

Options and ECO Recommendations for Summary Statements for Target Setting

Kathleen Hebbeler
Lynne Kahn
Early Childhood Outcomes Center



Demonstrating Results for
Infants, Toddlers and Preschoolers with Disabilities and Their Families



Setting Targets for Child Outcomes

Introduction and Background

Through the SPP/APR process States must set targets based on their baseline data for each of the indicators. OSEP received comments from States regarding the number of targets associated with SPP/APR Indicators C3 and B7, the Early Childhood Outcome Indicators. The comments suggest that three sets of five targets (each set totaling 100%) is excessive, and that OSEP should reduce the number of targets for these indicators, preferably to **one or two** numbers for each of the three outcomes. States will set targets in their SPP/APRs once baseline is established in the SPP/APR due 2010. Additionally, OSEP needs a plan for how to present outcome data and set targets for the child outcome performance measures at the national level that will allow valid conclusions to be drawn about the programs.

Child Outcome Performance Measures:

Part B, Section 619

Measure 1.2 of 3: The percentage of children with disabilities (aged three through five) participating in the Special Education Preschool Grants program who demonstrate [improved] positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (Desired direction: increase)

Part C

Measure 1.1 of 1: The percentage of infants and toddlers with disabilities participating in Part C who demonstrate [improved] positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and demonstrate appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. (Desired direction: increase)

Note: OSEP is NOT changing the indicators or the measures, and the baseline data will still be established with the five progress categories for each of the three outcomes. OSEP asked the ECO Center to develop an options paper, facilitate a discussion, and make recommendations on the following the questions:

- Should OSEP reduce the number of **targets** associated with the progress data in the SPP/APR?
- And, if so, what would be the most meaningful subset or summary of progress data on which to set targets?

Terminology Used in this Discussion

Indicator (also known as the 3 OSEP outcome areas):

Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Measure (also known as the 5 OSEP progress categories):

- a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning
- b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers
- c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach
- d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers
- e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers

Summary Statement:

A statement based on one or more of OSEP progress categories that will be used to describe child progress and for which targets will be set.

Target:

Numerical goal related to the summary statement, e.g, 65% in 2011; increase by 1% each year.

OSEP Evidence of Effectiveness for the PART Review

OSEP will need summary statements at the national level to provide evidence of effectiveness for the Part C and Section 619 Programs for the Program Rating Assessment Tool review, a process applied to all federally funded programs since 2002 (see Expectmore.gov for more information). Examples of indicator data for other federal programs (see Expectmore.gov) provide implications for the types of data considered adequate for this review. Three such examples from PART reviews are presented below.

Example 1: Early Reading First

Measure (summary statement): The percent of 4-year-old children participating in Early Reading First programs who achieve significant gains on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-III

Explanation: This measures the development of receptive language, a skill correlated with improved academic performance in kindergarten. The goal is for ERF children to catch up with their peers before entering school. This is the same test used for Head Start and for Education's Early Childhood Longitudinal Study. The baseline was set in 2004. (ED needs to provide info on its definition of "significant ")

Year Target Actual

2006 baseline 59.5
2007 60.5
2008 61.5

Example 2: Title I Grants to Local Education Agencies

Measure (summary statement): The percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading/language arts assessments will increase to 77.7 percent.

Explanation: This measure focuses on progress toward the statutory goal of 100-percent proficiency in reading/language arts by SY 2013-2014. * The baseline has been recalculated since 2005-06 assessment data are now available, and that was the first year States were required to assess all students in grades 3-8 and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

Year Target Actual

2004	undefined	49.7
2005	undefined	52.6
2006	*	55.3
2007		60.9
2008		66.5
2009		72.1
2010		77.7

Example 3: Title 1 Grants to Local Education Agencies

Measure: The difference between the percentage of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading/language arts assessments and the percentage of all students in grades 3-8 scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on State reading/language arts assessments will decrease to 6.5 percent.

