Moving to the Next Phase of Outcomes Measurement, 2009-2013
OSEP Update
Meeting Objectives

- Update advisors on the major developments and activities related to the collection of child and family outcome data nationally
- Describe the proposed activities of the ECO Center for 2009-2013
- Solicit input on future directions and proposed activities for 2009.
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The ECO Mission

Provide national leadership to assist states with the implementation of high-quality outcomes systems for early intervention and preschool special education programs.
What we are about.....
Status of National and State Work
Highlights from . . .

- Feb 2008 SPP and APR review
  - Child Outcomes - Indicators C3 & B7
  - Family Indicator - Indicator C4
OSEP Reporting Requirements: Child Outcomes

- Positive social emotional skills (including positive social relationships)
- Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication [and early literacy])
- Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
OSEP Reporting Categories

Percentage of children who:

a. Did not improve functioning

b. Improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers

c. Improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it

d. Improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers

e. Maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

3 outcomes x 5 “measures” = 15 numbers
February 2, 2009 was the third year of reporting according to the current indicator.

The second year of reporting child progress data.
### State Approaches to Measuring Child Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Part C (56 states)</th>
<th>Preschool (59 states)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One tool statewide</td>
<td>8/56 (14%)</td>
<td>13/59 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Publishers’ online tools</td>
<td>2/56 (4%)</td>
<td>3/59 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSF 7 pt. scale</td>
<td>40/56 (71%)</td>
<td>36/59 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6/56 (11%)</td>
<td>7/59 (12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Number of Children Included in Feb ‘08 SPP/APR Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Part C (52)</th>
<th>Preschool (53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30 = 19</td>
<td>&lt;30 = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30-99 = 15</td>
<td>30-99 = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100-499 = 11</td>
<td>100-499 = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500-999 = 4</td>
<td>500-999 = 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000+ = 3</td>
<td>1000+ = 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-5944</td>
<td></td>
<td>Range: 1-4249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part C (52)**
- Number of Children Included: 52
- Number of Facilities: 52

**Preschool (53)**
- Number of Children Included: 53
- Number of Facilities: 53
Assessment Tool Trends

- **Part C**
  - HELP
  - BDI-2
  - AEPS
  - Carolina
  - ELAP

- **Preschool**
  - Creative Curr
  - BDI-2
  - Brigance
  - AEPS
  - High Scope
  - WSS
Populations Included

- **Part C**
  - 40 States statewide
  - 6 phasing in
  - 6 sampling

- **Preschool**
  - 23 States statewide
  - 14 phasing in
  - 6 sampling
  - 5 included children in other EC programs
Caution – Interpreting Data

- Only represents children who have entered and exited since outcome system put in place in states
  - In a typical state, data may represent children who participated in the program for 6 to 12 months
- The quality of data collection usually increases over time as guidance gets clearer and practice improves the implementation
Improvement Activities

- Almost all states (Part C and 619) are conducting training and professional development:
  - Assessment strategies
  - Data collection procedures
  - Data analysis and use
  - (and a little bit of) Practices to improve child outcomes
Improvement Activities

- Improving infrastructure for providing TA and support
- Processes
  - Reviewing data for accuracy and quality
  - Reviewing and revising processes
  - Identifying successes and challenges in the implementation of the outcomes system
- Improving data collection and reporting
Part C Family Indicator

- Percent of families participating in Part C who report that EI services have helped the family:
  - Know their rights
  - Effectively communicate their children’s needs
  - Help their children develop and learn
Part B (3-21) Family Indicator

- Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.
### Part C Tools for Family Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># (%) of states</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 (46%)</td>
<td>NCSEAM Family Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 (37%)</td>
<td>ECO Family Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (11%)</td>
<td>State developed surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (6%)</td>
<td>Added ECO items and/or NCSEAM items to their state survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 (52%) reported that they provided translations and/or translation services to assist families.
Overall Trends for Part C Family Indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part C has helped family:</th>
<th>a. Know their rights</th>
<th>b. Communicate child’s needs</th>
<th>c. Help child develop and learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>46-97%</td>
<td>49-99%</td>
<td>56-98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States made progress</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># (%) of states</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 (26%)</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 (72%)</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Combination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family Indicator Measurement Challenges

