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Introduction of Session

Agenda

• Facilitators
• Discussants
• Importance of Focusing on Local Education Agencies (LEAs)
  • One State Education Agency’s (SEA’s) Experiences
  • Creating a Culture of Data Quality
  • Multi-faceted Approach to Data Quality
  • Creating Partnerships
• IDC Knowledge Lab (resources)
• Developing a Culture of Data Quality
• Questions and Answers
• Adjourn
Importance of Focusing on LEAs

• One SEA’s Experience
• Creating a Culture of Data Quality
• Multi-faceted Approach to Data Quality
• Creating Partnerships
One SEA’s Experience…

Missouri

Stephen Barr
Assistant Commissioner
Wisconsin Department of
Elementary and Secondary Education
One SEA’s Experience…

Missouri

- Missouri Student Information System (SIS)– collects data for all students
  - Submission edit checks
  - Consistent rules/definitions/calculations/etc.
- Monthly webinars regarding upcoming data collections/changes
- Multiple SIS vendors in the state, but all have to produce the MOSIS upload files. Regular conference calls with vendors.
One SEA’s Experience…

Missouri  (Continued)

• Face to face data training for new special education directors
• TA documentation on the web
• Phone/email TA
• Data reports to LEAs (child count, exiting, end of year summaries, etc.)
• LEAs know that we use the data they report for various purposes (monitoring, identification, invitations to participate, etc.)
Another SEA's Experience…

Wisconsin

Patricia Williams
Assistant Director
Special Education Team
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
Indicator 13 Postsecondary Transition

Percent of youth aged 16 and above with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) that include:

- Appropriate measurable postsecondary goals based upon an age appropriate transition assessment;
- Transition services, including courses of study; and
- Annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs.
Indicator 13 Postsecondary Transition

There also must be evidence:

• The student was invited to the IEP Team meeting, and

• A representative of any participating agency with the prior consent of the parent or adult student was invited to the IEP Team meeting.
## Indicator 13 Postsecondary Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Wisconsin Indicator 13 %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2006</td>
<td>26.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2009</td>
<td>71.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2010</td>
<td>72.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2011</td>
<td>79.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2012</td>
<td>98.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2013</td>
<td>98.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2014</td>
<td>99.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Postsecondary Transition Plan (PTP)

- An online IEP form developed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
- Assists the Local Educational Agency (LEA) to document the transition requirements with prompts and compliance checks
- Allows for individualization

https://apps4.dpi.wi.gov/PTPDemo/Pages/DistrictMenu.aspx
Indicator 7 Child Outcomes

Nancy Fuhrman
Early Childhood Data Consultant
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## Current Data Collection: Child Outcomes Summary Form

### Wisconsin LEA-Child-Outcome Summary Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Form Completed: Click here to enter a date (Check One) Entry CO3F-##### OR-Exit CO3F-##### a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child's Name: ****** a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth: ****** a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Date: Click here to enter a date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected IEP Implementation Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Date: Click here to enter a date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Primary Disability: Choose an Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child's Secondary Disability: Choose an Item</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Persons involved in Child Outcomes discussion of child's functioning and rating decisions

### Identity supporting evidence for thinking about the child's functioning in the three outcome areas and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and observations from individuals in close contact with the child)

### Child Outcome Areas

1. **POSITIVE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SKILLS**
   - Social skills
     - Relating with adults
     - Relating with other children
     - Following rules related to good behavior and interacting with others in order to maintain a healthy relationship

2. **ACQUIRING AND USING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS**
   - Including communication, language and sensory
     - Thinking, reasoning, remembering, problem solving
     - Understanding symbols
     - Understanding physical and social interactions

3. **MEETING PHYSICAL ACCOMMODATIONS TO MEET NEEDS**
   - *Meeting basic needs* e.g., eating, drinking, sleeping, clothing, hygiene
   - *Meeting functional needs* e.g., motor, cognitive, communication, sensory, visual, or hearing a disability
   - *Meeting social needs* e.g., peer interaction, family interaction, and social-emotional needs

### Rating Definitions

- **COMPLETELY**
  - Child shows functioning expected for his or her age in all almost all everyday situations that are part of the child's life. Functioning is considered appropriate for his or her age. No one has any concerns about the child's functioning in this outcome area.

