

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

<p>Text Response</p> <p>All of the Text Responses were verbatim from the ECO/IEP Survey provided by practitioners.</p>	<p>SDE Response</p>
<p><i>Will this take care of all of the goals required for an IEP or just be an additional area for goal writing? Can the teacher use a variety of means for data collection or is the teacher restricted to using the SDE approved data collection products? Do the ECOs address all of the standards?</i></p>	<p>The new process that embeds the ECO into the IEP process, including annual goal development, will fulfill the requirement for both the IEP process and the ECO's reporting. In addition to required SDE approved anchor assessment, teachers can and should use a variety of data collection sources. If the team feels a goal does not fit under one of the ECO's 3 reporting areas, the team can use the traditional IEP goal page to identify that goal. We would expect all standards to be able to fit under 3 outcomes. Choose the standard(s) most aligned to skill need. No need to list all standards that relate.</p>
<p><i>Will each form need to be completed for each goal? Will this be up for a trial period before we have to use it—just so the kinks can be worked out? If the student does not have delays in a particular outcome area then why are we including goals on an IEP? Why more goals, especially if goals are not needed in the specific area? Why would you add an outcome to the IEP if the student does not need that skill as a goal. Concerns about all of it. Will teams need to develop goals in areas where there are no needs? What if you are not writing goals for that area? What do you do if a child doesn't need goals in one of the areas.</i></p>	<p>The new process would require the team to address the student's present level of performance for each of the 3 early childhood outcome areas. However, if the student ratings a 6-7, the PLOP would indicate the student is currently performing age appropriately in this area and no IEP goal needs to be written.</p>
<p><i>Do we have to write IEP goals for each section of the ECO where the children fall below typically developing children? All of our children have special needs. They require specially designed instruction for the areas they struggle with. Not all children need to have social goals. I feel this will lead to us over identifying social and adaptive goals that will be addressed as children develop and learn language skills.</i></p>	<p>Yes, you would most likely write a goal for each section of the ECO where the child falls below typical development. The team makes the decision as to which skills/goals are the priorities for the IEP period. If there are areas of deficit in the OSEP accountability/outcome areas, we should develop programs and write goals just as we work to improve proficiency on statewide assessments for older students. All preschool teachers in the State of Idaho were invited to participate in a pilot project to test the new process. Seventeen teachers from all over the State utilized the forms in at least one preschool IEP.</p>
<p><i>So, do we complete this as part of the IEP and then have to enter it in on the State site too???</i></p>	<p>The IEP/ECO's new process would be completed as a team process and the ratings in the 3 ECO's would be submitted in for the SDE to be used in OSEP reporting for Indicator 7.</p>
<p><i>Does this replace the IEP or are you adding 9 pages??????? It does not fit the billing for Medicaid--Developmental Therapy.</i></p>	<p>The new process will incorporate the ECO's into the IEP forms. One form would be completed to meet both IEP and ECO requirements. This process fits ECO into the existing IEP process instead of doing a separate 4 page ECO document. After documentation of ECO process is embedded into IEP, team would enter the demographics and rating in the web-based system. Developmental Therapy will be changing under the new School-Based Medicaid Redesign and training will be offered to address</p>