- Representativeness
- Response rate
Trends in Improvement Activities

- Clarifying and developing policies and procedures (40 states)
  - clarification of policies regarding family rights and family centered services
  - modifications to procedures related to the implementation of family surveys

- Providing training and professional support (28 states)
  - to providers and service coordinators regarding family rights and procedural safeguards
  - effective practices relating to family centered services
  - understanding the procedures for implementing the measurement of family outcomes
  - and understanding and using the family survey data for program improvement
Trends in Improvement Activities

- **Processes (27 states)**
  - evaluating the processes used to implement family outcome measurement in FFY 2005 (including distribution methods, follow-up, methods of analysis)
  - family focus groups or random interviews with families to validate outcomes data

- **Improving data collection and reporting (25 states)**
  - developing strategies for improving the family survey response rates and representativeness of the data
### Tools used for B8: Preschool Parent Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># (%) states</th>
<th>Assessment Tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 (35%)</td>
<td>NCSEAM school-age survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 (30%)</td>
<td>State developed survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Included NCSEAM items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>Modified/ customized NCSEAM survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (15%)</td>
<td>NCSEAM school-age survey and preschool survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>ECO Preschool Family Outcome survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What We Learned in the First 5 Years
Points to remember

- State systems were developed very quickly
- Developing/Adapting data systems is a slow process
- Local providers (teachers, early interventionists, etc.) provide the child outcome data
ECO TA – Helping States Get Started

- State level planning and stakeholder meetings to determine approach
- Development of COSF and FOS
- Initial COSF trainings
- Initial discussions with publishers
- Reviewing state procedures
- National calls regarding requirements
- TA to support SPP/APR development
- Development of Communities of Practice (FOS, COSF Data, COSF Training Consortium)
- Development of web site to share ECO, OSEP and State materials
Lessons about states

- Most states have embraced the 3 child outcomes and outcomes measurement and are collecting outcomes data for their own purposes.

- Many states are building bigger systems than needed to produce the federal data.
Lessons about the states

- States have opted to use a variety of approaches
- Ongoing need to build state capacity to collect, analyze, and use data
- Getting high quality data requires an investment of fiscal and human resources
Lessons from the states

- Process of measuring outcomes brought service issues to light – and states are addressing them, e.g.,
  - Knowledge of functional outcomes, typical child development
  - Need for ongoing assessment
  - Sharing assessment results with parents

- Assessment issues
  - Need for more functional assessments
  - Use multiple sources, multiple settings
Lessons specific to ECO

- We need to reach more people
- We need to get a consistent message out to more people
- We need to help more people have a high quality professional development experience
There is a lot to be learned about how to do this well.
Knowledge Development
Why do we care about outcomes?
Why do we care about data on outcomes?
System for Producing Good Child and Family Outcomes

- Good Federal policies and programs
- Good State policies and programs
- Good Local policies and programs
- High quality services and supports for children 0-5 and their families
- Good outcomes for children and families

- Research
- Evidence Based Practice
- Prof’l Development
- Strong Leadership
- Adequate funding
System for Producing Good Child and Family Outcomes

- Good Federal policies and programs
- Good State policies and programs
- Good Local policies and programs
- High quality services and supports for children 0-5 and their families
- Good outcomes for children and families

- Research
- Evidence Based Practice
- Prof’l Development

- Strong Leadership
- Adequate funding

Information infrastructure
Information Infrastructure

Set of components, some or all of which are linked together, to regularly produce information about programs and services and child and family outcomes.
Improve the nation's data on children and families

Good decisions are based on good data, and a hallmark of Casey's approach is using sound data to advocate and build strategies for change. KIDS COUNT consistently earns high marks and gets attention from policymakers for tracking changes in the educational, social, economic, and physical well-being of children. However, the nation's ability to make the best program and policy decisions is often stymied by inadequate data.

Census Data

Most pressing is the need to ensure that the 2010 Decennial Census is adequately funded, managed, and promoted. The government relies upon the data to determine how to distribute nearly $400 billion each year for important programs and how many representatives a state gets in the U.S. House. The public and private sectors and nonprofits also use the data to evaluate initiatives, analyze target populations, and allocate resources. An undercounted community loses out.

