

Family Outcome #1: Families understand their children's strengths, abilities and special needs

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<p>Percent of families who understand basic infant or toddler development and are able to assess how their infant or toddler's development is progressing by the time they transition from Early On.</p>	<p>Understanding basic infant/toddler development is good, but not the point of the outcome</p>	<p>Assess is the wrong word-this doesn't address how or where and covers only 1 part of the outcome-</p> <p>[2-sam] The outcome is for families to understand <u>their own child's</u> development. This one mentions only basic infant toddler development.</p>	<p>-This indicator addresses outcome #1 only-divide the outcomes! [2-sam] The outcome is for families to understand <u>their own child's</u> development. Doing that in context of basic child development is fine (see next indicator), but is secondary—their own child is the important thing.</p> <p>This indicator gets at progress, but progress ("changes") is already addressed fine by the previous outcome 5, as revised.</p> <p>How will parents assess their child's development? Checklist? Use recognize instead of assess. (group)</p> <p>BONUS: Indicators 6 and 7 could actually be put together:</p>
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families who understand basic infant or toddler development and are able to recognize how their infant or toddler's development is progressing by the time they transition from Early On.</p>			
<p>Percentage of families who report that they have an understanding of their child's strengths, current skills and</p>	<p>Score is 9 but only ½ of the outcome addressed-"self report?"—</p>	<p>Too specific-too many clauses-doesn't address both parts-these techniques are not</p>	<p>Doesn't address both outcomes-this is redundant, only deals with #1- addresses outcome #1 only- divide the</p>

special concerns.		<p>necessary for all children-do not like parent report- Understanding is important, but indicators need to reflect much deeper by practice/demonstrating/utilizing/etc.- -triple barreled-is self report accurate? -all parents would report they have an understanding, poor wording</p>	<p>outcomes-only the first part is a measure of the outcome- This indicator addresses outcome #1 only-divide the outcomes [2-sam] This as rewritten covers the base understanding of the child, at a given point. It also adds the understanding of typical child development, such as how much delay and how different is my child. This is I think helpful to parents and certainly something they ask about directly and often. Deeper layer of #6. More specific than #6.</p>
-------------------	--	--	---

Recommended wording:
Percent of parents who understand their infant/toddler's strengths and skills in light of basic development and are able to use this information to assist their infant/toddler develop by the time of transition from Early-On.

Family Outcome #2: Families know their rights and advocate effectively for their children.

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Relative percentage of families vs. service providers who report that families participate as full partners in team meeting to plan goals and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It's behavioral • Comparison of two perceptions • Full partners-families Vs what service providers • Offers more than one perception of effectiveness and knowledge as a check on subjectivity • If advocating is measured by participation this is good • Basis of comparison highlights differences in perception of a parents/providers • Comparison based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subjective (4) • By report • Indirect measure³ of effective advocacy • Does not demonstrate that families have their rights 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A difference in perception is a wonderful change agent • Only ½ of what we need to know in the outcome

Recommended wording:
Percent of parents that report their family as full partners in planning goals and services on the Initial IFSP (as compared to service providers reports of the percent of families as full partners in planning goals and services on the Initial IFSP)

Percent of parents who have been given the opportunity to learn advocacy skills (%of parents that file a complaint, # of parents asking for mediation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures action not perceived knowledge or satisfaction • Being given a copy of EO rights is different than advocacy/conflict resolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do all parents want to learn about advocacy? • Do you use all children/families as the denominator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • advocacy, a formal complaint may never have to be filed • Michigan has an opportunity to be a leader in the area of parent involvement • If we make advocacy an indicator we hold our feet to the fire.
--	---	---	---

<p>Percent of families who know the range of services available for their children.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measurable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • only knowing • outcome is dual so the indicator will have one or the other • not relevant • redundant with #B • Doesn't measure advocacy • Only measures knowledge not effectiveness • Non measurable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • good start • only covers ½ of the outcome • not well written, but begins to get at the issue of understanding vs. informed of procedural safeguards
---	--	---	---

Recommended wording:
Percent of families who are knowledgeable of the range of services available for their child and family at the time of the Initial IFSP.