- **SOMewhat**
  - Child shows functioning expected for his or her age but there are some significant concerns about the child functioning in this outcome area. These concerns are substantial enough to suggest monitoring or possible additional support. Although age-appropriate, the child's functioning may border on not keeping pace with age expectations.

- **NEARLY**
  - Child shows functioning expected for his or her age but is in some situations. Child's functioning is age-appropriate and not age-appropriate behaviors and skills. Child's functioning might be described as like that of a slightly younger child.

- **NO**
  - Child shows occasional age-appropriate functioning across settings and situations. More functioning is with age-appropriate than inappropriate.

### Summary of Relevant Evidence (Rate in the Decision-Table)

- **Neatly**
  - Child does not show functioning expected of his or her age in any situation. Child uses immediate foundational skills, one at a time. Across settings and situations. Immediate foundational skills are the skills upon which to build age-appropriate functioning. Functioning might be described as for the age of a younger child.

- **Near or**
  - Child occasionally uses immediate foundational skills across settings and situations. More functioning, it is age-appropriate than inappropriate.

- **Neatly or**
  - Child does not show functioning expected of his or her age in any situation. Child's functioning does not yet include immediate foundational skills upon which to build age-appropriate functioning. Child's functioning reflects skills that are not immediately foundational.
**Current Data Collection: Indicator 7 Child Outcomes Application**

### Child Information - Entry Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name:</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name:</td>
<td>Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
<td>03/01/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry Date:</td>
<td>03/01/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: Is this child Hispanic or Latino?</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2: Select one or more of the following categories that apply to this child.</td>
<td>✓ American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Disability:</td>
<td>Autism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Data Collection: Indicator 7 Child Outcomes Application

Child Outcome Rating - Entry Record For Test Child

Positive Socio-Emotional Skills

Utilizing information from the Child Outcome Summary, report the current status for the Positive Socio-Emotional Skills child outcome area.

Positive Socio-Emotional Skills
- [ ] 1
- [ ] 2
- [ ] 3
- [ ] 4
- [ ] 5
- [ ] 6
- [ ] 7

Sources of Information - Assessment Tools
Select all that apply. At least 1 response must be selected.

- [ ] Assessment, Evaluation and Programming System
- [ ] Battelle Developmental Inventory, Second Edition (BDI-2)
- [ ] Brigance Inventory of Early Development II
- [ ] Carolina Developmental Profile
- [ ] Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC)
- [ ] Developmental Profile - 3 (DP-3)
- [ ] Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- [ ] Learning Accomplishment Profile Third Edition (LAP-3)
- [ ] Teaching Strategies Gold
- [ ] The New Portage Guide Birth to Six
- [ ] Transdisciplinary Play-Based Assessment, Second Edition (TPBA-2)

Other, please specify

Other Sources of Information
Select any that apply.

- [ ] Birth to 3 Child Outcome Exit Rating
- [ ] Child Care/Head Start Input
- [ ] Parent Input/Guardian Input
- [ ] 4K/5K Teacher Input
- [ ] Medical Report

Other, please specify
Indicator 7 Child Outcomes – The New Application

- Interactive Utilizing the Child Outcomes Decision Tree
- Heightened Emphasis on Documenting Evidence
- Replaces the COSF and the Current Indicator 7 Child Outcomes Application

- Child’s Wisconsin Student Number (WSN)
- Notification Needed Exit Outcomes
- Data Sharing
Child Outcomes Ages 3-5 Decision Tree

Does the child function in ways that would be considered age-expected in regard to this outcome?

No (Consider rating 1-3)

Does the child use any immediate foundational skills related to the outcome upon which to build age-expected functioning across settings and situations?

Yes

Briefly describe use of immediate foundational skills.

No

To what extent is the child using immediate foundational skills across settings and situations?

Occasional use of immediate foundational skills

Briefly describe.

Uses immediate foundational skills most or all of the time.

Briefly describe.

Yes (Consider rating 4-7)

Is the child’s functioning age-expected across all or almost all settings and situations?

No, Combination of Age-Expected and Immediate Foundational and/or Foundational

To what extent is the child’s functioning age-expected across settings and situations?

Occasional use of age-expected skills, more behavior that is not age-expected

Briefly describe.

Uses a mix of age-expected and not age-expected behaviors and skills.

Briefly describe.

Yes, All or Almost All Age-Expected

Briefly describe use of age-expected skills across settings and situations.

Does anyone have concerns about the child’s functioning with regard to the outcome area?

Yes

Briefly describe.