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

	these concerns.
<i>Why are we assessing outcomes on children every year? Don't you do it on entering and exiting the program?</i>	An annual review of the present level of performance, student's ECO's ratings, and appropriate goals is part of evaluating the student's progress. There is no need expectation that the anchor assessment be completed annually. If expectation is that ECSE programs increase progress in 3 outcome areas, it makes sense to see how we are doing annually instead of waiting until the end of preschool years and so we can develop IEPs that promote the areas of need.
<i>Will there be an inservice for this new IEP form, with focus on Outcomes terminology, such as immediate foundational skills and foundational skills, ect.</i>	Training will be offered in a variety of formats, in person in each region of the State, archived electronic training modules, and on-going TA via Regional Coordinators and Early Childhood Coordinator.
<i>The forms are mostly user friendly but I am not sure that parents would understand them. For example; e--/what is the Performance Descriptor Scale & Decision Tree? If it is mentioned then it should be labeled for parents to understand. Is it necessary to list all of the eGuidelines or the ones you want to use?</i>	Comments provided by this survey were evaluated and implemented when appropriate assuring that all elements of Indicator 7 were addressed. The National ECO Center developed a Decision Tree that has been used in all ECO training since the program was implemented. There resource documents can be found on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse, Learning Communities, Early Childhood, EC Documents, ECO
<i>I am not sure how the embedded ECOs can be completed before we know the child. Often we receive BDIs from Infant Toddler Program or we do assessments to create Elig. Reports and write goals for IEP without really knowing the child. Then after 30-45 days of the child actually attending our program, we completed the ECO form. If this can streamline the paperwork, it would be good. I am just wondering how we are expected to collect the data needed for the ECOs before or during the IEP process. Parent information helps, but often is not totally accurate. I would think that I would need to do more 30 day placements of children, before writing their Elig. & IEPs. Is that your suggestion?</i>	<p>The ECO's timeline would be adjusted to become part of the eligibility and IEP process. Supporting documents will be developed to help teams gather the necessary information during the screening and eligibility process. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.</p> <p>We have 60days to complete evaluations and to determine eligibility. We encourage teams to develop time and procedures to gather the most accurate data to determine eligibility and write an initial IEP understanding that new information can be added using the amendment and annual review process.</p>
<i>We do not do classroom observation before a student starts in the ECSE classroom, how are we supposed to rate how they function in the classroom without observing the child for a few weeks?</i>	<p>Observations should happen as a part of a comprehensive initial evaluation for a young child, which could include information collected during screening, meeting with parents, classroom visits, etc. Also information is collected from parent on how the child functions during typical routines and activities in the home.</p> <p>Supporting documents will be developed to help teams gather the necessary information during the screening and eligibility process. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance has improved and is not accurately</p>

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

	reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.
<i>I am concerned about the increased time it will take to gather and compile this information. Will it be more meaningful? Yes. Will it take time away from serving children? Yes.</i>	The process of embedding the ECO's into the IEP process will decrease the need for teachers to complete duplicate paperwork that utilizes most of the same information.
<i>The 3 drafts were only different because of the three outcomes but they all had Positive Social Emotional Skills under the Outcome Area Grid in part e. of the Present Level of Performance. Would this be changed to match the 3 Outcomes?</i>	Fixed
<i>Clarification on some terms decision tree and performance descriptor scale. Unclear why we are writing the goals on this sheet if they are in the IEP.</i>	The ECO and the IEP forms would be combined into one form. The student's identified goals would be written and reported under one of the ECO headings.
<i>How this relates to IEP writing? Excent?</i>	The IEP goals would be done as they have always been done just reported under one of the ECO headings. Once the forms are approved by the State Board of Education, they will be sent to the various IEP platforms for integration into their system. These forms will be available through Excent if that is the platform your district uses.
<i>How do you include goals that are not tied to the outcomes (as the articulation example above)? Do you have to do the ECO's at every yearly IEP review or only the initial? How is the exit data done as the IEP will continue beyond the child's participation in ECSE?</i>	If the team feels a goal does not fit under one of the ECO's 3 reporting areas, the team can use the traditional IEP goal page to identify that goal. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.
<i>Why they are necessary</i>	In 2005, the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) began requiring State Early Intervention and Preschool Special Education programs to report on child outcomes and the family indicator. For child outcomes, States are required to report on the percent of infants and toddlers with Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) or preschool children with Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) who demonstrate improved: 1.Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships); 2.Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication [and early literacy]); and 3.Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.
<i>I am assuming this will replace the original IEP?</i>	Yes
<i>Background of the flow from age-appropriate to immediate foundation to foundational skills. Are we going to spend a fair amount of time discovering/discussing each of these items per</i>	Yes, you will be putting