<p>Percent of families confident in their abilities to make choices about intervention for their infant or toddler and will be able to implement those interventions effectively in the natural environment; measured at the time of the initial IFSP and during subsequent IFSP reviews</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • extremely important • can be surveyed • confidence is vital to actualizing the advocacy piece in this outcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • too many variables • how you measure confident • may not be valid measure • multiple parts in the indicator • vague 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to define "natural environments" • Subjective, measurable- :could only be self report • It does not say families can (implement) as demonstrated by –but it is a great indicator • How to help families be confident-powerful-strong sense of self/knowledge in the field-need research on what makes this happen (strategies
--	---	---	---

Recommended wording:
Percent of confident in their abilities to make choices about interventions for their infant or toddler and will be able to implement those interventions effectively in the natural environment; measured at the time of the initial IFSP and during subsequent reviews.

SPP Indicator:
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their child's needs.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped their family know their rights.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45 day timeline.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.</p>
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).</p>
<p>SPP indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p>

Family Outcome #3: Families help their children develop and learn.

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<p>Percent of parents that utilize positive parenting skills in their home environment to help their infant or toddler develop and learn 6 months after entering Early On. (Confidence is only one measure of helping with development; interactions and experiences are another.)</p>	<p>5. (Mark) Utilizes positive behavior interventions, which are supported in the research; identifies the home setting and a 6-month time interval.</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Like the concept of families actively involved with the interventions that are research supported.</p> <p>Parent's confidence in their skills is an essential component of this indicator.</p>	<p>Target is families, not parents</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Agree with Sam— target needs to be families.</p> <p>5. (Mark) Needs to identify what positive parenting skills “look like” within daily activities and routines in the home; needs to add settings outside of the some in the community; needs to add other time intervals, maybe at 3-month intervals.</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Agree with Mark. This needs to be written in a way that is understandable in clear language. Home environment needs to be expanded to include natural (community) environments.</p> <p>[2-sam] target should be families.</p>	<p>-Addresses outcome #3 only - helps with outcome #3-not sure how () help clarify anything-focuses on parents only-time frame is given, but not necessarily appropriate “parenting skills” a small part of “helping 0-3 develop”</p> <p>5. Utilizing positive “parenting skills” and behavior support is an essential part of developing an infant and toddler develop and learn.</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Agree with Sam— Need to clearly define “parenting skills— possible interactions that support the infant or toddlers growth and development?</p> <p>Families are supported in the care-taking role? (Very wordy)</p> <p>2-sam] The outcome is for families, not just parents, so perhaps we should use a word other than parenting skills-- “appropriate interactions” maybe? The rewording doesn't have the mention of confidence. I think this is important too, as several others said; it seems to be a contributing factor to the indicator—hard to write it in.</p>

			Parents and other family members should be considered as wording in this indicator. (group 8/26/05)
<p>Recommended wording:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of families who understand their infant/toddler's abilities and needs and are able to use appropriate parenting skills in the home environment to help their infant/toddler's development following 6 months (? 12 months) of participation in Early-On. • Upon completion of 1 year of Early On intervention strategies, 85% of parents will demonstrate positive methods of parenting through the use of encouraging words, facial expressions, and physical touches during interactions between parent and child at home. (Nancy) 			

<p>Percent of families who assist their infant or toddler in learning about positive social relationships through one-on-one exchanges with the child, using positive words with the child and demonstrating physical affection for the child.</p>	<p>- -I believe physical affection and using positive words will help children grow and develop- - indicator has 3 components, need to be separated-</p> <p>5. Identifying positive social relationships and one-on-one exchanges is the family member-child interactions, which are the first relationships for the child; identifying positive words and physical affection are the stimuli that motivates and encourages risk-taking and new learning for the child (and for most of us).</p> <p>Explains how the change will be operational zed. (Jillian)</p> <p>4 Char: provides specificity on 'positive social relationships'</p>	<p>Do not like the word learning, needs to be more specific-- the charge of learn is weak-toddlers do not "learn about" social relations-" assist in learning" is Vague and difficult to measure -learning not good description, demonstrate may be a better choice</p> <p>5. Needs to identify who and the what of the positive relationships are with – who is the other person and what does it "look like"; needs to describe what on-on-one exchanges "look like" and add examples of daily activities and routines and communication partners within the family.</p> <p>4 Charo: there are 3 distinct behaviors, so will need to separate them into sub-</p>	<p>-This indicator addresses outcome #3 only-outcomes should be separated define positive social relationships these should be separate goals this indicator is relevant to outcome #3 only- do all 3 components need to be achieved to be responsive to the outcome?</p> <p>5. The indicator contains essential components that will encourage infant and toddler risk-taking towards new learning and development: positive social interactions and physical affection.</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Agree with Sam. Measurement needs to be developed at initial involvement and future time frames need to be agreed on. Only focuses on the second outcome. Many aspects to measure - one on one</p>
--	---	--	---

