

Idaho's ECO/IEP Embedding
Short Summary of Survey Finding

70% of Respondents were ECSE teachers

55% have been working 10 or more years

84% respondents ECOs was one of their primary responsibilities

57% were initially trained by SDE and 33% received training by a college or not at all

70% of respondents felt they were proficient or expert at completing the ECO process

69% have completed 16 or more ECO's

64% use a team process to determine entrance

59% use a team process to determine exit scores

88% collect data on the AA, IF and F during assessment and observations

71% use the decision tree

31% do not think their ECO rating is valid or reliability 69% think it is very or somewhat valid and reliable

30% they use the data to develop their EC program 70% use ECO data not at all or to a small extent.

In what way(s), if any, has collecting the Early Childhood Outcomes data influenced your practice as an Early Childhood Special Education Teacher?

Does not influence practice responses	Positive impact on practice responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paperwork • because it is required • seems arbitrary • extra step • little to do with how I teach • outcomes are subjective • more time • separate from eligibility and IEP • redundant and nuisance • time to do full anchor assessment • too much focus on testing not teaching • exit can result in questions about eligibility • increased workload • since done after IEP does not influence work with child • IEP influences EC practice not ECO • reporting requirement only • not useful • already collect information to develop IEP • time away from teaching • duplication of IEP/eligibility process • waste of time for SLP only students • write goals from assessment so ECO is an extra burden • Frustration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guide instruction • measure progress • use of Creative Curriculum skills • make decisions about curriculum and teaching methods • record of growth • helpful in writing goals, objectives, lesson plans • ensure focus for skills in all domains • helps parents give accurate input • increases parent input • baseline • look at the whole child • consistent way to look at child progress • help to understand developmental levels • anchor assessment useful data for practice • parents filling out forms for their input • more observation • more team communication about a typical child • layer of reporting • help to write goals and objective • maintain focus • like Creative Curriculum • understanding developmental stages • aware of progress

Other comments

- need more training, inconsistency between Infant Toddler Part C and Part B scores, SLP does not understand the reasoning for ECOs this information is repetitive of what is on IEP, concern for exit, don't understand ECOs

In what way(s), if any, has participating in the Early Childhood Outcomes data collection process changed the Early Childhood Special Education program that you work in?

No change to practice responses	Positively changed practice responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paperwork, just another form • more work not related to services provided by teacher • just what the state says to do • not relevant, not a useful tool • more time, not enough time to process paper during work hours • ECO areas are very broad in comparison to IEP goals • not a close connection to IEP goals • team does not want to take the time so do it alone • not valued by the team • too subjective • no feedback from the state on deficient areas • program will not change if ECOs goes away • more testing, SLP – case load too high and adds to much work • current practice lacks not a true picture of child • progress with most challenging students is not reflective in ECO reporting • outcomes do not reflect minimal growth of severe students • data is more important for developing goals and intervention than reporting outcomes • easier to see growth in IEP but not on an anchor assessment • takes time away from teaching • do not see how the information is used to improve the system • redundant • takes time away from kids; more meetings that takes time away from students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes parents more at the end of the program • good review of the whole child • decisions on how the child is doing • helps group children for intervention • address goals • record of growth • pushed to do exit testing for all students • better job of getting a wide range of information from multiple sources • for SLP only helps get full developmental picture • get a closer look at the child • more than standardized testing for PLOP • parent input • awareness of what is typical and normal • structured • planning for daily lessons • aligned to needs and standards • added depth • made me more aware of areas I was not teaching

Other comments

- Funding, want more input on how ECOs affects local programs, includes parents more at the end of the program, do well with entry and struggle with exit, don't understand it, more stressful

Attached are DRAFT Preschool IEP forms that are being considered to embed in the Early Childhood Outcomes into the preschool IEP process. Does the document flow easily from one section to the next so that gathering information from families, assessments, and IEP team members runs smoothly?

