

Early Childhood Outcomes Meeting Notes

May 11, 2005

Utah State Office of Education, Room 156

Participants: Debbie Ballard, Diane Behl, Rachelle Blair-Thatcher, Susie Bond, Brenda Broadbent, Catherine Hoelscher, Patrice Isabella, Anne Kilgore, Vanya Mabey, Connie Nink, Susan Olsen, Susan Ord, Randall Sanders, Janet Wade, Robin Rector, Jennie Gibson,

Discussion and Decisions:

Stakeholders: Need all to “buy in” and be involved from the start

Part C: Might use standards more at the program level (across programs)
Part C needs to have standards that represent small steps (Preschool steps are bigger)

Pros: IDEA 2004 requires more emphasis on pre-literacy & numeracy in Part C
Standards must be family friendly
Standards can serve as a basis for curriculum, goals, and tools/assessment
Standards can serve as a vehicle of communication between programs and between Part C and Part B
Standards provide a better roadmap for services/CSPD
Standards may facilitate consistency even with different curriculum
Standards will strengthen the transition process
Give some common ground across EI programs

Part C – Needs to work on transition, work on preparatory skills

Part B – Needs to work on being more family centered

Part B - Needs standards down to birth, for children with severe delays

Part C - The standard will be useful, but doesn't feel that they need to use it to develop our outcomes or the IFSP

Part B and C Standards already built into the assessments (but there are gaps in the assessments)

Cons: – Part C doesn't want a generic IFSP outcomes based on standards

Standards: The standard system is not an assessment system
EI standards are needed (allows for aggregated data)
Standards of development and examples, not an assessment
The EI's are as different as dogs and trees
Shared framework/functional standards
Determine standards and outcomes from domain base (grant) and then come up with global functional outcome indicators
Standards can be adjusted to “common outcomes”
Standards develop what services are needed for progress
All have to report to OSEP on the same outcomes
Takes the guesswork out of writing IFSPs and IEPs
Communication vehicle for different service providers
Obstacle: Getting everyone “to play”

“Individualizing” comes in with methodology
Making development continuum explicit

How to measure progress: Measurement is based on standards
Assessments speak to standards, which translate to outcomes
Develop an infrastructure for what we’re already doing
Don’t add another layer

Consensus: Brenda – proposes we have 0-5 standards. Those standards would be crosswalked with the curriculum, we will use assessment tools already used or new ones, those would be crosswalked with what we agree to be our indicators and our OSEP outcomes. The group agreed with the proposal.

It is important that if the standards are adopted by USOE, that they call them standards, if not they will not be enforceable. Part B 3-5 has to use standards because Part B is tied to NCLB and must show progress toward general curriculum.

Bottom line – we all have to report to OSEP – how we are going to get there

Randall presented an Engineering Analogy—Standards are like specifications for a project design, but the engineers have flexibility to produce a product as long as it meets specifications.

What can People do? Ann has already pulled together existing information
Sift the information
Look at Kentucky product – online
Ann – suggested that we go to the experts in each area, to help sift out the information
Debbie proposed we bring all 9 state standards written for birth to five to the group and let us all review them rather than going to experts in each area.
Stakeholders indicated that they need to be educated
Diane Behl – have we addressed family outcomes? Need to look at both child and family outcomes
Group comment--Want to make sure we have a parent-friendly component in our standards

How to Proceed: Take what works that is already done. Other states are so far ahead-- we do not want reinvent the wheel

- 1) Review literature & “what’s out there”
- 2) Stakeholders sift information first
- 3) Need regular education involvement
- 4) Need to keep in mind Family Outcomes/Standards

Plan for next meeting: Bring existing standards to the table
Anne will send out a packet ahead for people to review
June 2, 9:30 am
Final location TBA, but we have 156 USOE reserved