	<p>[2-sam] positive emotional support is important for all development and learning, not just for social relationships.</p>	<p>indicators; if this is from the parent's perspective, then needs to say 'Percent of families who report they assist....' If it's observational (via provider), then measurement becomes more complex</p>	<p>exchanges, positive words, physical affection. "Assist" is vague, not very measurable. (Jillian)</p> <p>4 Charo: are there other or better ways to measure 'positive social relationships'</p> <p>(2-Sam) positive emotional support is important for all development and learning, can just mention that. "Etc." Indicates that the list in parentheses is just examples. Affection, how do we measure this? Is affection the right word? (Laura)</p> <p>Is responsive better wording? Perhaps leave out physical. Parent's responsiveness to infant is important component as well as child's ability to anticipate their needs being met. Reciprocal affection. (group)</p> <p>Within 6 months of Early On intervention, 100% of families involved in home visits will positively interact with their infant or toddler in a way that is accepting, playful, and affectionate. (Nancy)</p> <p>Suggest: Percent of families who demonstrate physical affection and provide</p>
--	---	---	--

			<p>positive one-on-one interaction with their infant/toddler to encourage the development of age appropriate social relationships in the community (home, school, etc) following 6 months (?) participation in Early-On. (Dave)</p>
--	--	--	--

Recommended wording:
Percent of families who demonstrate physical affection and provide positive one-on-one interaction with their infant/toddler to encourage the development of age appropriate social relationships in the community (home, school, etc) following 6 months (?) participation in Early-On.

<p>Families incorporate strategies and activities into their daily routines to help their child develop and learn.</p>	<p>5. Identifies daily activities and routines for family members to help their child develop and learn; indicates that families can help their child develop and learn, rather than relying on an expert professional.</p> <p>4 Charo: good conceptually</p>	<p>In home? No time factor</p> <p>5. Needs to describe strategies and activities, what might they "look like" during what types of daily activities and routines; need to identify where families receive the strategies and routines – from the IFSP.</p> <p>Only focuses on the second outcome. Strategies and activities? What ones? This indicator really doesn't say much. How would development and learning be measured? (Jillian)</p> <p>4 Charo: lacks specificity; what kinds of strategies or activities? What setting?</p>	<p>This indicator addresses outcome#3 only-strategies and activities, please define- does "strategies and activities" mean those that are tied to a specific early intervention service?</p> <p>3. (Sharon) Needs to be specific in clear language as this practically s the heart (central focus) of early intervention. 4 Charo: this needs more content; is this self-report or observational?</p> <p>I like the daily routines, might add in their natural environments, but I think we need to define what strategies and activities they are doing. We need a time line. (Andrea)</p>
---	---	--	---

			<p>2-sam] revised version gets at a specific part of helping child develop—using specific strategies and activities.</p> <p>I used “regular” routine since “daily” is limiting—a routine might be the weekly dinner with grandparents, or weekly shopping, for instance.</p> <p>Too vague (Nancy)</p> <p>Group feels that this needs to be linked to IFSP.</p> <p>100% of families who receive “do-at-home” activity sheets will perform the activity with their child within 10 days and describe how it went, including a description of their child’s reaction to the activity, whether it was successful, and how often it was repeated. (Nancy)</p>
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families who incorporate into their daily routine at home appropriate learned activities and strategies which encourage their infant/toddler’s development following 6 months (?) participation in Early-On.</p>			