Explanation: This measure focuses on the program goal of closing achievement gaps between poor students and other students. * The baseline has been recalculated since 2005-06 assessment data are now available, and that was the first year States were required to assess all students in grades 3-8 and thus will support a more accurate comparison in subsequent years.

Year Target Actual

2004	undefined	13.9
2005	undefined	13.3
2006	*	13.0
2007		11.4
2008		9.8
2009		8.1
2010		6.5

Note: Title I has the same two measures for mathematics

What was Needed

In November, 2007, input was needed on formulating one or more meaningful summary statements for state reporting on the Indicators C3 and B7 and for OSEP reporting to OMB for the PART review process. The question addressed was how best to reduce the 5 OSEP category numbers to one or more target numbers to present the most appropriate picture of the outcomes achieved by children in Part C and 619. Should the target be one number? Two numbers? Should the same summary statement(s) be used for each of the three outcomes and for Part C and 619? Should the states report the same summary statements to OSEP as OSEP will report to OMB?

ECO Activities to solicit Stakeholder Input

Two teleconferences were held in November with state Part C and section 619 stakeholders to discuss the options available for summary statements, and advantages and disadvantages of various options. The following types of summary statements were presented and discussed on these calls.

Summary statements States and OSEP can make from the data reported in the five progress categories (to help inform the decision about how to set targets)

1. Focus on program effectiveness: Percent of the children participating in Part C/619 services who increased their rate of growth (changed growth trajectories) for [the outcome area, e.g. knowledge and skills] during their participation in services.
 - Data: Percentages reported in C + D
2. Focus on prevention (e.g. regarding children with established conditions or who are at risk): Percent of the children in Part C/619 who entered the program at age expected levels in [e.g. their social relationships], and were able to continue to function at an age expected level throughout their time in the program.
 - Data: Percentage reported in E
3. Focus on both prevention and program effectiveness message: Percent of the children participating in Part C/619 who maintained age appropriate functioning or increased their rate of growth in [e.g. being able to take care of their needs] during their participation in the program.
 - Data: Percentage reported in C + D + E
4. Focus on readiness: Percent of children who exited the Part C/619 program performing at age expectations.
 - Data: Percentages reported in D + E
5. Focus on simple progress: Percent of the children who made progress in [e.g. early language and problem solving] during their participation in Part C/619.
 - Data: Percentages reported in B + C + D + E

6. Focus on results for the most significantly involved children: Percent of the children who are served in Part C/619 who did not make progress in [independence and self-help] while participating in the Part C/619 program.

- Data: Percentages reported in A
- Who are these children? These children include those with degenerative conditions, (very significantly involved children)

Example of a complementary family benefits message: Part C provides support to families, however, and as a result of participation in Part C, [x%] of the families of these children increased their understanding of their child’s needs, had the formal and informal support systems they wanted and needed, knew how to help their child, etc.

- Data: Indicator C4 disaggregated by child progress category

No clear recommendations arose to the surface during the telecalls, but several considerations were discussed and additional options were prepared for the OSEP National Early Childhood Conference held in early December, 2007. These options were presented and discussed in two sessions at the conference. Following the conference, in early January, 2008, the options were also presented to the ECO Advisory committee for their consideration and recommendations. A summary of the options was available on the ECO website during the month of January for public reaction and input.

Summary of Potential Options

1. Choose one or more of the most meaningful single progress categories: e.g. Percentage of children reported in E, (selected as “prevention” statement.)

Example: 25% of the children in Part C/619 entered the program at age expected levels in their social relationships, and were able to continue to function at an age expected level throughout their time in the program

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succinct • Could be presented as a prevention message as it puts the focus on those children who maintained age expected development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single number does not adequately capture the range of types of progress being made- so this one could not stand alone. • Does not represent many other kinds of progress that children made. • Focuses only children who came into the program at age expectation which seems inconsistent for a program serving children with special needs. • Not likely to change much from year to year (?)

