Webinar Logistics

• Webinar is being recorded
• Slides & recording will be posted
• Participant lines are muted
• Chat box for questions & comments
• Post-webinar evaluation
Webinar Intended Outcomes

• Learn about
  • the latest national child and family outcomes findings
  • where to find more information about the national analysis, and
  • how to find resources to support state and local child and family outcomes data use
Child Outcomes
General Background

• Looking at compliance is not enough to produce good results, so the focus has shifted to also looking at results.
• All federal agencies are required to report on the outcomes achieved by their programs.
• The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) uses child outcomes data to:
  • Justify the funding for Part C and Part B Preschool.
  • Monitor state results through Results Driven Accountability processes (Part C only).
Three Child Outcomes

- In 2005, OSEP required states to report data on 3 child outcomes.
  - Children have positive social emotional skills (including social relationships)
  - Children acquire and use knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication [and early literacy])
  - Children use appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
OSEP Progress Categories as Developmental Trajectories

- a. Did not improve functioning
- b. Improved in functioning, no change in trajectory
- c. Moved closer to functioning like same-aged peers
- d. Improved functioning to that of same-aged peers
- e. Functioning like same-aged peers
The Summary Statements

1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in each outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by program exit.

2. The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome by program exit.
# State Approaches to Measuring Child Outcomes: FFY 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Part C (N=56)</th>
<th>Part B/619 (N=59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COS</strong></td>
<td>41 (73%)</td>
<td>42 (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(decrease -1)</td>
<td>(increase +1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One tool statewide</strong></td>
<td>9 (16%)</td>
<td>8 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(increase +1)</td>
<td>(decrease -2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher's online system</strong></td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>5 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(remained the same)</td>
<td>(decrease -3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>3 (5%)</td>
<td>4 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(remained the same)</td>
<td>(increased +2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method for Calculating National Estimates & Criteria

- Weighted average of states that met minimum quality criteria

Minimum quality criteria for inclusion in national analysis:

  - Reporting data on enough children
    - Part C – 28% or more of exiters
    - Part B Preschool – 12% or more of child count
  
  - Within expected patterns in the data
    - category ‘a’ not greater than 10%
    - category ‘e’ not greater than 65%
Number of States that Met Criteria for Inclusion in the National Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Part C</th>
<th>Part B Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1. Reasons for excluding Part C states</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
<td># excluded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data (Reported outcomes data on less than 28% of exiters)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot; and &quot;e&quot; patterning (Had at least one outcome with category &quot;a&quot; greater than 10% or category &quot;e&quot; greater than 65%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States included in the analysis</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Reasons for excluding Part B 619 states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data (Reported outcomes data on less than 12% of child count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;a&quot; and &quot;e&quot; patterning (Had at least one outcome with category &quot;a&quot; greater than 10% or category &quot;e&quot; greater than 65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No 3-5 Child Count data available for 2017-2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States included in the analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## National Child Outcomes Data for Children Exiting in 2017-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Part C Early Intervention</th>
<th>Part B Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summary Statement 1</td>
<td>Summary Statement 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Relationships</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action to Meet Needs</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data are based on 48 Part C states and 45 Part B Preschool states. Only states with high-quality data were included.
Part C Child Outcomes Data Trends: FFY2012-2017

SUMMARY STATEMENT 1

SUMMARY STATEMENT 2
Preschool 619 Child Outcomes Data Trends, FFY 2012-17

SUMMARY STATEMENT 1

SUMMARY STATEMENT 2
Part C Completeness of Child Outcomes Data (n=51)
Completeness = Total with outcomes data/total exiters

Inclusion Criteria = 28% and higher
Part B Preschool: Completeness* of Child Outcomes Data (n=48)
Completeness = Total with outcomes data/child count

Inclusion Criteria = 12% and higher
State-Level Variation and Patterns
Part C State Variation: Exited within Age Expectations – Knowledge and Skills, 2017-18 (n=51)

National estimate = 47%
Part B State Variation: Exited within Age Expectations – Knowledge and Skills, 2017-2018 (n= 50)

National Estimate = 56%
SS2 and Percent Served

State 2

Who are these children?

State 1
Part C: Average Percentage Who Exited within Age Expectations by State Percent Served, 2017-18 (n=51)

Social Relationships:
- < 2.5% (n=12): 53%
- 2.5-3.9% (n=25): 56%
- > 3.9% (n =14): 59%

Knowledge and Skills:
- < 2.5% (n=12): 43%
- 2.5-3.9% (n=25): 47%
- > 3.9% (n =14): 51%

Actions to Meet Needs:
- < 2.5% (n=12): 56%
- 2.5-3.9% (n=25): 54%
- > 3.9% (n =14): 62%
Part B Preschool: Average Percentage Who Exited within Age Expectations by State 3-5 Percent Served, 2017-18 (n=49)

- Social Relationships: 59%, 57%, 56%
- Knowledge and Skills: 52%, 52%, 52%
- Action to Meet Needs: 70%, 62%, 65%

Legend:
- < 5.7% (n=12)
- 5.7-7.5% (n=16)
- >7.5% (n = 21)

*Link to Percent Served Data
2017 State Child Outcomes Data Quality Profiles
State Child Outcomes Data Profile
[State Name][Part C or Part B 619]

2017
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Comparison of State and National Data

Figure 1. Preschool Special Education National and State Percentages for Summary Statement 1

Figure 7. Preschool Special Education State Trends for Summary Statement 2, Outcome B
Some Child Outcomes Resources

- **Child Outcomes Highlights for FFY17**
  - A 2-page summary of the national results.