Family Outcome #4: Families have support systems

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Percentage of families who report having access to parent organizations or support groups relevant to their child's disability and their family's lifestyle and priorities at the time of their initial IFSP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is measurable in specific time frame. • Having access is good • Very specific to the child's disability and families preferences • Very clear and measurable • wonderful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to measure over time need to be clearer on the timelines for measurement: ie.. at the time of IFSP. • Remove "who" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insert at the end of the indicator "at the time of their initial IFSP and at each subsequent IFSP" • Say, "X % of families report having access" • Many families may have access at the time of their initial IFSP but may not be able to communicate that depending on other factors related to their child's enrollment. The situation may be too "new" for them to fully understand all the resources available to them.
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families report having access to parent organizations or support groups relevant to their child's disability and their families' lifestyle and priorities at the time of their initial IFSP and each subsequent IFSP.</p>			
Percent of families who report that they have adequate community supports in place upon the 6 month review.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community is more family friendly than the next indicator. • Well written 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove "who" • Define adequate community support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In order to measure the effectiveness of intervention should be related to indicator #1. • At the end of indicator add "and at each subsequent IFSP." • Adequate community supports needs more definition. • Caution: the indicator needs to show that there is an increase in support for

			<p>the family as a result of intervention.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is adequate? Did they have adequate supports before EO?
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families report that they have adequate community supports in place upon the 6 month review and at each subsequent IFSP.</p>			
<p>Percent of families who understand their infant or toddler's disability and how to access supports within the community related to that disability at the time of transition from Early On.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good indicator covers the whole spectrum. • Great start • Identifies a "when" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove "who" • Need "as evidenced by" • Combines 2 areas "understand" and "how to access" you could have either on with out the other 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change language to say... "report they understand their infant....." • I like this one it's specific • Too many conditions
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families report they understand their infant or toddlers disability an how to access supports within the community related to that disability at the time of transition from Early On.</p>			
<p>Percent of families who report that they have support systems in place at the time of the IFSP or upon the 6 month review.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well written 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear about when during the IFSP initial, annual? • Remove" who" • Many are missing the "where" • Define support systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very similar to the second indicator- combine with number 2 to create comprehensive indicator. • This one is getting there but how are families counted if they report support services at time of IFSP and report none at 6 months.
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families that report that they have support systems in place at the time of their initial IFSP and upon 6 month review.</p>			
<p>Percent of families who report connections to formal supports such as medical, child care, transportation, insurance, etc. at the time of their initial IFSP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well written 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove "who" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand on the time frame at the end of the indicator: to say same as #2. • Define connections, access?

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What does this tell us about change as a result of the EO intervention it could work with additional info, could get complex
<p>Recommended wording: Percent of families report connections to formal supports such as medical, child care, transportation, insurance, etc at the time of their initial IFSP and at each subsequent IFSP.</p>			
<p>Percent of families that report at the time of completion of the initial IFSP that they have the necessary supports in place in their lives (such as income, housing, food, supportive stable relationships, quality child care, transportation, insurance, etc.) to be able to focus their attention on their child's development or that the initial IFSP addresses how these critical supports will be met either through direct service or referral.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great, measurable • Lengthy, but meets the criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too wordy and value laden • Does not address whether or not the supports actually come into being, and some supports may not be able to be provided. • Wow, break this up into several indicators or get rid of the unnecessary conditions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be broken up, checklist maybe. • Goal seems to be to help family focus their attention on the child. • Some pieces of this may better be captured in another outcome.
<p>Recommended wording: Too long may need to look at for future or drop this one.</p>			

Family Outcome #5: Families are able to gain access to desired services, programs, and activities in their community.

