

OSEP's Revised Child Outcomes Reporting Requirements for Part C and Part B/619 Programs: What the Changes Mean for States

This document summarizes recent changes in Office of Special Education Program's (OSEP) reporting requirements for Part C and Part B/619 programs related to child outcomes and what they mean for states. The changes apply to child outcomes reporting only, and do not affect family outcome reporting requirements. This document was developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes Center and should not be considered an OSEP policy document. OSEP documents related to the SPP/APR can be obtained at <http://www.rfcnetwork.org/content/view/248/358/>.

What has not changed

The child outcomes indicators that Part C and Part B/619 programs are required to report on in 2007 and beyond have not changed. They are:

Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs/ preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. *Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);*
- B. *Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication [and early literacy –for preschool]); and*
- C. *Use of appropriate behavior to meet needs*

The reporting requirement for the February 2007 APR (FFY July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006) is unchanged as well. For 2007, states are required to report data at entry, that is, the percentage of children who began services functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers and the percentage who did not for each of the three outcomes.

The reporting for 2008 (FFY July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007) and beyond is based on children who have been in services for at least six months. How a child is counted is determined by comparing functioning at exit to functioning at entry for each of the three outcomes. Data are to be reported on each of the three outcomes for all children who exit during the year.

What has changed

The previous three categories which states were required to report on have been expanded to five categories to allow for the collection of more meaningful information about the progress of children in Part C and Part B/619 programs. Previously, states had been instructed to report progress in three categories for each outcome area*:

- *a. *The percentage of children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.*
- *b. *The percentage of children who improve functioning (not included in a).*
- *c. *The percentage of children who did not improve functioning.*



States now are required to report progress in five categories for each outcome area. The lettering for the new categories is in the opposite direction; it is as shown in the table below.

Original 3 Reporting Categories*	New 5 Reporting Categories
c*. % of children who did not improve functioning	a. % of children who did not improve functioning.
b*. % of children who improved functioning but were not counted in a*	b. % of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.
	c. % of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.
a*. % of children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	d. % of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.
	e. % of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.

- The requirement for original category *c has remained the same, but is now labeled as category a.
- The original category *b has now been split into categories b and c. These categories separate those children who are making progress toward age appropriate functioning but have continued to acquire skills at the same rate and those whose progress is such that their rate of skill acquisition or developmental trajectory has improved.
- The original category *a has been split into the new categories d and e. The new categories make a distinction between children who have continued to exhibit functioning comparable to same age peers from entry to exit, and those who progressed enough between these time points so that by the second point they were functioning comparable to same-aged peers.

These new categories are described in greater detail below:

- The percentage of infants and toddlers [preschoolers] who did not improve functioning.*
These children either acquired no new skills or behaviors, or their level of functioning has regressed between entry and exit.
- The percentage of infants and toddlers [preschoolers] who improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.*
These children acquired new skills and behaviors but there has been no positive change in their developmental trajectories. At exit, they were



acquiring new skills at the same or lower rates than they had when they began services.

- c. *The percentage of infants and toddlers [preschoolers] who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.*
These children acquired skills and new behaviors at a faster rate after beginning services than they had before. There was a positive change in their developmental trajectories but they had not attained functioning comparable to same-aged peers by the time they exited the program.
- d. *The percentage of infants and toddlers [preschoolers] who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.*
These children did not show functioning comparable to same-aged peers at entry but did at exit.
- e. *The percentage of infants and toddlers [preschoolers] who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.*
These children showed functioning comparable to same-aged peers at both entry and exit.

The new reporting categories total 100% for each outcome:

$$\% a + \% b + \% c + \% d + \% e = 100\% \text{ for the outcome.}$$

What this means for states

The impact of this change to an individual state will depend on what decisions the state had made with regard to data collection and how far along the state was in implementing those decisions (e.g., providers trained, data system designed, etc.).

- For states using the 7-point ECO Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF), no changes will be needed at the local level because data from the form can be used to generate the 5 OSEP reporting categories. If these states have already developed a data system based on the 3 OSEP categories, some of the programming will need to be redone.
- States that implemented a data collection and reporting system based only on a yes-no categorization with regard to functioning comparable to same-aged peers (was the child functioning comparable at entry? at exit?) will need to revise their systems because they are not collecting enough information to generate the 5 new OSEP categories.
- States using commonly-used online assessment systems to generate their OSEP reports should encounter minimal difficulty because the assessment publishers are building their systems to produce the 5 OSEP reporting categories.
- States using a single assessment tool statewide probably will encounter minimal difficulty in the change to the 5 categories depending on how they had planned to report the assessment findings to the state.



The full range of possible state impacts are too numerous to cover in this document. Contact one of the ECO Center staff or e-mail the ECO Center at staff@the-eco-center.org if you have a question about the new requirements and their impact on your state's system.

