|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Functional Ongoing Assessment** | Information gathered during functional assessment conversations, including the Routines Based Interview (RBI) is integrated into the IEP/ IFSP development and writing functional goals and child outcomes rating.  Team members engage in ongoing assessment practices, including the use of an age anchoring assessment tool, to inform instruction, support coaching practices and track child progress. | Team members engage in on-going assessment practices to inform child’s entry and exit rating. | Functional assessment information is used to inform the child outcomes rating process but not utilized to develop functional IEP goals or IFSP Outcomes. Functional assessment information is not represented on the not represented on IEP: Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance or the IFSP Summary of Development. | Entry and exit ratings based entirely on a child’s individual skills rather than the child’s everyday functioning across settings.  IFSP outcomes and IEP goals are based only on the child’s area of delay or suspected disability. |  |
| A system is in place to use RBI to gather information about child’s everyday functioning across settings at entry (part of IEP evaluations process and exit.  **CC:** Uses information from families as part of the assessment process, including listening to the child and parent/caregiver and making observations in multiply settings of the parent and child’s emotional states and their interaction patterns. | Team members **gather information from parent/caregiver(s)** about child’s functioning across settings to inform entry and exit ratings (via a home visit, phone call, technology, etc.) | Functional assessment is used for entry rating but not exit rating.  Inconsistent use of functional assessment practices occurs among/across team members, e.g. early childhood special educator do functional assessment but speech-language pathologist doesn’t. | Information gathered only in child’s disability area (e.g. by speech-language pathologist only) and/or minimal input from primary caregivers is taken into consideration. |  |
| A system is in place for how information will intentionally be gathered about a child’s functioning across settings for entry *and exit* ratings and shared with all team members. The system includes who will gather the information, when it will be gathered, how it will be gathered and what will be gathered and how it will be documented.  **CC:** Utilize observation, assessment, and screening approaches and tools that occur in natural environment and take advantage of incidental moments of listening or observing. | Team members gather information about the **child’s functioning across settings** such as child care, Head Start and other key environments within the child’s world to inform entry and exit ratings. | Some team members have incorporated functional assessment into the evaluation process during a child’s initial evaluation but not as a means to support exit ratings. | Children are rated without information about the child’s functioning in settings outside of their primary daytime location. Entry and exit ratings are determined without observing a child’s functioning within other environments, e.g. childcare, home, public playground or parent/caregiver home. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Functional Ongoing Assessment continued** | IEP goals and IFSP outcomes are functional rather than skill specific or skill based  IEP Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance is organized in the three outcomes.  Program / LEA teams regularly and systematically review/practice identifying what child behaviors & skills belong in each of the 3 child outcomes.  All new team members participate in New Staff Child Outcomes PD.  **CC:** Integrates the Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards domains of development and Guiding Principles into developmental expectations for children. | Team members are knowledgeable about what **functional behaviors** are included in each of **the three outcomes** and understand how individual developmental domains are integrated into the three outcomes. | Some, but not all, team members rate children in all outcomes considering multiple developmental domains when rating children. There is inconsistency among team members around this practice.  Some, but not all team members have been trained in the three outcomes but these team members do not review or discuss this further with other team members.  Inconsistent levels of professional development and knowledge around the relationship between child outcomes and the five developmental domains. | Team members view child outcomes narrowly and consider only domain/discipline specific criteria when completing the rating process and don’t see the relationship or influence of how the three child outcomes influence one another; e.g. a speech-language pathologist when rating for Outcome 2.  Team members complete the rating process with little or no professional or colleague support. |  |
| Team members utilize an age-anchoring assessment tool to inform about age-expected level for entry and exit ratings. | **CC:** Utilize observation, assessment, and screening approaches and tools that:   * Are developmentally, culturally, and linguistically appropriate, as well as valid for the intended purposes. * Allow for the adaptation of tools and strategies using assistive technology as a resource. | Team member’s use only locally developed tools or insufficient sources of age-expected behavior or discipline specific assessment tools when comparing a child’s functioning with age-expected development. Examples include PALS, ASQIII, report cards, S-L Assessment Tools that don’t look at the whole child.  Team members use a criterion-reference / curriculum-based tool when rating a child for outcomes at entry and/or exit only.  Team members use Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards developmental continuum (in lieu of assessment tool) when doing exit rating of 6-year-olds as a source of age-expected behavior. | Team members look broadly at child’s functioning and do entry / exit rating without considering AE/IF/F developmental continuum.  Team members take into consideration child progress and/or current functioning without comparing to age-expected behavior.  Team members complete child outcomes rating without referencing an assessment tool. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Rating Practices** | Team discussions of child development and/or a child’s development through the lens of the three outcomes are incorporated into regular / ongoing staff meetings. | Team members engage in **team** discussion to determine entry and exit ratings with full team consensus. | A team process is used at the time of the child’s initial IFSP/IEP but not at the time of exit. | There is a single person completing the rating, e.g. Director of Special Education or Service Coordinator, without a team conversation. |  |
