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Why Develop an Assessment System?

• Mounting Pressure for More Formal Assessments
  – Standards and assessment movement within the K-12 system
  – Evidence of potential impact of early intervention
  – Increasing investments in early childhood education
  – Desire to “close the gap”
  – NCLB & Good Start Grow Smart
  – Head Start Reauthorization
Considerations

• No common set of assessment tools used by programs or states
  – Gilliam & Zigler (2001) identified 42 different assessments used in 13 states

• Some tools measure multiple domains; others measure one domain
Considerations

• Different types of assessments being used in the field
  – Naturalistic assessments (e.g., work samples, observation, teacher checklist)
    • Example: Work Sampling System, High/Scope COR (Child Observation Record)
  – Standardized, norm-referenced
    • Example: DIAL-III (Developmental Indicators for Assessment of Learning); PPVT
Considerations

• No assessment is cheap - Costs associated with assessment system implementation
  – Design
  – Training
  – Data collection
  – Data management & analysis
  – Reporting writing & dissemination

• Generally, the lower the stakes the lower the cost
Some Disagreement in the Field About Assessment

- Which type of assessment is better – naturalistic assessment vs. standardized assessment?
- Is it OK to use assessments of young children for high-stakes purposes?
- Should we use teacher-reported child assessment data to make decisions about programs and teachers?
- Can we use one assessment tool for multiple purposes?
Considerations Regarding Assessments Themselves

- No assessment is perfect
- Informal assessment is hallmark of the field but does not easily lend itself to the types of data needed
- Some domains have more assessment options
- Still working to establish predictive validity, reliability with various populations, etc.
KY Principles & Recommendations for Assessments

• Assessments should....
  – Bring about benefits
  – Be tailored to purpose
  – Be reliable, valid & fair for particular age & setting
  – Be age-appropriate in content and method
  – Be linguistically appropriate
  – Use parents as a valued source of & audience for assessment information
The Kentucky Approach

• Review the current child standards
• Determine key desired features of assessments
  – technical adequacy
• Identify assessments currently in use in the state
• Evaluate adequacy of those assessment tools
• Link child standards with assessment tools determined technically adequate
• Develop a data platform system to collect the data across programs
Three Assessment Distinctions

• Screening
  - “the use of a brief procedure or instrument designed to identify, from within a large population of children, those who may need further assessment to verify developmental and/or health risks” CCSSO, 2004

• Diagnostic
  - identify specific areas where children are not making progress; assist with determination of eligibility for services under IDEA; analyze nature and degree of developmental difficulties to guide an IFSP or IEP.

• Classroom/Instructional (CR or CB)
  - “an ongoing process of observing a child's current competencies (including knowledge, skills, dispositions and attitudes) and using the information to help the child develop further in the context of family and caregiving and learning environments” CCSSO, 2004
KY EC Data System

• Develop a universal data system to reliably collect and analyze assessment data from
  – Public Preschool, Early Intervention, Head Start and Child Care providers

• to measure child progress on
  – KY Benchmarks and Standards
  – 3 Child Outcomes required for Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP)

• across 12 potential CR-CB assessment tools
Approved Assessment Tools

- Preschool Child Observation Record (COR)
- Creative Curriculum
- Brigance Inventory of Early Development-II (IED-II)
- Assessment, Evaluation, & Programming System (AEPS)
- Learning Accomplishment Profile–3 (LAP–3)
- Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP)
- Carolina Curriculum for Infants and Toddlers and for Preschoolers with Special Needs (CCITSN, CCPSN)
- Work Sampling System, Ounce (WSS/WSHS)

---

- School District Choices
- EI Choices
- Child Care Choices
- Head Start Choices
Why KEDS?

• Support improved instruction through continuous assessment
• Improve outcomes for children
• Allow flexibility to choose reliable assessment tools at local level
• Document child outcomes
Overarching Principle

- Designed to:
  - be used by all programs and all children, including those who have special needs, those from culturally diverse backgrounds, children who are at-risk (economically and developmentally), and those who are typically developing.
Desire to ensure the system could be refined to measure different required outcomes without changing assessment and practice at the local level.
Key Steps

1. Data Collection
2. Data Reliability
3. Data Analysis & Reporting
Data Collection Systems

Step 1

Design web portal

Design data import functions for assessment data and demographic data

Design data export functions
Reliability of data – consistency of the data entry across informants

Degree to which the data gathered are measuring what was intended.

Degree to which the data are gathered accurately across informants

Reliability, Validity & Fidelity

Step 2
Data Analyses for KEDS

Step 3

- Develop Syntax based on crosswalk and age anchoring
- Develop formulas for each reporting category
- Test and Refine Data Analyses for KEDS
Advantages for Programs

- Rich data set-items, benchmarks, standards
- Inclusive Standards-includes all children, all programs birth to five years
- Provides normed sample specific to KY
- Consistent with KY’s quality framework
- State-level analyses/responsive to outcome changes
- Flexibility of choices-
  - For assessment instruments
  - For modalities of data collection (online, disc, paper)
Advantages for Teachers

• Builds on best practice for continuous assessment
• Enables thorough knowledge of children
• Builds on KY standards already in use
• Eliminates extra work for teachers in assessing solely for agency specific outcomes
• Allows choices: best assessments for
  – child
  – program
Advantages for Children

• Reduced assessment burden
  – Within and across programs
• Use of appropriate assessment for child
• Immediate information for teacher about child strengths and needs to support program planning
Challenges

- Development of a decision criteria process and tools for reporting of data across instruments
- Ensuring reliability and validity of data collected
- Documentation of needed support and costs for local programs
- Alignment of standards sets (birth to three, three and four, K-12) within and across instruments
- Addressing outliers
  - Children at the five-year-old level
  - Children with significant disabilities
Addressing the Challenge of Multiple Data Systems

- Develop a process for alignment across 12 Recommended CR-CB Assessments
Current Number of Children in System

- Public Preschool = 13,323
- Head Start = 3,171
- Early Intervention = 1,006
- Child Care = 115

- Total = 17,615
Types of Reports Produced

• Aggregate Summary by:
  – OSEP Outcome (current)
  – KY EC Standards (2011)

• By State & District or County

• By Program Type

• Disaggregated by Child Demographics as determined by oversight agency
Sample Report: OSEP Outcome 1- Positive Social Emotional Skills

Children without IEPs

- A: no improvement (2%)
- B: some improvement (3%)
- C: improved nearer to age-appropriate peers (8%)
- D: achieved age-appropriate level (54%)
- E: maintained age-appropriate level (33%)

All Children

- A: no improvement (2%)
- B: some improvement (9%)
- C: improved nearer to age-appropriate peers (7%)
- D: achieved age-appropriate level (49%)
- E: maintained age-appropriate level (34%)

Children with IEPs

- A: no improvement (19%)
- B: some improvement (5%)
- C: improved nearer to age-appropriate peers (12%)
- D: achieved age-appropriate level (30%)
- E: maintained age-appropriate level (19%)
Overall System Challenges

• Assessments for children with significant disabilities
• Reliability of assessment data and data entry
• Ability of program administrators and providers to use data to inform daily practice

• Changing Leadership across state programs
• Requests to use outcome data for other purposes.
Kentucky Early Childhood Data System (KEDS)

https://www.kedsonline.org/