"As we approach the 2010 Census, we must get an accurate count to provide low-income populations and communities their fair share of public funds—and political representation," says William O'Hare, a Casey Foundation senior fellow.

The Obama administration should nominate, and the Senate should confirm, a strong new Census Bureau director quickly so that the agency has effective leadership. It is also important to stave off proposed cuts, relative to what was spent in 2000, in advertising and outreach that can make critical differences in Census response rates. And residents should be hired to follow up with people who do not return their Census forms, particularly in historically undercounted communities.

To make the Census more efficient and effective and less vulnerable to partisan attack and gamesmanship, the federal government should make the Census Bureau more independent, for example...
Part C and 619: Information Infrastructure

National/Federal Level

- Data states report to OSEP
  - 618 data (Child count, etc.)
  - SPP/APR indicator data
- Studies
  - National Early Intervention Longitudinal Study (NEILS)
  - Pre-Elementary Education Longitudinal Study (PEELS)
- Data collected by other agencies
  - Head Start
Part C and 619: Information Infrastructure

State Level

- Data state routinely collects from local programs (e.g., APR data, demographic, services, billing, etc.)
- Studies and evaluations
- Other (Quality Rating Systems)
Information Infrastructure

- Local Programs
  - Data required by state
  - Studies and evaluations (Large locals)
  - Other
    - Ongoing classroom assessments
- We do not have much information about the existing information infrastructure at the local level
Role of the information infrastructure

Good data are the window into how well the services and supports and the supporting infrastructure are working.
States vary with regard to the capacity of their information infrastructure (collection and use).

States vary with regard to their vision for their infrastructure.

ECO is charged with helping states work on the outcome measurement component (one part) of the information infrastructure.
ECO’s Major Activities

- Knowledge Development
- Technical Assistance and Dissemination
- Leadership and Coordination
Early Childhood Outcomes Center

ECO Logic Model

ECO Center activities  →  High-quality state outcomes measurement systems  →  Strategic use of data

State Resources

Improved services and practices

Other OSEP Centers

Improved outcomes for children and families
Knowledge Development

- Develop and validate framework - 1st two years
  - Work with 4? 6? 8? states
  - Process and criteria for state selection under development
- Timeline:
  - Information sharing in February.
  - Implement selection process - February
  - Selection of states by March 2009
- Disseminate framework in years 3-5
Process for Framework Development

- Literature review
  - Accountability (mostly school aged)

- Stakeholder review
  - Advisors, TWG, work groups

- Review of state systems
What is a framework?

- Representation of the state infrastructure needed to produce high quality data
- Collective set of components of an outcomes measurement system
- A given component will look different in different states.
Examples of System’s Components

- Method for data collection
  - Assessment (for child outcomes)
  - Survey (for family indicators)
- Professional development
- Procedures for overseeing implementation
- Etc.
Is there literature to support that
- a measurement system has to have the component?
- Some approaches to the component are more effective than others?

We expect varying levels of support for different components and sub-components
- Professional wisdom to empirical evidence
- E.g., defensible sampling plans vs. supervision for assuring high quality data
ECO’s working validation questions

1. Have we identified all key components? Which ones are required for an effective system and which are optional?

2. What are the possible variations on how states can implement each component?

3. Are some implementation methods better than others? (e.g., do some approaches to child outcomes data result in better data? Are some approaches to professional development more cost effective?)
Knowledge Development: Related Products

- Self-assessment tool for States
  - How close to having fully developed infrastructure for outcomes measurement?
  - Track State changes over time (pre-post)

- Catalog of implementation examples for each component
  - “Shopping list” of options for each component and what is known about variations on implementation
Validating a Framework for Outcomes Measurement
Early Childhood Information Infrastructure: Data Needed for Program Improvement

- WHO
- SERVICES
- QUALITY
- COST

OUTCOMES
Where are states now?

