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## Activity 1: Data Quality and Broad Data Analysis

As part of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the state is conducting a broad data analysis. The purpose of this analysis is to look at how children in the state are performing on child outcomes. The evidence for this activity is existing child outcomes data, presented in the state’s child outcomes data quality profile. The inference will be related to comparisons between national and state data, year to year comparisons, and comparisons across outcomes. The action will be the identification of a potential measureable result and areas in need of further analysis.

**As you review the data in this activity consider the following questions and record your thoughts.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Notes** |
| * How is the state doing on their child outcomes? Does the state’s child outcomes data look different than the national data? If so, how? |  |
| * Is the state performing more poorly or better in some outcomes than others? If so, which one(s)? |  |
| * What are the trends in the state child outcomes?   + Are the state child outcomes trends stable, trending upwards, or trending downwards?   + Are the trends similar or different across the outcomes? |  |
| * Do the data appear to be of high quality? Are there any data quality concerns? |  |
| * What outcome(s) would you recommend for further analysis? |  |
| * What additional data or information would you like to see? |  |

***(See Part C or Part B 619 Child Outcomes Data Quality Profile)***

**Expected Patterns for Progress Categories**

When examining your state data for data quality, ECTA recommends using the following expected ranges for the progress categories when looking for patterns in the data, listed below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Category a | Category b | Category c | Category d | Category e |
| 0 | <5% | <5% | <5% | <5% |
| >5% | >50% | >50% | >50% | >65% |

**Questions:**

Do you see any unexpected patterns in the progress categories that were not identified in the state child outcomes data quality profile? If so, please describe.

Given the information in the data quality profile and progress category patterns, what, if any, concerns do you have about the quality of the state data? How might you address those concerns in the future?
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## Activity 2: Reviewing Local Program Data

In this activity we will dig deeper into the performance of local programs. The evidence we will use is child outcomes data for local programs. Inference will be related to comparisons between local programs to the state and year-to-year comparisons. Action will be the identification of a subset of programs that can be analyzed for more in-depth or drill-down analyses.

As you review the data in this activity consider the following questions and record your thoughts.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Notes** |
| * Do local programs’ child outcomes data look different than the state data? If so, how? |  |
| * Are some local programs performing more poorly or better in some outcomes than others? If so, which one(s)? |  |
| * What are the trends in the local program child outcomes?   + Are the trends stable, trending upwards, or trending downwards?   + Do the trends look different depending upon the size of the program?   + Or type of assessment used? |  |
| * What, if any, concerns do you have about the quality of the local program data? |  |
| * What programs would you target for more in-depth analysis and qualitative drill-down?   + High, low or programs with concerning or unusual patterns? |  |
| * Given the patterns in the local program data, what would you recommend to investigate further as the potential measureable result? (Please describe the evidence supporting the selection of this result.) |  |

**Comparing programs by the type of formal assessment used**

**Longitudinal patterns for the highest and lowest programs, social emotional outcome**

**Comparing progress categories for the programs meaningfully different from the state summary statement values**

\*Note: See expected patterns table on page 2.

**What else would you like to know about these programs and what would your hypothesis be?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What else do you want to know?** | **Hypothesis** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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## Activity 3: Linking Practices to Child Outcomes

In this activity we will examine several examples for linking practices to performance in the child outcomes (i.e., the measurable result). The evidence we will use is cross-tabulations between the potential state identified measureable result (children’s positive social emotional outcomes) and information about program practices that may explain the low percent of children exiting at age expectations in positive social emotional outcomes. Inference will be related to comparisons between the low and high performing programs. Action will be the identification of a potential root causes and improvement strategies.

To gather more information about practices, the state examined two pieces of information: 1) the percent of children with IFSP outcomes/IEP goals related to social emotional functioning through a document review; and 2) the level of implementation of quality practices for the programs gathered by creating a self-assessment of the effective practices directly related to Outcome 1: positive social emotional that were identified by the Relationship of Quality Practices to Child and Family Outcome Measurement Results resource: <http://www.ectacenter.org/eco/assets/docs/QualityPracticesOutcomes_4-29-11-Final.doc>

<http://www.ectacenter.org/eco/assets/xls/QualityPracticesOutcomesSpreadsheet_5-11-11.xls>

\*Note: For additional qualitative information about the program’s practices, see the reflections and comments on the completed quality practices self-assessments for the high and low performing programs.

**Before diving into the graphs below, take a moment to consider the information you know or have access to about the practices of local programs in your state.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Notes** |
| * What data and information do you have available or could gather about programs in *your* state that you could use to categorize programs and link to child outcomes? |  |

**Comparing Programs by the Percent of Children with IFSP outcomes/IEP goals related to Social Emotional**

**Comparing Programs by Level of Implementation**

**Based on the data and information available, how do practices differ for low and high performing programs?**

\*Note: For additional qualitative information about the program’s practices, see the reflections and comments on the completed quality practices self-assessment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Low and High performing programs** | **Presence of outcomes/goals related to social emotional on individualized plans** | **Level of Implementation of Quality Practices (high, medium, low)** |
| Program B (n=109) |  |  |
| Program C (n=78) |  |  |
| Program I (n=143) |  |  |
| Program N (n=234) |  |  |

**As you review the data in the charts above and the self-assessments consider the following questions and record your thoughts.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Notes** |
| * What are some possible interventions or systems changes that would improve child outcomes in these programs? |  |
| * Would the same strategy work for all the low performing programs? If so, what strategy might that be?   + If not, would there need to be different strategies, and what might those be? |  |