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

area/goal. Do you have just take the eGuidelines and run the sequence?? What's the plan?	
1. If a child only qualifies for IEP goals in one area, do all 3 goal pages need to be included in order to address all three outcomes? How does that work for goals on subsequent annual reviews? 2. It says that General Content Standards need to include ALL eguideline standards related to the annual goal. Is this the case? 3. This form looks like we have to complete the ECO information gathering and ranking process not only at entry and exit, but also at annual reviews. Is this the case?	1. The new process would require the team to address the student's present level of performance for each of the 3 early childhood outcome areas. However, if the student ratings a 6-7, no IEP goal needs to be written. 2. The team would pick the most appropriate eGuidelines/standard to address the area of need. 3. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.
Why is this necessary? There is already one form for this can be found in confidential files for initials, so why do we have to re-do everything? For annuals why do we have to do this? I thought ECOs were an entrance and exit procedure, doing it at every annual would not make it that, it would be a yearly thing. How are we supposed to service children and complete this additional paperwork? Why should we bombard parents with every single standard? How can parents easily identify the skill area (ex. fine motor, gross motor, articulation, etc). As a parent, "Social Skills" is much easier to understand as a domain instead of "Positive Social-Emotional Skills, Including Social Relationships."	Progress monitoring on a regular basis and annually collecting PLOP has always been the requirement and expectation. This is not additional paperwork. There is not the expectation that every standard be provided to the parent for every goal. Rather give the parent enough information to help them understand the skill you are addressing appropriate for that student. You help them see the connection between the IEP annual goals and what students are expected to learn to be successful.
I'm not exactly sure what you want on the Present Level of Performance b and c.	Section b and c have been modified based on information provided in this survey.
In the section with the State Approved Anchor Assessment and date completed, what is meant by Annual Review Rating? What rating are you referring to? When doing a curriculum based assessment like the AEPS or the developmental checklist from the Brigance or the Creative Curriculum, there is no total rating. These are just a checklist of skills. Also, we don't do annual ratings, just an entrance and exit rating for ECOs.	During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, and the new process will now allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.
I feel like for 3 year olds coming from Infant Toddler this form is too soon coming before we know the child. Often parents tell us the child can do something when they can't or have only done it once. Also we have found the ECO's (exit)coming from Infant Toddler to be optimistic. We get a much better and correct picture after having them in class for a couple of weeks.	Most of the Infant Toddler services are provided in the student's home, so it is expected that some children will rating lower upon entrance to the LEA then they exited out of the Infant Toddler Program. Supporting documents will be developed to help teams gather the necessary information during the screening and eligibility process. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the students new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program. Information from the Infant Toddler Program is only one piece of information used to rate a student.

