

**Early Childhood Outcomes: OSEP TA Document for 5 reporting categories**

**Child outcomes (Part C SPP indicator #3 and Part B SPP indicator #7)**

Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs/preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication **and early literacy –for preschool**); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

For each of the three outcome areas, OSEP has expanded the reporting categories from three to five (see table below).

<b>Previous 3 Reporting Categories</b>	<b>New 5 reporting categories</b>
c. % of children who did not improve functioning	a. % of children who did not improve functioning.
b. % of children who improve functioning (but not in a)	b. % of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.
	c. % of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it. [improved developmental trajectory]
a. % of children who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	d. % of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers. [gap closers]
	e. % of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.

**Timeline:**

For the Annual Performance Report (APR) due in February 2007, States are only required to report **status at entry** data for children entering the program in 2005-2006. States should report the status at entry data for each of the three outcome areas using two reporting categories: % of children who entered at a level comparable to same aged peers and % of children who entered at a level below same aged peers.

Beginning with the APR due in February 2008, States will be required to report children using the 5 reporting categories. Additionally, in presenting their results, States should provide their criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and States should list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for the child outcome indicators, including if the State is using the 7-point ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form.

**Examples of criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers”**

ECO Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF) If a State is using the ECO summary tool, then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been scored as a 6 or 7 on the COSF.

Mandating one assessment tool state-wide If a State is using one assessment tool state wide then the developers/publishers of the tool should be consulted on defining “comparable to same-aged peers” and criteria should be reported.

Other. If using another criteria such as linking to Early Learning Guidelines/Early Childhood Standards, stakeholder group or expert recommendation, please describe in detail.

**New reporting category “c” (% of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it)**

OSEP expanded the reporting categories from the four proposed categories presented at the April 2006 Early Childhood Outcomes TA Meeting to include this fifth category because it will provide more meaningful data that relates directly to the purpose of Part C and Part B, Section 619. Both early childhood programs under IDEA are focused on maximizing the development of young children with disabilities. Having the expectation to reach or maintain functioning comparable to same-aged peers (reporting categories d & e) in some outcome areas is appropriate for some young children receiving services under IDEA. However, for many children with disabilities improving functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers (but not reaching it) is the goal of the program. Children reported in this new category “c” are those that improve their developmental trajectory (i.e. rate of growth) from entry to exit. There are several different approaches States could take to determine which children to report in category “c”. Below are a few examples:

If using the Child Outcomes Summary Form:

- Example: A child scores a 4 at Time 1 and a 5 at Time 2

If using a percent delay:

- Example: A child who is 40% delayed at Time 1 and 20% delayed at Time 2

If using standard deviations:

- Example: A child who is 2.5 standard deviations below the mean at Time 1 and 2.0 standard deviations below at Time 2.

**For States using ECO's COSF.**

Many States are planning on using ECO's Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF). Below are guidelines for using the COSF in determining how to report data using the five new reporting categories. This is not an exhaustive list of all possible data scenarios, so States using the COSF are encouraged to consult materials developed by ECO.

<b>Reporting Category</b>	<b>Using ECO's COSF</b>
a. % of children who did not improve functioning.	Children who are scored lower at exit than entry (or are scored a 1 at both entry and exit) and received a "no" on question b at exit.
b. % of children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	Children who are scored a 5 or lower at entry, scored the same or lower at exit, and received a "yes" on question b at exit.
c. % of children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	Children who are scored higher at exit than entry but did not reach 6 or 7.
d. % of children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	Children who are scored a 5 or lower at entry and a 6 or 7 at exit.
e. % of children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	Children who are scored a 6 or 7 at both entry and exit.