programs interpret, report, and communicate information related to family outcomes. | **-** | / |
| **Using Data** | | |
| [11.](#qi11) State agency makes regular use of what it is learning from families to improve programs. | **-** | / |
| [12.](#qi12) Local programs make regular use of what they are learning from families to improve programs. | **-** | / |
| **Evaluation** | | |
| [13.](#qi13) State evaluates its family experiences and outcomes measurement system regularly. | **-** | / |
| **Cross-system Coordination** | | |
| [14.](#qi14) Part C and 619 coordinate family experiences and outcomes measurement. | **-** | / |
| [15.](#qi15) Family experiences and outcomes measurement is integrated across early childhood (EC) programs statewide. | **-** | / |

| 1. State has articulated purposes(s) of the family experiences and outcomes measurement system. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In Process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. Stakeholders are involved in development of the purpose(s). |
|  | 1. Written statement addresses why data are being collected and how data will be used. Statement specifies who will use the data and for what purposes. |
|  | 1. Statement is easily accessible to local administrators, providers, families, and the general public. |
|  | 1. Families receiving services are fully informed of the purposes for collecting data on family experiences and outcomes. |
|  | 1. Purposes include meeting reporting requirements and providing ongoing information for data-based decision-making for program improvement. |
|  | 1. Purpose includes examining multiple aspects of families’ experiences with the program and their outcomes (e.g., helpfulness of early intervention, family outcomes, family-centered services) |

Proceed to [next page](#qi02) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 2. Data collection procedures are carried out efficiently and effectively. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In Process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know NA = Not applicable (for *l* and *o* only)** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | | **Evidence of Implementation** | |
|  | | 1. Data collection methods are aligned with the purpose(s) the state wants to address. (Methods refer to multiple aspects of the data collection, such as how the data are collected, from whom, when, how often, etc.) | |
|  | | 1. Stakeholders are involved in deciding on the data collection methods. | |
|  | | 1. State has comprehensive written policies and procedures describing the data collection and transmission approach. | |
|  | | 1. Policies and procedures are clear and readily accessible. | |
|  | | 1. Procedures are revised as necessary based on needs of local or state agency; systematic process exists for communicating changes in timely manner. | |
|  | | 1. Families are fully informed about data collection procedures (e.g., when surveys are available, how to return them). | |
|  | | 1. Data collection procedures have the capability to produce valid and reliable data. | |
|  | | 1. Processes are available to facilitate efficient and complete data collection. | |
|  | | 1. State has evidence that the data collection procedures are being implemented with high fidelity (e.g., state has local supervisors overseeing the data collection process or state has documentation that a vendor has mailed surveys to families). | |
|  | | 1. Data collection procedures are institutionalized; implementation remains stable through staff changes or changes in a vendor. | |
|  | | 1. Ongoing support and technical assistance for data collection issues are readily available; problems are addressed in a timely fashion. This includes support for families who are completing the survey and program staff who may be involved in the data collection | |
|  | | 1. If state is sampling, sampling procedures produce a representative sample of sufficient size. (Select “Not applicable” if not sampling.) | |
|  | | 1. State has procedures to encourage all groups to participate in the data collection process (i.e., to ensure an adequate response rate). | |
|  | | 1. Procedures make it possible for all families to participate in the data collection, including those with low literacy levels and non-English speakers. | |
|  | | 1. If state is conducting multiple data collections with families (e.g., two different surveys), state has coordinated these data collections through an overall plan. (Select “Not applicable” if there are not multiple data collections with families.) | |
|  | | 1. Program staff are fully informed about the nature and the purpose of the data collection, including service providers or others who regularly have contact with families. | |

Proceed to [next page](#qi03) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 3. State’s method for entering, transmitting, and storing data is effective and efficient. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In Process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | | * 1. Data on family experiences and outcomes are entered efficiently and accurately. |
|  | | 1. Systematic checks on data entry are in place. |
|  | | 1. Those entering and transmitting data have access to necessary hardware and software and know how to use them (e.g., scanning equipment is working properly). |
|  | | 1. Technology support is effective. |
|  | | 1. Procedures are in place to update the data system as needed and communicate changes to the users. |
|  | | 1. Those handling data understand and protect confidentiality. |
|  | | 1. Data system protects confidential information. |
|  | | 1. Protocols for archiving data are in place. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi05) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 4. State identifies accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | | 1. State has a written set of publicly available accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. |
|  | | 1. The questions were developed with broad stakeholder input, including that of families. |
|  | | 1. The questions are consistent with the purposes of the state’s family experiences and outcomes measurement system. |
|  | | 1. The questions address family outcomes and family’s experiences with service delivery. |
|  | | 1. The questions address how family experiences and outcomes relate to child, family, service, and system characteristics. These questions require the family survey be linked to a child identifier. |
|  | | 1. Answers to the questions will provide useful information for accountability and program improvement. |
|  | | 1. A process is in place for regularly reviewing and revising the questions. |
|  | | 1. State has policy or guidance that addresses local program responsibilities with regard to the development of accountability and program improvement questions. |
|  | | 1. State helps build the capacity of local programs to develop accountability and program improvement questions. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi06) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 5. Local programs identify accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