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

	Each district has an interagency agreement that is signed and reviewed yearly, to address the timelines of student's being served in the Part C program. Whenever possible, transitions from Part C to Part B should be started allowing for adequate time to get an accurate assessment of a child's functioning. Initial assessment, when possible, needs to start 60 days before turning 3.
<i>Would the state then choose one anchor assessment or would we still have choices? One concern I have is, is this going to increase the size of an IEP? (ie: regularly 10 pages to 15 or 20 pages)</i>	The State approved anchor assessments would continue to be the same. The new process has the potential of increasing the size of the IEP by 3 pages, but it decreases the need to report the same information in two separate documents.
<i>If a district uses a checklist format, such as the Creative Curriculum, would you want a copy of that stapled to the IEP, so the parents would have access to the information of where their child is, and what they need to do in order to become age appropriate in their skills?</i>	No, teachers would summarize the information that was gathered from whatever Anchor Assessment was used and report that information on the new IEP forms. They would also use the section for Age Appropriate Skills, Immediate Foundational, and Foundational section to report areas of need.
<i>What is expected to be typed in section (b) boxes. How much detail is required? Would we write a regular PLOP in this section that links to our eligibility form/testing?</i>	The section used to note what Age Appropriate, Immediate Foundational, and Foundational skills that the student possesses. Some areas will be more extensive than others based on the student's abilities. The team would write a PLOP meeting all of the requirements of IDEA that reflects the student's abilities, base line of current functioning in identified need area, and a comparison to typically developing peer. This information would be linked to eligibility, testing, parent input, observation, and State approved Anchor Assessment.
<i>b. I have questions on how to categorize the Immediate Foundational Skills and the Foundational Skills. Currently I list child's strengths according to evaluation, observations and parent input in the area, then the needs, then add the age appropriate skills, then we draft a goal. It would be helpful to see a completed form. Also, in section e, do we update the ratings at the annual review and include the previous rating?</i>	Guidance documents with sample forms are being developed and will be provided during training. Yes.
<i>Too much information before the actual goal. I feel we overwhelm the parents with the DOE information and they have trouble understanding their child's present level as measured by the standardized evaluations. Our team keeps the Ecos data and form with our working binders and use it very well as a separate document.</i>	This is a good opportunity to assist parents in understanding their child's abilities and how they can partner with the school's developmental preschool to educate their child.
<i>No objectives/benchmarks. They may not be required by federal law but are required for ISAT-ALT, so are required in this district for all students. it's the right thing to do for parents. All 3 forms have the "Positive Social Emotional Skills" box under e instead of the other 2 Outcomes.</i>	Students in LEA development programs do not participate in the ISAT-ALT. The federal reporting requirement for Idaho's 3-5 year olds in developmental preschool programs is the Early Childhood Outcomes. We have fixed the skill areas under section e.
<i>How does Outcome 1, 2 & 3 mesh with the areas the child qualifies in? For example, if I have a child who only qualifies in the Cognitive area, do I still have to fill out a goal sheet that</i>	The new process would require the team to address the student's present level of performance for each of the 3 early childhood outcome areas. However, if the student

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

<i>describes Outcome 1: Positive Social-Emotional Skills if the child is not going to have a social goal? And Outcome 3: taking care of basic needs? Will I always have 3 goal sheets even when the child only qualifies in one area and needs goals in only one area?</i>	ratings a 6-7, no IEP goal needs to be written. Even though a child might only have a need in one Outcome area, there is a federal mandate to report in all 3 outcome areas.
How can I as a speech pathologist be expected to evaluate social emotional skills, motor skills, self help skills, pre reading and math skills and all the other things that the creative curriculum (or other assessments necessary to evaluate objectives 1,2,3) address? so many of these things are really out my scope of expertise and a lot of times I am the only one evaluating the child. If I am writing an artic only goal and I am only concerned about objective 2, can I skip objective 1 and 3 as it really does not relate?	ECO ratings are supposed to be complete as a team progress, gathering information from a variety of sources. All students receiving EC Special Education services are required to complete ECO data. Students must be evaluated in all 3 Outcome levels. If the student ratings a 6 or 7 on a particular outcome no goal needs to be identified. LEA teams can decide how they complete comprehensive evaluations for the initial eligibility and it should be done through a team process.
Section C needs to be revamped or imbedded into another section. It is confusing and somewhat unnecessary perhaps. Overall, I think that the sections needs to be reevaluated and could possibly be even further reduced.	Input was taken into consideration and the form has been modified to reflect survey responses.
I have absolutely no idea of what you are looking for in section C. A and B discuss what the student is doing: immediate foundational and age appropriate skills as well as stating what typical same age peers are able to do, showing you what you need to be working on with your student. (Is this the right usage?)	Input was taken into consideration and the form has been modified to reflect survey responses. Guidance documents with sample forms are being developed and will be provided during training.
For Annual Reviews when there is no need for additional ECOS reporting (until exit) would the IEP goal pages remain the same? What does the "annual review" of each ECO area amount to?	During the student's annual IEP meeting, the team will discuss if the student (without doing an additional anchor assessment) has made progress during the last school year to move on the ECO's rating scale.
When do we spend time with kids and families after paperwork?	This new process would not require any more paperwork than what is already required. However, instead of completing two different forms, the IEP and ECO's COSF-R forms, IEP teams would only be required to complete one sent of paperwork.
How is this process going to help parents understand the education of their child? Why is so much information in the present levels of performance necessary? Part C: "Based on assessment information, present level of performance and observation in a variety of settings and situations...." - What academic activities would be necessary to include with an initial IEP? We are not working towards academic success, we are working towards developmental success.	Supplemental information will be developed, in collaboration with IPUL, to assist IEP teams to educate parents. Present Levels are a necessary component in articulating the needs of the student in comparison to typically developing peers, a baseline to measure growth, and incorporate information gathered from a variety of sources. Part of a student's development is the growth in pre-academic activities.
I am assuming that if the child's functioning is age-appropriate the space will be marked and the rest of the form and the rest will be left blank. Are we rating the children at every annual review?	When completing the new draft forms, the IEP team will identify those skills that the student has that are considered age appropriate and report those skills in that section, if the student has intermediate foundational or foundational skills, these would be reported in those sections as well.
How to do the total assessment before the children are in the program less than 45 days.	The ECO's timeline would be adjusted to become part of the eligibility and IEP process. Supporting documents will be