Negative Responses	Positive Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevancy • if language delay do we need to address social needs • waste of time • overlaps in many areas and feels like gathering same information that is already requested for goals • lengthy and redundant • don't like that each outcome has a goal under it • eligibility and IEP will be overwhelming to parents • why am I repeating IEP goal on outcome form • to lengthy, make process longer • timeline issues • too much testing before working with the child if using the AEPS • easier to write goals in domain areas verse ECO areas • issues in getting the exit scores from Part C to be used on an initial IEP • concern about changing focus of IEP • concern about assessing outcome each year, major concern doing ECO's every year if Feds only require at entrance and exit • too much to involve parents and make meeting time longer • not parent friendly, way too involved to present to parents, parents do not understand anchor assessment terminology, • complicated • will slow down the eligibility process • listing AA, IF, and F skills will slow the IEP process and should be in eligibility not IEP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No longer separate activity • makes IEP process longer but needs to be done • correct information is sent to the State • ties all components together • very clear about what skills are AA, IF, and F • clearly document strengths • need guidelines to write PLOPS • organized but long • provides families with more evidence about child's abilities • more collaboration with team • allows accountability for determination of skill level • makes ECO a valuable piece rather than separate • not a duplication

Other

- Part C and D need to be revamp since they are duplicating A, B and E flow well; A, B and C confusing D seems a duplication of eligibility E and F fine; won't know until I use it; a lot to incorporate; in PLOP it would make the column long if only filling out one of the skill area; issue with computer based IEP platforms; B and C should be combined

Does the form support the process of gathering information from families in a way that lead to functional, meaningful outcomes?

Negative Responses	Positive Responses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unrealistic to get every parent to give input • too cumbersome • not parent friendly • already gather parent information • collect information prior from families prior to IEP and eligibility • parents have already attended the eligibility meeting • too long, too many steps • makes meetings longer • do difficult to sit with family and develop IEP and fill out B section • makes families really sad to hear skills child is lacking • too much grief for parents • parents would have to fill out questionnaires ahead of time • keep documents separate since I do not understand the need for ECO document • ECO is only used to gather information and functional outcomes come out of the IEP as a team process • parents already providing information in evaluation and IEP • already doing meaningful observations and completing parent forms • COSF forms takes a lot more prodding of parents for information • difficult for parents to answer the question what are my child's strengths, hard for parents to articulate concerns • how much parent input do we need • parents don't know how to make sense of their child in regard to education • needs to be more parent friendly • parent is not a valuable member until parent teacher conferences • likes parent input but not AA, IF and F skills • gathering information from parents is good but not actuate for goal outcome without extensive observations • waste of time for every annual review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helps parents see how delays effect learning • gives staff and parents more information • parent input section good • important to have family input • incorporates family input better than current process • will improve involving parents in IEP process • like the parent input format • more functional for families • lessens duplication and lessens overwhelming families • streamline process, easy way to include family with functional goals • includes parent on each outcome

Other

- Annual review usually does not look at areas that are not identified as a need, belong in eligibility and IEP, no need for new form, does the parent have to agree with the team, parent are in denial about students abilities, awkward if family and staff do not agree

What part of the form do you like/or you most excited about?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not excited at all • time consuming • extra work • don't like every year • redundant, too long • needs to be concise • needs to be easier and more direct to read • makes ECO more difficult and less accurate • fits better in the eligibility report • make the ECO a separate section of the IEP but not part of the goal page • I am furious about this • less time to work with kids and parents • back off with the forms • IEP forms are trying to cover too much • logistical nightmare • not a functional IEP document • it is an ECOs dropped into an IEP • combines too many areas • does not allow each discipline to write their own area of performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Likes gathering information as part of a goal • parent input • it is there when you do the IEP • a function rather than a chore • good to have it all in one place • good to link to eGuidelines and goal • not separate entities • easy to incorporate Part C information • discussion assessment during services • streamline the gathering of information and completion of forms • one document • do not have to maintain separate information on website • all information plays a role in the development of the program • help team to look at whole child not just needs • more family input into the IEP process • making ECO part of a child's goal • not just simple jumping through another hoop like the previous process • like to look at scores every year not just at entrance and exit • like the goal format is the same • like that PLOP includes parent input and the 3 outcome areas • like that the focus is on what the student can do • like that I do not have to type a new PLOP in the same outcome area • like the chart to summarize the skills • writing goals for outcome areas • incorporating outcomes into PLOP and eligibility • using anchor increases accountability • assist teacher to focus on one paperwork set • decreases the duplication • for initial IEP less paperwork then filling out separate forms • encourages the team process • ECO scoring is done by the team not just the teacher • reminds to use eGuidelines
---	---