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<p>% of families with IFSPs who report that they access desired services, programs and activities in their communities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific to outcome • Cuts to the heart of the outcome • Are accessing desired services • Reporting identified services within community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't say when (time of measurement) • Doesn't give timeframe • No beginning or ending. What became better? • The action is 'family reports' • No timeline (as a result of early on) • When is this date reported? Initial IFSP? Review? On exiting? • Define examples of services, programs, activities. • Not all families who need it get IFSPs • How to measure 'desired' services? • How to define 'communities?' • When measured? Time element... 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reword - % of families showing increased access to services, programs, and activities in their communities • The right words are here so it = #1 ranking, but the indicator does not have clarify. It is process vs. results..." As a result of Early On..." • Not multicultural • Process oriented, not outcome oriented • Reword - "Families with IFSPs access desired services, programs and activities in their communities." • In this system where will we measure impacts/access for people who don't receive IFSPs but need services? <p><i>Comments from meeting transcript on this indicator -</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>services that are identified in their community</i> • <i>related to the outcome</i> • <i>actually accessing the services</i> • <i>status vs. progress outcome??</i> • <i>time point at which we are</i>

			<i>measuring??</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What about communities when not all the families are identified??</i>
Recommended wording: Percent of families with IFSPs who report they are informed about, understand, and have accessed desired services and activities they value, which have empowered their participation in the community, as a result of Early On.			

Child Outcome #1: Children have positive social relationships

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Percent of infants and toddlers who have demonstrated secure attachment to at least one caregiver.	Reflects a crucial element of infant and toddler positive social relationships Centrally relevant for infants and toddlers	No data source specified Is expectation of only one secure attachment enough?	Aren't we talking about attachment with the primary caregiver? Research shows that it is the quality of the attachment not the quantity that matters Need to look at cultural differences in attachment – does this matter? What about children with disabilities who may never reach this outcome?
Recommended wording: Percent of infants and toddlers who make progress toward secure attachment with at least one primary caregiver.			
Percent of infants and toddlers who demonstrate positive social behaviors with family and peers.	More positive than other similar indicators that were rated.		Seems like measurement criteria ought to include "when"
Recommended wording: Percent of infants and toddlers who show progress in interacting positively with significant adults in their natural environments.			
Percent of infants and toddlers whose parents demonstrate appropriate and dependable parenting techniques and interactions measured annually while served by, and at transition from Early On.	Appropriate parenting – means nurturing and responsiveness this is critically important Parent focus makes sense given that we are talking about young children	Don't see the connection between this and positive social relationships Confusing who is being measured (should be child) Don't like words appropriate and dependable	
Recommended wording: No change			

Percent of infants and toddlers who interact positively with peers and maintain social interactions and participate socially in the natural environment by their transition from Early On.	Grounded in natural environment Time frame is included	Too much to measure Needs to be simplified	
Recommended wording: Percentage of infants and toddlers who make progress toward interacting positively with children in their natural environments.			
The infant and toddler is able to actively control their own behavior and demonstrate ability to comfort himself/herself.	Strong relationship to outcome Self-calming is important for forming positive social relationships	Does this lead us to the outcome?	Need to look at age anchoring Each child develops individually can't age anchor
Recommended Wording: Percent of infants and toddlers who make progress toward actively controlling their own behavior and demonstrating ability to comfort himself/herself.			

Child Outcome #2: Children acquire and use knowledge and skills.

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<p>Percent of infant and toddlers exiting from Early On due to developmental progress and achievement of IFSP Outcomes (not transitioning to Special Education) at the time of IFSP Reviews or transition planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important to legislators and funders; it is the only one they care about. • This is what we think legislators want to see. • Accounts for kids exiting EO due to catching up. • States a positive outcome: a child does not need long term special education means EI was successful. • Exiting due to developmental progress reinforces outcome stated above, and focuses on EO role. • Important data to share with legislators, shows individual child progress. • Shows progress of parent driven outcomes. • Avoiding Special Education is important to legislators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Just achievement of IFSP outcome does not mean they will exit. • Leaves out the children born with disability. • Needs revising with how to measure. • Don't like wording. • Leaves out the children born with a disability, not all children will transition without need. • Need to eliminate 'not transitioning to Special Education;' it is very offensive. • What about children going to Special Education – they would also acquire and use knowledge. • Too broad, stated as a negative 'not in Special Education.' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove the parenthesis. It is negative. • Remove 'achievement of IFSP outcome.' • Difficult to understand as written. • Exiting EO due to developmental progress, not necessarily achievement of IFSP outcomes. To be eligible for EO must show delay in one area of development. Simply meeting IFSP outcomes does not mean the child does not have a delay. • This outcome says that ones that would become age appropriate and not Special Education children (?) made progress and achieved their outcomes.