No

1 – Child does not yet use immediate foundational skills

2 – Child uses some immediate foundational skills

3 – Emerging Child uses immediate foundational skills

4 – Child rarely uses age-expected skills

5 – Somewhat – Child uses age expected skills some of the time

6 – Child uses age expected skills but there are some concerns

7 – Completely Child uses age-expected skills in all settings and situations

https://uaapps4.dpi.wi.gov/PSO/account/login
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Child Outcomes Prep Tool</th>
<th>Chronological Age:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child’s Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age-Expected</td>
<td>Immediate Foundational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome One</td>
<td>Positive Social Emotional Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Two</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Child Outcomes Professional Development Continuum of Practices

### Indicator 3.7 - Child Outcomes Continuum of Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Component</th>
<th>Exemplary Practice / Integration of IEP Practices / Core Competencies (EC)</th>
<th>Benchmark or Expected Use Practice</th>
<th>Developmental Use in Practice</th>
<th>Unacceptable Use in Practice</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Functional Ongoing Assessment</td>
<td>- Information gathered during functional assessment conversations, including the Result-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 to inform child's entry and exit rating.</td>
<td>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 IEP, Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance or the IFSP Summary of Development.</td>
<td>Entry and exit ratings based entirely on 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.</td>
<td>Information gathered only in child's disability area (e.g., speech-language pathology) only and/or minimal input from primary caregivers is taken into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 multiple 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.).</td>
<td>Functional assessment is used for entry rating but not exit rating. Inconsistent use of functional assessment practices occurs among/within teams members, e.g., early childhood special educator vs. functional assessment but speech-language pathologist doesn't.</td>
<td>Information gathered only in child's disability area (e.g., speech-language pathology) only and/or minimal input from primary caregivers is taken into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Children are rated without information about the child's functioning in settings outside of their primary daily 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Continuum of Practices - Sections

- Functional Ongoing Assessment
- Rating Practices
- Internal Monitoring System & Data Reporting
- Data Analysis
Levels of Practices

Exemplary Practices
- System integration
- Core Competencies

Expected Practices
- Expected of all districts
- Leads to accurate, meaningful data

Developmental Practices
- Partially in place
- Some enhancements needed

Unacceptable Practices
- Ineffective practices
- May lead to inaccurate data
Contact Information

Patricia Williams
Assistant Director Special Education Team
patricia.williams@dpi.wi.gov
(608) 266-1781

Nancy Fuhrman
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(608) 266-6438
Creating a Culture of Data Quality

• Begin at the point of data entry
• Address data quality at each stage
• Communicate the value of data quality
• Provide feedback on the quality of data
• Highlight uses of the data
Multi-Faceted Approach to Data Quality

- Communication
- Training
- Guidance
- System features (such as Edit Checks/Validation)
- Data availability (for use by SEA, LEA, others)
Creating Partnerships

• Create a sense of working together
• Provide LEAs with tools and support
• Emphasize the common goal of providing high-quality services to students and families
• Highlight how data informs policies and initiatives
IDC Knowledge Lab

https://ideadata.org/resource-library/knowledge-lab

• Review of IDC’s Knowledge Lab web page
• In-depth review of selected resources
  • Educational Environment Ages 3-5 (Indicator B6)
  • Maintenance of Effort (MOE)/Coordinated Early Intervening Services (CEIS)
Developing a Culture of Data Quality for LEAs

Communication

• How do you promote the importance of data quality to your LEAs?
• What guidance materials are available for LEAs?
• What training opportunities do you provide to LEAs?
• What other ways does your SEA promote the message of data quality?
Developing a Culture of Data Quality for **LEAs** (Continued)

**System Development**

- Does the timing or method of data collection from LEAs have an impact on data quality? How “fresh” are the data when you collect them?

- How do you ensure that the data being submitted meet expected data quality standards?

- Are the same data collected in multiple places through multiple systems? How might you reduce the risk that data will be reported differently in different systems?
Data Use/Reporting Strategies

• Do LEAs know how the data being submitted are used? By the SEA? By Department of Education (ED)?

• How does the quality of data impact funding? Accountability? State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) evaluation?

• How are the data used to promote SEA initiatives and policies?

• How are data used in LEA determinations for compliance monitoring?
Questions and Answers

Open for Discussion
For More Information

Visit the IDC website
http://ideadata.org/

Follow us on Twitter
https://twitter.com/ideadatacentor
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