2. Percentage of children who “made substantial progress” or “exceeded developmental expectations” or “changed growth trajectories” while participating in the program - Combination of two or more categories: Percent of children in C+D

Example: 50% of the children participating in Part C/619 services made substantial progress in the acquisition of knowledge and skills.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be described as a marker for program effectiveness since these children made more gains than expected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not represent the other kinds of progress that children made. • Percentage likely to be smaller for states with a higher percentage of children in Category E. Will this suggest programs in these states are less effective (i.e, a disincentive to broaden eligibility criteria)? • Implies (100 minus the number) did not make significant gains when those in category age actually maintained age expectations

3. The percentage of children who exited the program functioning comparably to same age peers- Combination of two or more categories: Percent of children in D+ E

Example: 40% of children left the Part C/619 program performing at age expectations

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 619, compatible with focus on school readiness since it presents children who achieved same age functioning at the end of the program • Compatible with other outcome summary statement that describe the % of children who achieve a certain level of performance. • The implication of 100 minus the number is accurate (e.g., for the example above, 60% of the children did not meet age expectations when they left the program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not represent the other kinds of progress that children made. • Focusing only on this summary statement suggests the purpose of the program is so children can catch up which is not a reasonable expectation for many children.

4. The percentage of children who maintained age appropriate functioning or made greater than expected progress- Combination of two or more categories: Percent of children in C+ D+ E

Example: 75% of the children participating in Part C/619 maintained age appropriate functioning or made greater than expected progress in being able to take care of their needs during their time in the program.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be described as a marker for program effectiveness and prevention since some children made more gains than expected and others maintained age appropriate functioning • Implications of 100 minus the number is accurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage likely to be higher for states with a higher percentage of children in Category E. Will this suggest programs in other states are less effective (i.e, an incentive to broaden eligibility criteria)? • Somewhat cumbersome to describe • Does the form of the summary statement lead to assumptions about the rest of the children (i.e., that they didn't make progress)?

5. The percentage of children who acquired new skills during their time in program- Sum of two or more categories: Percent of children in B+C+D+E

Example: 96% of the children made progress in improving their social skills during their participation in Part C/619.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Captures all types of progress being made by children in program • Likely to be a big number 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not likely to change much from year to year • Doesn't convey any "value added" by program participation since almost all children are likely to acquire new skills over time with or without intervention.

6. Increase children who made greater than expected progress (C+D) and decrease the percentage of those who only made progress (B)- Relationship between two or more categories:

Example: The percentage of children making greater than expected progress increased to 42% and the percentage who made less than age expected progress decreased to 21%.

Pros	Cons

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Captures three types of progress being made by children in program • Puts the focus on children who made greater than expected progress (i.e., the value added by the program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat cumbersome to communicate • Size of the percentages related to size of category E so numbers will vary from state to state. • Summary statement raises questions about what happened to the rest of the children.
---	--

7. Of the children who entered the program with needs in an outcome area, the percentage who made greater than expected progress- Relationship between two or more categories. $(C+D)/(A+B+C+D)$.

Example: 46% of children with needs related to acquiring knowledge and skills made substantial progress in this outcome.

Pros	Cons
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Captures two types of progress being made by children in program • Puts the focus on children who made greater than expected progress (i.e., the value added by the program) • Controls for variation across states in the number of children who did not have needs in an area (E) by taking them out of the denominator thus leading to more comparable numbers across states. • The implication for 100 minus the reported number is accurate and can be implied (e.g., for the example above, 54% did not make significant gains). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Somewhat cumbersome to describe the calculation. • Does not show the progress of children in category E.

Are there any other variations or combinations of summary statements that should be recommended?

Other Questions and Considerations

- If one or two targets are set for each outcome area, should states be required to provide a rationale for their targets?
- Is there a point where maintenance of the percentages is sensible? E.g. How long can C+D keep increasing, given the population that a state serves?
- OSEP Category A: Percentage will be very small. It is not likely to change much from year to year nor from state to state, unless the state changes its eligibility criteria.