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

	<p>developed to help teams gather the necessary information during the screening and eligibility process. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the student's new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program.</p>
<p>How can a team write the plops together when there is very very little time for collaboration as it is? Would the echoes then have to be reported at every annual review?...entrance and exit is quite sufficient. What about the transition year? Two different IEP's for every kiddo going into kindergarten? COME ON PLEASE Do you really want to take that much more of the professionals allotted time to spend on paperwork when a good system is already in place that is so much more cohesive? What about the District's desire to keep things the same across preschool, elementary, and secondary Special Education? Who is gonna pay for the required observations across settings and when will this occur?</p>	<p>The ECO's timeline would be adjusted to become part of the eligibility and IEP process. Supporting documents will be developed to help teams gather the necessary information during the screening and eligibility process. During the student's annual review, if the student's performance is not accurately reflected in the initial rating, it can be changed to reflect the student's new ECO's rating. Ratings will still only be reported at entrance and exit to the SDE, it does allow the team to change the rating as the child progresses through the EC program. The new process will be part of Idaho's IEP so when a child transitions into Kindergarten a new IEP will not be needed until the student's annual IEP date, as is the current process. This new process would not require any more paperwork than what is already required. However, instead of completing two different forms, the IEP and ECO's COSF-R forms, IEP teams would only be required to complete one set of paperwork. Currently, there are additional forms required for secondary Special Education so the precedence is set to meet the needs of the program by embedding IDEA requirements into Idaho's IEP process.</p>
<p>not sure what is meant by state approved anchor assessment not sure what is meant by foundational skills</p>	<p>The State has identified 10 anchor assessments that districts can choose from to complete at the entrance and exit for a student in the ECSE programs. A list of State approved anchor assessments can be found on the Idaho Training Clearinghouse, Learning Communities, Early Childhood, EC documents, ECO.</p> <p>Foundational skills are those skills exhibited by a much younger child.</p>
<p>1. As mentioned above, does each specialist have to fill out the ECOS portion on their goal page? 2. There are not places for "objectives" after each "goal".</p>	<p>The IEP and ECO's process is completed by a team that includes the parent. If the team thinks an objective is necessary they can be included.</p>
<p>How are we supposed to adequately answer question 1. c. under each outcome when we have not seen the student in an academic setting? What is the purpose of question 1. f.? It does not make sense. Where am I supposed to write objectives under the annual goal? What exactly is the purpose of putting the outcome ratings into the IEP document? Do we report on outcome area annual instead of at entrance and exit as it is now? If so, are we supposed to do an updated anchor assessment each time? What is the purpose then of writing an IEP? If we are required to do an anchor assessment each year</p>	<p>Input was taken into consideration and the form has been modified to reflect survey responses. Regional training will be provided and supporting documents developed to assist IEP teams in utilizing the new ECO/IEP process.</p>

25. What part of the form do you have questions about? Please explain:

will we be required to obtain consent to evaluate and write an evaluation report annually? If so, what is the purpose of the 3 year re-evaluation? How do we write IEPs for speech only students who do not need goals in the areas of social-emotional, literacy, or taking actions to meet needs?	
---	--