

Utah Early Childhood Outcomes Meeting Minutes

8/17/05, 9:30 – 11:30

USOE

Those in attendance:

Anne Kilgore, Connie Nink, Sarah Yerman, Eileen Chamberland, Sue Ord, Susanne Bond, Janet Wade, Catherine Hoelscher, Barb Fiechtel, Patrice Isabella, Vanya Mabey, Janna Forsgren, Debbie Ballard, Chris Giacobelli, Diane Behl

Goal for today: Obtain feedback birth to 5 – motor, language, numeracy – standards

1. General comments to the drafted standards:
 - a. Comments: Liked the format where it's organized by the standard rather than the age range.
 - b. Dislikes
 - i. Motor-indicators
 - ii. "Strategies" – seemed unnecessary
 - iii. Health status, practices-good info, but not relevant here
 - iv. Didn't like the size of it/amount of detail – too much material, especially Cognitive areas
 - v. Need more about physical growth (height, weight)
 - vi. Cognitive from birth to 3 is inappropriate / content
 - c. Format – most like it with one idea (standard) and it follows through all the ages rather than multiple ideas focused on one age.
2. Comments:
 - a. We need alternative indicators for children with disabilities, esp. for those who will not be progressing along typical developmental continuum. These functional/alternative indicators were viewed by many of the meeting members to be critical if these standards are to guide intervention. Connie emphasized that the first step in the standards development was to develop them for "typical development," and then later alternative indicators would be addressed. Another approach proposed was to reference a separate document/tool re: alternative/functional indicators.
 - b. Connie confirmed that the purpose of these standards is to drive IEP's and program activities. Once the standards are in place, all IEP's will have to reference these standards or give a reason for their exemption. Point: The standards will drive the IEP's.
 - c. We can not hold each child to these standards / we need to individualize them. Need alternative indicators for cognitive.
3. Regarding formatting / three main categories
 - a. Language / some wording is not measurable / like "a child favors a book" --- indicators should be measurable, reflecting an actual skill is more measurable. It was suggested that the words need to be defined i.e. "Indicators", "benchmarks" etc.

- b. The format should reflect the Standard and the Indicators; possibly the strategies, but this third column is not essential for this purpose. The most important column is the indicators.
 - c. 1st Column / Learning expectations: offer a few benchmarks / examples; don't make it too wordy.
 - d. The 2nd Column / Indicators: Needs to be simplified, too much and complicated for new teachers. They will not look at all of it.
 - e. The role of the standards in supporting the development of a way to measure the outcomes was questioned. Although the group in general supported the concept of developing standards, it was unclear as to how these standards would help address the main purpose of the GSEG grant, which is to determine a strategy for measuring the child and family outcomes. Connie emphasized that the standards are essential for 619 /Preschool Special Needs; she is relying on the collective wisdom of the team to determine the relation between the standards and outcomes measurement. This is a big issue that is interfering with the team's sense of direction on where we're headed. Diane stated that the original intent was that the standards would be useful in informing the assessments used, which would then be useful in providing data for measuring the outcomes. However, given the functional nature of the outcomes and the uncertainty re: assessment tools used, this rationale seems inadequate for guiding us. It is Susanne Bond understands "The purpose of the "Standards" is the guide for PLOP (Level of Performance) and for IEP's. They need them to be measurable...will be used in reporting to the Feds.
4. The role of the GSEG team was not clear to many participants, especially the Part C representatives. Their perception was that the GSEG grant was charged with supporting the development of the standards, and that the OSERS outcomes were being addressed via the SICC and other Part C work groups. Diane clarified that the purpose of the GSEG grant is to support the development of measuring and monitoring strategies for the OSERS outcomes. This demonstrates the importance of reiterating the purpose of our activities to ensure all new participants understand the purpose of the grant and that communication occurs among all key stakeholders.
5. BabyWatch representatives shared their proposed State Performance Plan and the annual OSERS report. Their priorities were highlighted, i.e.: Documentation of child functional progress and transitions to Part B. (see document). It's critical for them to develop a measurement strategy; if we measure consistently, then we report consistently.
6. Next Steps:
- a. Get on the same page re: purpose of GSEG, focus on measuring the outcomes.
 - b. Revisit who to involve
 - c. Connie will take charge of ensuring the standards are finalized. BabyWatch participants said they would offer their expertise re: standards for birth to three. However, the standards may not necessarily be used by BabyWatch.
 - d. A proposal was made to form two separate workgroups to development outcome measures. However, Diane and others argued that this potentially would be

duplicating work. The combined, coordinated efforts of Part C and Part B would provide a more unified vision and buy in

e. It was decided that the next meeting will be held on Sept. 21, 2005 at 9:30 am. The location of the meeting was not discussed; it is presumed that it will be in the same USOE conference room. The purpose of the next meeting will be to determine how the standards are useful in guiding the outcomes measurement. Diane believes it would be valuable to determine if the standards are a prerequisite to developing the measurement strategies; perhaps these can be parallel efforts rather than seeing the standards as a prerequisite.