*Does state have a process for systematically collecting information from local programs about how they are identifying accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes?*

*If yes, complete this page. If no, select “1” in box above.*

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. Local programs have a written set of publicly available accountability and program improvement questions related to family experiences and outcomes. |
|  | 1. The questions were developed with broad stakeholder input, including families. |
|  | 1. The questions are aligned with the vision and purposes of the state’s outcomes measurement system. |
|  | 1. The questions address family outcomes and family experiences with service delivery. |
|  | 1. The questions address how outcomes relate to child, family, and service characteristics. These questions require the family survey be linked to a child identifier. |
|  | 1. Answers to the questions will provide useful information for accountability and program improvement. |
|  | 1. A process is in place for regularly reviewing and revising the questions. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi07) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 6. State agency analyzes data in a timely manner. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. State has sufficient resources to conduct data analyses in a timely and accurate manner. |
|  | 1. State can access all data elements necessary to address state level questions. |
|  | 1. State conducts analyses to address accountability and program improvement questions at least annually. |
|  | 1. State conducts additional ad hoc analyses as needed. |
|  | 1. State thoroughly documents analyses so that a new analyst could repeat the analyses and find the same results. |
|  | 1. State provides support to local programs to build capacity to analyze local data. Support can include the state agency providing analyzed data to the local program. |
|  | 1. State has policy or guidance that addresses local program responsibilities with regard to data analysis. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi08) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 7. Local programs analyze data in a timely manner. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

*Does the state have a process for collecting information from local programs about whether local programs are analyzing information related to family experiences and outcomes?*

*If yes, complete this page. If no, select “1” in Quality Indicator Rating box above.*

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. With appropriate safeguards (i.e., de-identified family experiences or outcomes data), local programs have access to the data elements necessary to address local accountability and program improvement questions. |
|  | 1. Local programs conduct analyses or work with another entity to conduct analyses in a timely and accurate manner. |
|  | 1. Local programs thoroughly document the analyses so that a new analyst could repeat the analyses and find the same results. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi09) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 8. State agency ensures completeness and accuracy of data. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. State implements a process for checking the completeness and accuracy of the data. |
|  | 1. The results of the process provide evidence that the data are high quality for the intended purposes. |
|  | 1. State regularly tracks missing and incomplete data and has implemented a plan for reducing missing and incomplete data. |
|  | 1. The state’s survey response rate is sufficient to provide valid generalization to the target population. |
|  | 1. The data are representative at the state level. |
|  | 1. The data are representative at the local program-level. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi10) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 9. State agency interprets, reports, and communicates information related to family experiences and outcomes. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. State has developed a comprehensive plan for interpreting, reporting, and communicating evidence related to family experiences and outcomes to relevant audiences, including families. |
|  | 1. State has procedures in place to address confidentiality issues raised by analyses that produce cells with small numbers. |
|  | 1. State agency conducts systematic and comprehensive review of analyses including consideration of possible interpretations about family experiences and outcomes and the relationships between these and child, family, service, and system characteristics. |
|  | 1. Representative stakeholders are included in the process of review and interpretation. Interpretation reflects stakeholder input. |
|  | 1. State agency leadership is knowledgeable about family experiences and outcomes and can explain the results to relevant audiences. |
|  | 1. State communicates results to target audiences for intended purposes in appropriate formats. |
|  | 1. State provides support to local programs related to interpreting and reporting family experiences and outcomes data. |
|  | 1. State has policy or guidance that addresses local program responsibilities with regard to interpreting and sharing family experiences and outcomes data. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi11) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 10. Local programs interpret, report, and communicate information related to family outcomes. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

*Does the state have a process for systematically collecting information from local programs about interpreting, reporting, and communicating information related to family experiences and outcomes?*