- WHO
- OUTCOMES
- SERVICES
EC Information Infrastructure: Data Needed for Program Improvement

Early Childhood K G1 G2

WHO SERVICES COST QUALITY OUTCOMES OUTCOMES OUTCOMES OUTCOMES
Starting to Build the Infrastructure: The Outcomes Measurement System
Examining and Tweaking Service System

**Plan (vision)**
- Program characteristics
- Child and family outcomes

**Check**
- (Collect and analyze data)

**Reflect**
- Are we where we want to be?
- Is there a problem?
- Why is it happening?
- What should be done?

**Implement**
- Is it being done?

**Is it working?**

**Is it working?**
Major Areas of Outcomes Measurement System Framework

Vision for What Is to Be Learned

Data Collection and Transmission → Analysis → Reporting → Action
Vision for what is to be learned

- State has articulated the outcomes that the service system is trying to achieve and for which children and families
  - Must collect data on the OSEP child outcomes and family indicators
  - Might have other outcomes or different organizing framework (e.g., State early learning guidelines)
- State has articulated why outcome data are being collected
  - Purposes for which data are to be used
- State intends to use data for ongoing program improvement
- State vision is available to the public
- If vision for outcomes measurement system exceeds state’s current capacity, plan has been developed for how the full vision will be achieved
Data Collection and Transmission

- State has a method capable of accurately capturing outcome information
  - Method is adequate for all outcomes
  - Sampling plan is technically sound (if sampling)
- State has effective procedures for moving data from the local to the state level
  - Procedures have been clearly communicated
  - Timelines for data submission have been clearly communicated to those who need to know them
  - Procedures work
    - High percentage of data arrives at state on schedule
Data Collection and Transmission (Cont’d)

- State has developed necessary policies and procedures to support data collection and transmission
- Data collection and transmission procedures are appropriately implemented
  - Criteria have been established for “appropriately implemented”
  - State has procedures in place for supporting effective data collection and transmission methods
    - For child outcomes, staff development related to the data collection method
    - Procedures are in place to monitor fidelity of implementation
    - For surveys, procedures to promote high response rate
    - Procedures to prevent data entry errors (e.g., field restrictions)
    - Procedures to check and correct data entry errors
    - Procedures for checking and reducing missing data
    - Timelines are monitored with action taken to ensure adherence
    - Data are analyzed to identify potential problems related to data quality and problems are addressed
- Families have ready access to information about why the data are being collected and to data on their child
Analysis

- Plan has been developed for how the data will be analyzed (i.e., What questions will the data address?)
  - Plan reflects multiple users’ need for data on outcomes
  - Plan developed with stakeholder input
  - A schedule has been developed that will result in the analyses being conducted in a timely manner
  - Plan includes providing analyses to local programs in a timely manner (or supporting local programs in accessing their own data)
    - Local programs have provided input as to what information they need and how they want information
  - Plan is consistent with the state’s vision for what it wants to learn
  - State has capacity to analyze data to address multiple questions related to outcomes
    - Either in-house or through arrangements with another organization
  - Analyses conducted in accordance with the schedule
Findings are shared with key audiences in timely manner in appropriate formats

- Key audiences have been identified
- Reporting schedule has been developed
- Reporting schedule is followed
- Reports are made easily accessible
- Reports effectively address the information needs of the intended audience
Implications of analyses for program improvement are identified at least annually
- Alternative explanations are considered
- Input from multiple perspectives is considered in interpreting the evidence
- Consideration given to whether additional information is needed to make sense of the data before the evidence should be acted on

Action plan developed based on what was learned from the data at least annually
- Input from multiple perspectives considered in developing the action plan

Activities to improve outcomes by improving programs implemented at least annually
Major Areas of Outcomes Measurement System Framework

Vision for What Is to Be Learned

- Data Collection and Transmission
- Analysis
- Reporting
- Action
Partner States

The partner states will play a major role in developing the framework.
What does it mean to be a partner state?

ECO will:

- Work with state to “map out” the components of its child and family outcomes measurement systems
- Identify with state the specific components to target for validation (i.e., for additional study and possibly data collection)
- Work with state to identify what kind of information is needed to learn how well the components targeted for study are working
- Work with state to develop and implement a plan to collect the information for component validation (helping with the design of any data collection tools, designing a sampling plan, helping with data collection and analysis)
- Help state understand what was learned and what kind of adjustments to the component are needed.
What does it mean to be a partner state?