- OSEP Category E: Percentages are likely to vary from state to state based on the state's eligibility criteria or identification procedures. If a state serves a fairly high percentage of children, the state is likely to have a higher percentage of children in Category E than a state that serves fewer children. Percentages for a single state are not likely to vary much from year to year unless the state changes its eligibility criteria.
- **Because the numbers add to 100%, targeting some number(s) to go up means others must go down.**

ECO's Recommendations

After the numerous discussions on this topic including conference calls with Part C and 619 coordinators, two presentations at the OSEP Early Childhood Conference, a meeting with their advisory board, and a discussion board on their website. Based on these discussions and their own expertise and experience, ECO developed the following recommendations:

Should OSEP require states to submit data on the same summary statement(s)? Our recommendation is yes but a weak yes as explained below. We would recommend there should be at least one statement for which all states are expected to report data and set targets. The rationale for all states submitting a common core of summary statements is that it presents a more unified approach to accountability if all states are tracking the same statements and if the statements the states are tracking match what OMB tracks for the PART and what OSEP includes as a GPRA indicator. It also makes it clear what LEAs for 619 and local programs for Part C are to focus on. A common core of statements would constitute a national consensus upon which early intervention and early childhood special education will be held accountable. A common core also means each state does not need to go through the process of understanding, explaining, and then picking its own set of summary statements. As we have learned over the last few months, understanding the options is not an easy task. Finally, there were only a few states that were lobbying for states selecting their own and all states will, of course, be able to track any additional set of summary statements they want.

We don't see this recommendation as critical, however, because even if OSEP lets each state select their own summary statement upon which to set targets, the data will be available to compute any summary statement at the federal level. If OSEP anticipates that establishing one or more required summary statements will generate significant ill will, it might not be worth it.

What should the summary statements be? We would recommend two complementary summary statements as the required statements.

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in the outcome, the percentage who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited $(C+D/A+B+C+D)$. (This was number 7 in the options paper but is being described with different words.)

There was no clear consensus across the stakeholders on the conference calls, at the December national meeting, at the Advisory Board, or on the ECO web site but this statement did have a fair amount of support. It addresses several of the criteria that ECO had defined for the

statements including it reflects the purpose of and value added by the program (i.e., changing trajectories), is comparable across states with the removal of category E, it can reasonably be expected to change over time; and it can be explained to the public. The advantages and disadvantages were described in the options paper and still apply. We feel it is the best choice of the currently developed set of options.

2. The percentage of children who are functioning within age expectations by the end of the program (D + E) (This is number 3 in the options paper).

Although this would be a very incomplete summary statement by itself, it represents a nice complement to the first recommendation. It reflects the emphasis on school readiness approach and the prevention of disability by putting the spotlight on the percentage of children who are within age expectations at exit. It meets a number of the ECO criteria for a summary statement: it reflects the value added by the program (if one assumes the E children might not have maintained age appropriate functioning without intervention); it can be expected to change over time; and it is readily explainable to the public. Other advantages as well as shortcomings were discussed in the options paper and still apply. One advantage that was not mentioned is that it could serve as an incentive to states to serve more children in E by broadening their eligibility category. While this clearly is not the purpose of tracking a summary statement, we would not recommend an indicator that serves as a disincentive to expand category E. If category E will be a source of non-comparability across states and if it is related to breadth of eligibility, we would not want to remove it from all of the summary statements because we would like to see some acknowledgement of those states that are serving higher percentages of children in category E.

Hypothetical State Examples: Reporting Categories and Summary Statements

In an effort to better understand how the proposed summary statements will capture how children are progressing in different states, ECO created hypothetical, but realistic data from 5 imaginary States. Hypothetical data were created for Outcome area A only (each state will be reporting on 3 outcome areas). Each State’s hypothetical data and summary statements are presented individually. This is followed by a summary and analysis/discussion across all of the States.