| Team members use the Decision Tree **every** time a rating is completed. | Team members utilize the Indicator 3/7 Child Outcomes Decision Tree and Child Outcomes Bucket List when rating child. | Team members utilize the Decision Tree process but don’t have a clear understanding in the distinction between the 7-points of the rating scale. (e.g. don’t use Bucket List in addition to the Decision Tree) | Team members rate children based on the descriptions of the 7-point scale available on the Child Outcomes Summary Form and do not use the Decision Tree or Bucket List. |  |
| Team members are trained in the 7-point rating scale and exhibit good knowledge of the difference in the 7-point scale when completing entry and exit ratings. | Team members are knowledgeable in the distinction in the 7 points of the child outcomes rating scale. | Team members have participated in training on the 7-point rating scale but have questions or are unsure if they are accurately rating. | Team members have never been trained in the 7-point rating scale or participated in any professional development on this topic. |  |
| Team members are knowledgeable in typical child development and understand that the Child Outcomes Summary process compares children to a typical developmental continuum. | Team members engage in discussion of child’s AE-IF-F functioning by completing the Child Rating Prep Tool, in preparation for rating. | Team members are knowledgeable about the child’s AE-IF-F levels in some areas of development or one outcome area but not all three outcome areas. | Team members are either guessing or not confident about the child’s AE-IF-F level and basing a child’s rating on their own opinion, without referencing an age-anchoring assessment tool. |  |
| Please see practices in Functional Assessment element above. | Team members consistently and thoroughly reference information gathered from parent/caregivers and other primary caregivers when rating to consider child’s functioning across settings. | Please see practices in Functional Assessment element above. | Child outcome ratings are completed with little or no input from parent/caregivers, primary caregivers or others who are knowledgeable about the child’s functioning across settings outside of school. |  |
| Team members can consistently and clearly document evidence of the child’s age-expected or immediate foundational functioning across settings throughout the three child outcomes.  Team members appropriately select and use assessment tool based on:   * Purpose or type of assessment, e.g. screening vs. evaluation vs. ongoing monitoring of progress, etc. * Norm-referenced vs. criterion-referenced.   All team members use criterion-referenced/curriculum-based tool for ongoing assessment. Information from tool used in determining eligibility, writing functional goals, completing child outcomes ratings, tracking child progress and informing instruction.  **CC:** Recognize the purposes, strengths and weaknesses of multiple assessment strategies (such as formative vs. summative assessment and screening vs. ongoing assessment), and know how to use each strategy effectively. | Team members reference an age-anchoring assessment tool when determining AE-IF-F functioning.  Team members understand the distinction between Age-Expected / Immediate Foundational and Foundational levels of functioning. | Team member’s use only locally developed tools or insufficient sources of age-expected behavior when comparing a child’s functioning with age-expected development. Examples include PALS, ASQIII, Battelle (BDI), report cards, Speech-Language Assessment Tools that don’t look at the whole child.  Staff uses criterion-reference / curriculum-based tool when rating a child for outcomes at entry and/or exit only.  Staff use Wisconsin Model Early Learning Standards developmental continuum (in lieu of assessment tool) when doing exit rating of 6-year-olds at exit as a source of age-expected behavior. | Team members look broadly at child’s functioning and do entry / exit rating without considering AE/IF/F developmental continuum.  Team members consider individual child progress and/or current functioning without comparing to age-expected behavior.  Team members complete child outcomes rating without referencing assessment tool. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Rating Practices continued** | **CC:** Staff value that children are best understood in the context of family, culture and society.  **CC:** Show respect and responsiveness to cultural, linguistic, and family diversity and how this diversity impacts developmental milestones and expectations. | Cultural factors that may impact the child’s unique functioning are taken into consideration when rating a child. | Team members are aware of the child/family’s unique beliefs and culture but don’t consider it in the rating process. | The child/family’s unique beliefs and culture isn’t considered in the rating process. |  |
| For children transitioning from Birth-to-3 Program, the Birth-to-3 team is invited to the child’s initial IEP meeting so the Birth-to-3 Program and district personnel can jointly rate the child.  Annual Interagency Agreement meetings between county Birth-3 team members and LEA team members include a discussion of how child outcomes information will be shared, inclusion of Birth-3 team members in IEP meetings and selection and use of assessment tools. | For children transitioning from Birth-to-3 Program services, Birth-to-3 team members and LEA team members work jointly to complete the Birth-to-3 exit / LEA entry rating. | Birth-to-3 Program and LEA team members complete the child’s rating after the IEP meeting is completed.  LEA team members refer to the child outcomes ratings included in the child’s PPS records but no conversation between team members is held. | There is no communication between B-3 and LEA team members regarding the child level of functioning at the time the child’s exit’s Birth-3 services and enters early childhood special education services.  