- Nearly all of this work will be done by phone.
- ECO does not have funds to travel to the state but if state can support the travel, ECO can support the labor.
- ECO will work closely with the state to help the state learn how well some things are working.
Individualized Validation Plans (IVPs)

- What are the set of practices State A has in place?
  - Need good documentation
- How do we help State A verify that what is happening in State A is working?
  - Surveys? Expert review? Analysis of Child and Family Data?
- Note: ECO will assist the state with the data validation activities. ECO will work with each state to build state capacity to do this and incorporate what states are learning into revisions of the framework.
Benefits to the state

- Extensive individualized technical assistance from ECO related to the effectiveness of their outcomes measurement system
- Evidence as to how well certain components in their outcomes measurement system are working and assistance with system adjustments based on what was learned
- Ongoing participation in a learning community with the other partner states
- Hopefully, a more effective outcomes measurement system
Selecting the Partner States

- Looking for 4-8 states
- Some with both C and 619 participating
- Geographically distributed
- Diversity in size and other characteristics
- Diversity in data collection methods
Possible criteria for framework states

We will be looking for states with:

- Strong leadership, vision for their system
- Relatively functional data system
- Commitment to outcomes measurement
- Commitment as evidenced by resources allocated
  - Support for professional development
  - Support for quality assurance
- Can or plan to link child and family data??
Conditions for state participation

- Willingness to share de-identified data
- Willingness to conduct additional data collection (e.g., survey of providers)
- Willingness to maintain ongoing communication with ECO Center
- Commitment to being part of a learning community
Process for State Selection

- Should we
  - Have a totally open application process?
  - Invite a pool of states that we think are good candidates to apply and select from within the pool?
  - Ask only the states we think would be good partners to participate?

- Application process
  - Announcement and national conference call to describe
  - Application package (not a proposal)
  - Announcements on listservs, ECO web site
  - Short application – primarily providing descriptive information about system (could repeat what is in SPP if description already written) and signed letters of commitment from Department heads
  - Identification of liaison to ECO
Applications of Technology
Highlights of ECO TA Activities
States’ Needs Evolved

- Determining approach to measuring outcomes
- Developing data collection procedures and systems
- Training and TA for data collection
- Quality assurance
- Use of data
ECO TA Strategies Developed to Meet State Needs

- National conference calls / webinars
- Annual Outcomes conference
- SPP/APR guidance and feedback
- Individualized onsite TA
- Information requests via email and telephone
- Products and reports
- Web site development and maintenance
- Communities of practice
ECO TA: Data Quality

- Refining procedures based on implementation
- Supporting ongoing professional development
- Training & TA on quality assurance and data analysis
- COSF data review and protocol development
- FOS data review (IL & TX)
ECO TA – New Priorities

- Self-assessment regarding quality of outcomes measurement system
- Setting targets and local reporting
- Using data for program improvement
New in ECO-II

- Developing a framework for high quality outcomes measurement systems
  - Framework development informing TA
  - TA provision informing framework
New in ECO-II

- Reaching more people, more cost effectively
  - TA Cadre
  - Use of technology
  - Combining national meetings
Leadership and Collaboration
Soliciting Input across Stakeholders

ECO

Advisory group

Technical work group

Family work group

Part C work group

Section 619 work group
Participating in Broader EC Conversations

- Participation in interagency/cross project committees and workgroups
  - ECTA Consortium
  - Federal TA subcommittee
  - Ongoing communication
    - SCASS
  - Other ways to connect?
Collaborative TA

- Jointly sponsored meetings, conference calls
- Presentations, input sessions, workshops at others’ conferences
Using outcomes data for program improvement

Examples:

- Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Interventions for Young Children (TACSEI)
- Center for Early Literacy Learning (CELL)
System for Producing Good Child and Family Outcomes

- Good Federal policies and programs
- Good State policies and programs
- Good Local policies and programs
- High quality services and supports for children 0-5 and their families
- Good outcomes for children and families

- Research
- Evidence Based Practice
- Prof’l Development
- Strong Leadership
- Adequate funding

Information infrastructure