STATE 1

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	10	1
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	110	11
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	170	17
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved	200	

functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers		20
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	510	51
Total	N= 1000	100%

Summary Statements:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 76% substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $370/490 \times 100$

2. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total N} \times 100$, i.e. $710/1000 \times 100$

STATE 2

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	60	2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	390	13
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	900	30
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	600	20
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1050	35
Total	N= 3000	100%

Summary Statements:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 77% substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $1500 / 1950 \times 100$

2. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total } N \times 100$, i.e., $1650/3000 \times 100$

STATE 3

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	5	1
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	65	13
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	80	16
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	175	35
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	175	35
Total	N= 500	100%

Summary Statements:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 78% substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $255/325 \times 100$

2. Seventy percent (70%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total N} \times 100$, i.e., $350/500 \times 100$

STATE 4

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	70	2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	350	10
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	1155	33

d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	1225	35
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	700	20
Total	N= 3500	100%

Summary Statements:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 85% substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $2380/2800 \times 100$

2. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total N} \times 100$, i.e., $1925/3500 \times 100$

STATE 5

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	50	1
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	900	18
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	600	12
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	900	18
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	2550	51
Total	N= 5000	100%

Summary Statements:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 61% substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $1500/2450 \times 100$

2. Sixty-nine percent (69%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total } N \times 100$, i.e. $3450/5000 \times 100$

Summary and Analysis/Discussion

Summary of “National” Data from the 5 Imaginary States (a relatively small country)

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	195	2
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1815	14
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach	2905	22
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	3100	24
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	4985	38
Total	N= 13,000	100%

Summary Statements of “National” data:

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships, 75 % substantially increased their rate of growth in social and emotional skills by the time they exited.

Formula: $(c + d) / (a + b + c + d) \times 100$, i.e., $6005/8015 \times 100$

2. Sixty-two percent (62%) of the children were functioning within age expectations in social and emotional skills, including social relationships by the time they exited.

Formula: $(d + e) / \text{total } N \times 100$, i.e., $8085/13000 \times 100$

Percentage of Children in Each Reporting Category for Outcome A						
OSEP Categories	State 1 N =1000	State 2 N = 3000	State 3 N = 500	State 4 N = 3500	State 5 N = 5000	National N = 13000
a	1	2	1	2	1	2
b	11	13	13	10	18	14
c	17	30	16	33	12	22
d	20	20	35	35	18	24
e	51	35	35	20	51	38
total	100	100	100	100	100	100

1. Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percentage who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they exited.

%	76	77	78	85	61	75
----------	----	----	----	----	----	----

2. The percentage of children who are functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they exited.

%	71	55	70	55	69	62
----------	----	----	----	----	----	----

- State 1 is relatively high on both summary statements in comparison to the national percentages because the state served a lot of children at age expectation AND had a lot of children make significant progress/ change growth trajectories.
- State 3 is relatively high on both because the state had a lot of children who reached age expectations
- State 5 looks is relatively high on statement #2 because it served a lot of children who entered at age expectation but the state is relatively low on statement #1 (in comparison to the national percentage) because not many children made significant gains while in program.
- State 4 is very high on statement #1 because of the high percentage of children who made significant progress. In comparison to the national percentage, it was lower than the national number on statement #2 because the state served relatively few children at age expectation and relatively few achieved age expectations by exit. This is what we would expect to see in states with narrow eligibility criteria because they are serving proportionately more children with more severe disabilities.
- States 1, 3, 5 look very similar and were higher than the national percentage on summary statement #2. States 1 and 5 served a lot of children at entry who already had age appropriate functioning in this outcome area. By contrast, State 3 had a lot of children reach age expectations during the program
- States 2 and 4 are higher than the national percentage on statement #1 but lower on #2.

- States serving a larger number of children will have a greater impact on the national percentages for both outcome statements than states with smaller populations.
- In this hypothetical example, the national percentages were computed by adding up the number of children in each category across all five states. When we do this “for real,” we will need to use some sort of weighting procedure to make sure that the states that are sampling carry the appropriate contribution to the national figures. .