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Policy Context

- Family-centered (FC) practices are endorsed by many professional organizations as central to high-quality practice
  - Institute of Medicine
  - American Academy of Pediatrics
  - American Hospital Association
  - American Speech-Language Hearing Association
  - Division for Early Childhood
Part C Legislation

• Public Law 99-457 states that one of the goals of early intervention is “to enhance the capacity of families to meet the special needs of their infants and toddlers”
Research Context

• Meta-analyses of research provides strong evidence that FC practices lead to many benefits for families and children.
Dunst, Trivette, & Hamby (2007)

- Meta-analysis of 47 studies of family-centered practices in a variety of settings
- Higher use of FC practices was associated with:
  - Satisfaction with services*
  - Self-efficacy beliefs*
  - Parenting behaviors
  - Personal and/or family well-being
  - Social support*
  - Child behavior and functioning
*Strongest associations
Broom & Enriquez (2009)

• Reviewed 9 randomized trials of family-centered interventions in treating children with Type 1 diabetes

• Family-centered practices were associated with
  – Improved health outcomes for children
  – Reduced diabetes-related conflict in families
  – Improved family relations
Accountability Context

• Accountability
  – Federal government (Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education) requires states to submit data on outcomes

• Program Improvement
  – State agencies and local programs want to use data on outcomes to improve services for children and families
The Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) was funded to develop a set of family and child outcomes and to assist states in measuring and reporting outcomes to OSEP yearly.
Family Outcomes and Program Practices

Outcomes (Optional)

• Understand their child’s strengths, abilities, and special needs
• Know their rights and advocate effectively for their children
• Help their children develop and learn
• Have support systems
• Access desired services, programs, activities in their community

Practices (Required)

• 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
Instructions: Section A of the Family Outcomes Survey focuses on the ways in which you support your child’s needs. For each statement below, please select which option best describes your family right now: not at all, a little, somewhat, almost, or completely.

Outcome 3: Helping your child develop and learn

We are able to help our child get along with others.

We are able to help our child learn new skills.

We are able to help our child take care of his/her needs.

We are able to work on our child’s goals during everyday routines.
**Instructions:** Section B of the Family Outcomes Survey focuses on the helpfulness of early intervention. For each question below, please select how helpful early intervention has been to you and your family over the past year: Not at all helpful, a little helpful, somewhat helpful, very helpful, or extremely helpful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helping your child develop and learn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How helpful has early intervention been in...</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. giving you useful information about how to help your child get along with others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. giving you useful information about how to help your child learn new skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. giving you useful information about how to help your child take care of his/her needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. identifying things you do that help your child learn and grow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. sharing ideas on how to include your child in daily activities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. working with you to know when your child is making progress?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OSEP Requirements:
Child Outcomes

• Percentage of children with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:
  – 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
Measuring Development: Progress Categories

• For each of the 3 outcomes, states report the % 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
Practices, Outcomes, and Accountability

• Given that
  – FC practices are considered best practice, and
  – Research shows that FC practices are related to improvements in families and children, and
  – Programs are now being accountable for reporting child and family outcomes,

• Can we show that helping families can help children using state accountability data?
Conceptual Model

Child and family demographics
- Child gender
- Race/ethnicity
- Time in EI
- Family Income

Family-centered practices
- APR items
  - Helped family know rights
  - Helped family help child develop & learn
  - Helped family communicate child’s needs

Family outcomes
- Understand child’s strengths, needs, and abilities
- Know rights and advocate for child
- Help child develop and learn
- Have support systems
- Access the community

Child outcomes
- Social-emotional skills
- Acquisition and use of knowledge
- Appropriate behaviors to meet needs
State Data

• Minnesota Part C population
  – Serves just over 5,000 infants and toddlers
  – 4% Asian, 8% Hispanic, 9% African American, 73% White
  – 59% males

• Data collected through the Family Outcomes Survey – Revised

• Data collected at exit from the program.
Analysis Plan

• Structural Equation Modeling using Mplus

• Model fit criteria were
  – a value of 0.95 or greater on the comparative fit index (CFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)
  – a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) of 0.06 or below.
Model Fit Indices

CFI = 0.95
TLI = 0.94
SRMR = 0.04

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001
Conclusions

• Preliminary analyses show that FC practices help families achieve better outcomes

• When families achieved better outcomes, children also achieved better outcomes
• How can researchers partner with states to help the states answer the important questions about the use of recommended practices and their outcomes?
• How can states maximize the usefulness of their family outcomes data?
  – e.g. Use of identifying information (program, district, family)
National Early Intervention
Family Data
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Part C APR Indicator 4

Percent of families who report that early intervention services have helped the family...
(A) ...know their rights
(B) ...effectively communicate their children's needs
(C) ...help their children develop and learn
State Approaches: Surveys Used

- 25 NCSEAM (45%)
- 24 ECO FOS (43%)
  - 15 using the original FOS (27%)
  - 9 using the revised FOS (16%)
- 7 state-developed (13%)
State Approaches: Surveys Used

Legend:
- ECO Family Outcomes Survey - Original
- ECO Family Outcomes Survey - Revised
- State-developed survey
- NCSEAM survey
State Approaches: Survey Implementation

- Dissemination & return approaches
  - Hand-delivered
  - Mailed
  - Online option

- Follow-up strategies:
  - Phone calls
  - Reminder mailings
  - Incentives to programs
  - Incentives to families

- Populations surveyed
  - All families in program
  - Families of children in program a minimum amount of time (6, 9, 12 months)

- Survey Timing
  - Annual point in time
  - Aligned with child’s participation in program (e.g. at IFSP, at exit)
  - Other (monitoring schedule, regional)
Data Quality: Response Rates & Number Surveyed

• Response rate average = 37.5% (49 states reporting)
  – Ranging from 8% to 100%
  – Ten states with response rates below 20%
  – Ten states with response rates above 50%

• Mean number of surveys returned = 949
  – Ranging from n=34 to n=4374
Trends over time:
Early intervention has helped the family...

- Know their rights
- Effectively communicate their children's needs
- Help their child develop and learn

Legend:
- FFY 2006
- FFY 2007
- FFY 2008
- FFY 2009
- FFY 2010
- FFY 2011
How are states collecting these data

• Have to include
  – Targets
  – Actual
  – Representativeness
  – Improvement activities

• Innovative state analysis
  – Quality of the representativeness analysis
  – Analysis of the family outcomes by subgroups
  – Evidence that data were used to develop the improvement plan.
Results based accountability

• OSEP is moving towards a model of monitoring focused on results instead of compliance.

• Child and family outcomes are key early intervention results.
• How can states use their results data to make decisions about where to invest their resources
  – E.g. identify low performing programs; identify specific practices that are not being implemented
• What are researchers already doing to help states use results data?
• How can researchers engage states in partnerships for improving practices and results?