Recommended Wording:
Percent of infant and toddlers exiting from Early On due to developmental progress at the time of IFSP reviews or transition planning.

<p>Percent of children making progress on parent identified priorities for child within their natural environment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the one we should be working on with families. • I like the 'parent identified' and the 'natural environment.' • Validates parent involvement in IFSP goals. • Parent driven services – parents know their child best and help design direction of progress. • Like 'parent identified' and 'natural environment.' • Focus on parent identified priority. • Parent identified priorities. • Shows progress on IFSP outcomes which are parent driven. • Like 'making progress.' • This relies heavily on parent input/opinions. • Strong family focus – important to EO. • Could/should be functionally focused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be a concern between indicator and outcome. • Not all counties operating in natural environments. • Need a clearer connect between the outcome and the indicator. • This relies heavily on parent input/opinions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May need to re-word to get to be more specifically for this outcome, i.e. 'priorities related to skills and knowledge.' • Has merit but needs wordsmithing to score higher on SMART test. • Aren't all objectives/priorities to be family driven? This statement allows room for other than family driven objectives/goals to be measured. • Would be stronger if specified as 'parent-identified priorities for child skills/knowledge.'
<p>Recommended Wording: Percent of children making progress on parent identified priorities for child's skills and knowledge within their natural environment as evidenced by ...</p>			

<p>Percent of infants and toddlers who demonstrate progress in acquiring the skills and knowledge need to move nearer to functioning in comparison to same-aged peers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates individual child progress. • Concept is a goal of EI and critical. It is the work we do to help children close the gap between what the currently do and what typical behaviors other their age do. • This is the one that would drive public policy support. • Can demonstrate individual child progress. • Can show closing of gap between kids development with and without intervention • Like demonstrating progress • Like concept of age-anchored progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not account for children who maintain functioning, only measures progress. • Doesn't pass the SMART test as written. • Same aged peers would be more or less impaired/delayed. • Does not account for children who maintain functioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wording suggestion: 'demonstrate progress as evidenced by moving nearer to same-aged peers.' • Make sure the measurement tool assesses all levels of progress (maintenance, progress, regression, etc.) • Like the idea of measuring 'closing the gap.' • Change languges to something like: 'progress from functioning level to chronological level of skill development.' • Work on wording to reflect age appropriate skill level. • Could this indicator and % of IT exiting EO due to developmental progress be melded together? • Wording issues – 'acquiring skills and using knowledge.' • This works if you are looking at a specific set of skills or a tool (IDA).
--	--	--	--

Recommended wording:
Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained or improved developmental trajectory in acquiring skills and using knowledge.

Child Outcome #3: Children take appropriate action to meet their needs.

<i>Proposed Indicator</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Weaknesses</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Percent of infants and toddlers who move from place to place to participate in everyday activities, play and routines at the time of transition from Early On.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too specific – one domain only • Too narrow • Could be re-worded into a good indicator • Difficult to measure • Is this about movement or participation • Confusing • Missing what, where, and how • This isn't continuous progress. Transition only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't like this as worded • "Move from place to place " is rather simplistic prefer who have mobility to participate in... • What is the change, how will it be operationalized. Where? Unclear
Recommended wording:			
Percent of infants and toddlers who use gestures, sounds, words, signs, or other means to communicate wants and needs at the time of transition from Early On.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication is basic action to meet their need • Specific • Important developmental step • Strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusive at end of program only. • Needs to define • Measure earlier and often 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better defined than #2 • How will it be operationalized?
Recommended wording:			
Percent of children who meet their self-care needs which allows them to participate in everyday routines and activities at the time of transition from Early On	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose of self-care needs • Good intent • Fills in #1 • Gives what and time frame • Strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-care not defined • How to measure participate (Increase participation?) • Needs a where – "allows them to participate...in their natural environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This better than indicator #1 • Needs where the change or activity will take place • How will it be operationalized • The best one yet!

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to define self-care needs • Needs how and where 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even though this one gives somewhat of a timeline, "at the time of transition from Early On," it still fails in the issue of where.
<p>Recommended wording:</p>			
<p>SPP Indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>			