Birth to 3 exit ratings and LEA entry ratings are significantly different from one another when viewing the same children across programs. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Internal Monitoring System and Data Reporting** | Special education leadership reviews the Internal child outcomes system annually and makes adjustments to the system at that time as needed.  Birth to 3 Programs update/correct data when required.  Identified team member(s) keep up to date (via training and email) on statewide updates/changes and communicates these updates/changes to other team members. | A process for submitting Indicator 3/7 data is clearly defined and understood among LEA personnel and Birth to 3 Program personnel. This may include: who is responsible for data entry, when data is to be submitted, what data is kept on file and for how long and for Birth to 3 Programs understanding the use of #8. | Some, but not all, team members carry out the defined child outcomes procedures.  Some, but not all children receiving early childhood special education services are being rated for child outcomes.  Birth to 3 Programs annual data certification is submitted with little or no understanding of its purpose. | No system in place for carrying out Indicator 7 procedures.  Some or all children receiving early childhood special education services are not being rated for child outcomes.  Neither the Data Mart nor the Analytic calculator is utilized and they Birth to 3 personnel do not reach out for technical support from RESource or Birth to 3 State Lead. |  |
| Same as column at right | **One person monitors** children entering and exiting early childhood special education in an ongoing, intentional way to ensure every child that needs entry or exit ratings are completed in a timely manner (including children who leave the district unexpectedly).  Birth to 3 Program Coordinators do ongoing data checks to ensure Child Outcomes data is up to date and accurate. Data is corrected with required. Data verification is completed and turned in timely on an annual basis. | Individual team members are responsible for completing and submitting data at entry and exit.  Variety of people submitting data from own case load. | No system in place for monitoring entry/exit of children.  Data entry is done one time a year, or never.  The Director of Special Education submits all data without input from team members.  Birth to 3 Program does not submit their annual data certification or submit it with little or no intentionality of its intended use. |  |
| Notification of entry / exit data needed (including children who leave the district unexpectedly) is done through an **internal data system.**  Birth to 3 Programs keep PPS up to date and utilize the Data Mart regularly to assure data is accurate and complete. | District **personnel responsible for doing ratings are informed** when a child needs to have an exit or entry rating completed. | District personnel respond to monthly data reminder email or pass along email to the appropriate team members. | Team members are not aware of Indicator 3/7 requirements and not rating children at entry /exit.  Subset of child (e.g. children receiving speech-language services only) are not included in outcomes cohort. |  |
| Reporting requirements, for all special education indicators are posted in a document accessible to multiple personnel.  A listing of staff with access to the Indicator 7 application is posted in a document accessible to multiple personnel.  District staff knows process for having password reset. | The data submission process is shared when personnel change.  A login ID for the Special Education web portal is created and shared with new staff responsible for child outcomes data entry. | Reporting requirements for all special education indicators are posted near at least one computer in the central administration area.  A listing of staff with access to the Indicator 7 application is posted near at least one computer in the central administration area.  Some, but not all district staff knows process for having password reset | Reporting requirements for all special education indicators are not shared with personnel change.  The Data Mart is never accessed nor is PPS kept up to date regularly. Birth to 3 Program does not seek the support from RESource or Birth to 3 State Lead.  A login ID for the Special Education Web Portal is not created when new staff responsible for child outcomes data entry is hired. |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Core Component** | **Exemplary Practice / Integration of IFSP/IEP Practices / Core Competencies (CC)** | **Benchmark or**  **Expected Use in Practice** | **Developmental Use in Practice** | **Unacceptable Use in Practice** | **Evidence** |
| **Data Analysis** | Special education leadership / Birth to 3 Program Coordinator review child outcomes data regularly and engage in discussion with team members regarding the implications of the data.  Birth to 3 Programs utilizes both the Data Mart reports and the analytic calculator to analyze Child Outcomes data.  CC: Utilize opportunities to regularly identify, gather, analyze, synthesize and evaluate information / data to strengthen the quality and effectiveness of one’s work.  **CC:** Apply research and effective practices critically. | District personnel / Birth to 3 Program Administration / Program Coordinators have an understanding of progress categories and summary statements. | Special education leadership/Birth to 3 Program Coordinator reviews child outcomes data on DPI District Profile/PPS and the Data Mart, periodically with no further discussion held regarding meaning of the data. | Child outcomes data is never reviewed.  Neither birth to 3 Program Coordinator nor any of the team members know how to review data or utilize the Data Mart Child Outcomes reports. |  |
| Team members share information on purpose of the indicator (along with brochure) with parent/caregivers during initial IFSP or IEP development. | Personnel can verbalize the purpose of Indicator 3/7 (and its role within the State Performance Plan) to parent/caregivers, and understand that it is more than simply reporting entry/exit required data. | Some team members aware of purpose of the indicator but don’t share with parent/caregivers. | Team members are not aware of purpose of the indicator and complete ratings without understanding why (“because it is a requirement”). |  |