- **Guidance for Computing the Number and Percentage of Infants and Toddlers who did not Receive Early Intervention Services for at Least Six Months**
  - Guidance for states to support calculation including data requirements, assumptions, and data quality checks.

- (coming soon to the DaSy website) **Take a Look at Your Child Outcomes Data Profile**
  - Guidance on how to use your Child Outcomes Data Quality Profile

- **Year-to-Year Changes in State Child Outcomes Data: What Do They Mean?**
  - A 4-page brief designed to help stakeholders learn what questions to ask to understand year-to-year changes in child outcomes data.
More Child Outcomes Resources

- **Special Collection of Outcomes Reports**
  - An online collection of child outcomes data reports that states have produced for their local programs.

- **Child Outcomes Summary (COS) Process Professional Development Resources**
  - Collection of national resources to support training and TA on the COS process.
Part C
Indicator 4
Family Data
FFY 2017
Family Data

- Background
- State Approaches
- Data Quality
- Performance Data
- Resources
What Data are Included?

- Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2017
  - Data from February, 2019 APR submission
  - School year / State fiscal year 2017-2018
- 56 states & jurisdictions reported; 55 accepted by OSEP
- Quantitative data as reported to OSEP
- Qualitative data coded by DaSy/ECTA

Note: not all states reported on all qualitative variables
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
State Approaches: Surveys Used

- ECO FOS-Revised (20 states, 36%)
- NCSEAM (17 states, 30%)
- State-developed (12 states, 21%)
- ECO FOS-Original (7 states, 13%)
State Approaches: Family Populations Surveyed

- Family subgroups
  - Six or more months of services: 23 states (41%)
  - All families in program: 20 states (36%)
  - Other: 4 states (7%)
  - Not reported or unclear: 9 states (20%)

- Sampling plans: 10 states (18%)
State Approaches: Dissemination and Return

- Dissemination Methods (n=56)
  - Multiple methods: 24 states
  - In-person: 13 states
  - Mailed: 10 states
  - Not reported: 9 states

- Return Methods (n=56)
  - Multiple methods: 33 states
  - Mailed: 6 states
  - In-person: 3 states
  - Not reported/other: 14 states
  - Online option: 29 states (52%)
State Approaches: Survey Timing

- Annual survey/ point in time: 26 states (46%)
- At exit from program: 10 states (18%)
- At IFSP: 3 states (5%)
- Other/not reported: 17 states (30%)
Data Quality
Survey Response Rates

- All states reported a response rate
- Response rates ranged from 7.2% to 100%
- Mean response rate = 39.7%
- Median response rate = 33.5%
Indicator C4 Survey Response Rates FFY 2017
# Response Rates and Survey Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution Method(s)</th>
<th>Average response rate</th>
<th>Number of states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-person distribution</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple methods</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed-only distribution</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Return Method(s)</th>
<th>Average response rate</th>
<th>Number of states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multiple return methods</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailed-only return</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessing and Determining Representativeness: Considerations

- Consider multiple variables & family subgroups
- Variation in response rates is typical among family subgroup(s)
- Assessing difference among subgroups
  - Minimum response rate among subgroups
  - Proportion of respondents from various groups
- Making conclusions about representativeness
  - Plus/minus percentage
  - Statistical differences
  - Consider subgroup size
Data Quality: Representativeness of Family Data

Did data represent the state?

- Yes: 38 states (68%)
- No: 17 states (30%)
- Omitted: 1 state (2%)
Data Quality: Assessing Representativeness

- **YES** data were representative by:
  - Race/ethnicity (27 states, 48%)
  - Geographic variables (18 states, 32%)
  - Child’s gender (15 states, 27%)
  - Others: child age, disability/eligibility categories, length of time in services, income, primary language
FFY 2017 Performance

Percent of families who report that early intervention services have helped the family…

A. Know their rights: 90%
B. Effectively communicate child's needs: 91%
C. Help child develop and learn: 92%
Indicator 4 National Family Survey Data Trends: FFY 2012 - FFY 2017

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

[Bar chart showing trends from FFY 2012 to FFY 2017 for each category]
Indicator 4 Performance by Survey Used

- Knows Rights
- Communicates Needs
- Helps Child Develop and Learn

Survey Options:
1= FOS
2= FOS-Revised
3= NCSEAM
4= State Developed Survey
Resources
Additional Resources

- ECTA Family Outcomes online
  - ectacenter.org/eco/pages/familyoutcomes.asp
- Improving practices & family outcomes
  - Family engagement resources
  - DEC Recommended practices
- DaSy Center toolkits
  - https://dasycenter.org/resources/dasy-products/toolkits/
- Calculators & graphing templates
Family Outcomes Technical Assistance

- Family Outcomes Data Community of Practice
  - Planning for 2020 series
  - Sign up here

- Family Data Quality Profiles FFY 2017
  - Coming in December 2019

- Small group of states focused on improving equity in family data and practices
  - Planning for 2020

- Part C Indicator 4 individual technical assistance
Contact us

Kathy Hebbeler  Kathleen.hebbeler@sri.com
Siobhan Colgan  Siobhan.Colgan@unc.edu
Find out more at ectacenter.org and dasycenter.org

- The ECTA Center is a program of the FPG Child Development Institute of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, funded through cooperative agreement number H326P170001 from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent the Department of Education's position or policy. Project Officers: Julia Martin-Eile

- The DaSy Center is a program of SRI International, funded through cooperative agreement number H373190002 from the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent the Department of Education's position or policy. Project Officers: Meredith Miceli & Richelle Davis