

Emerging issues

- Quality of early data, review of trends from February, 2008, SPP data
- Implications for setting targets in 2010

State Approaches to Measuring Child Outcomes

Approach	Part C (56 states)	Preschool (59 states)
One tool statewide	8/56 (14%)	13/59 (22%)
Multiple Publishers' online tools	2/56 (4%)	3/59 (5%)
COSF 7 pt. scale	40/56 (71%)	36/59 (61%)
Other	6/56 (11%)	7/59 (12%)

*Preliminary Data. Includes states 'switching to' an approach.

Number of Children Included in February 2008 SPP/APR Data

Part C (52)

Range: 1-5944

<30 = 19

30-99 = 15

100-499 = 11

500-999 = 4

1000+ = 3

Preschool (53)

Range: 1-4249

<30 = 7

30-99 = 13

100-499 = 14

500-999 = 8

1000+ = 11

Preliminary data from ECO review of February 2008

Ranges were Huge!

Part C for Example:

Category	a	b	c	d	e
Outcome					
A	0-50	0-66	0-60	0-50	0-100
B	0-50	0-74	0-71	0-75	0-100
C	0-57	0-63	0-50	0-75	0-100

Caution – Interpreting this Year's Data

- Only represents children who have entered and exited since outcome system put in place in states
 - In a typical state, data may represent children who participated in the program for 6 to 12 months
- The quality of data collection usually increases over time as guidance gets clearer and practice improves the implementation

Scanning Your Data for Unusual Patterns

- First, focus on progress categories “a” and “e”
 - Should reflect the characteristics of the children served in the state (related to eligibility definition in Part C)
 - Should be fairly stable over time (when data are high quality and representative)

Checking Category “a”

- Percents too high?
 - Should represent children with very significant delays or degenerative conditions (any improvement in functioning puts a child into “b”)
- Why it may be too high
 - Decision rules based on different interpretation of “no progress”
 - Tools without enough discrimination to show small amounts of progress

Checking Category “e”

- Percents too high or low?
 - Should represent children functioning at age expectations at **entry and exit** in each outcome area
 - Do your patterns make sense for each outcome based on the children served in the state?
- Why it may be too high or low
 - Decision rules based on different interpretation of “age expectations”

Implications for Target Setting in 2010

- Higher N's > more stable means
- > Representative of children receiving services for 6 months to 3 years
- Improved quality of data
- Should be able to focus on data reflecting children's progress in a meaningful way

Target Setting Recommendations

- Use the same summary statements for Part C and Part B
- Strongest evidence of effectiveness of the Part C and Preschool Programs nationally:
 - Reflect the percentage of children who change growth trajectories
 - Also reflect the percentage of children who leave the programs within the bounds of age expectations

Data Sharing Communities

- COSF data
- Publishers' on-line analysis
- One tool statewide
- If you are interested in joining or learning more about them, let ECO know at [<staff@the-eco-center.org>](mailto:staff@the-eco-center.org)

August Conference

- Registration is open for the Measuring Child and Family Outcomes Conference, August 27-28, 2008, in Baltimore, MD
- Have something to present? Let us know at <staff@the-eco-center.org>
- Links to registration on both NECTAC and ECO web sites
 - www.nectac.org
 - www.the-eco-center.org