*If yes, complete this page. If no, select “1” in box above.*

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. Local programs interpret, report, and communicate information related to family experiences and outcomes in a manner appropriate to the size of the program. |
|  | 1. Local programs have procedures in place to address confidentiality issues raised by analyses that produce cells with small numbers. |
|  | 1. Local programs conduct a systematic and comprehensive review of analyses including consideration of possible interpretations about family experiences and outcomes and the relationships between these and child, family, service, and system characteristics per the program’s questions. |
|  | 1. Local programs include representative stakeholders in the process of developing interpretations of the data. Interpretations reflect stakeholder input. |
|  | 1. Local program staff are knowledgeable about family experiences and outcomes and can explain family experiences and outcomes results to relevant audiences. |
|  | 1. Local programs communicate results to target audiences for intended purposes in appropriate formats. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi12) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 11. State agency makes regular use of what it is learning from families to improve programs. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. State regularly implements a stakeholder process that includes families to consider the implications of family experiences and outcomes and other data. |
|  | 1. As appropriate, state identifies some local programs for targeted support and then works with these programs to jointly develop action plans. |
|  | 1. State identifies statewide systemic goals for improvement. |
|  | 1. State uses data to develop a comprehensive plan for program improvement. |
|  | 1. State implements and evaluates program improvement activities on a regular cycle. |
|  | 1. State provides data and support to local programs related to use of data for program improvement. |
|  | 1. State has policy or guidance that addresses local program responsibilities with regard to use of data for program improvement. |

Proceed to [next page](#qi13) or return to [Profile page](#COMSQI).

| 12. Local programs make regular use of what they are learning from families to improve programs. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

*Does the state have a process for systematically collecting information from local programs about making regular use of data to improve family experiences and outcomes?*

*If yes, complete this page. If no, select “1” in box above.*

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. Local programs regularly implement a stakeholder process that includes families for considering the implications of family experiences and outcomes data and other data. |
|  | 1. Local programs use data to develop a comprehensive plan for program improvement. |
|  | 1. Local programs implement and evaluate program improvement activities on a regular cycle. |
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| 13. State evaluates its family experiences and outcomes measurement system regularly.1 | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. State regularly develops/updates an evaluation plan addressing whether the individual components of the family experiences and outcomes measurement system are being implemented as planned/with fidelity, each component is producing its intended result(s), and the outcomes system as a whole is accomplishing its intended purpose(s). |
|  | 1. State implements its evaluation strategies according to plan. |
|  | 1. State regularly uses evaluation results to improve the measurement system components, to improve the effectiveness of the measurement system, and to revise the evaluation plan. |

1 Some quality indicators include elements that address evaluation. See Quality Indicators 1, 3 and 9.
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| 14. Part C and 619 coordinate family experiences and outcomes measurement. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. Part C and Section 619 programs use a coordinated approach for measuring family experiences and outcomes so that a common core of data is available to improve programs. |
|  | 1. Part C and Section 619 programs routinely coordinate family experiences and outcomes data analysis and reporting. |
|  | 1. Part C and Section 619 state and local programs work together to use the family data to assure that families uniformly experience quality programs and benefit from services across the early childhood years. |
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| 15. Family experiences and outcomes measurement is integrated across early childhood (EC) programs statewide. | |
| --- | --- |
| 1 = None of the elements are yet in process.  2 = Some of the elements are in process.  3 = All of the elements are in process.  4 = At least one element is fully implemented and the rest are in process.  5 = Most of the elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  6 = Nearly all elements are fully implemented and the rest are in process.  7 = All elements are fully implemented. | **Quality Indicator Rating** |
| Select one |

| **Elements and Evidence of Implementation**  **For each element, provide evidence and select a level of implementation:  NY = Not yet IP = In process FI = Fully implemented/achieved DK = Don’t know** | |
| --- | --- |
| **Level of implemen-tation** | **Evidence of Implementation** |
|  | 1. EC programs use a coordinated data collection approach for measuring family experiences and outcomes to minimize the need for families to complete multiple surveys and so that a common core of data is available to improve programs. |
|  | 1. EC programs use common data standards so that data can be linked across programs. |
|  | 1. EC programs routinely coordinate family experiences and outcomes data analysis and reporting. |
|  | 1. With appropriate safeguards, stakeholders have access to a common core of  de-identified data to allow a coordinated examination of issues related to family experiences and outcomes over time and across programs. |
|  | 1. EC state and local early childhood programs work together to use the family data to assure that families uniformly experience quality programs and benefit from them. |
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