Equity in Family Outcomes: Self-Assessment for Family Outcomes Cohort
Part 2: Equitable Family Outcomes
Last updated: July 7, 2020
State Team: INSERT STATE NAME

Purpose: The purpose of this self-assessment is to support state-level Part C leadership interested in examining their systems with regard to the extent to which their current systems are producing equitable family outcomes across all families.

Examining the overall Early Intervention systems set up for serving infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families, requires that states must reflect on overarching questions such as:

- To what extent are family outcomes equitable across families served?
- How are you analyzing data to determine equitable outcomes? Which variables are you using to analyze the data? Do you have ready access to the variables needed to analyze the data for equity?
- Where are the outcomes not equitable?
- Who can we engage and how can we examine the data to understand why outcomes are not equitable?
- What changes might be made to create a more equitable system of services?

Self-Assessment: To get started on the self-assessment, a state will pull together existing family outcomes data as well as respond to new self-reflection questions included in the tables below that relate to equitable family outcomes.

- Existing data: Tables and charts of family outcomes data analyzed by key demographic variables. Recommended variables are: Recommended variables are race/ethnicity, primary language, income, geographic location. Ideally trend data for 3-5 years.

- New data: State team self-assessment of EI system and the extent to which it is set up for serving all children and families equitably. The items presented in this self-assessment are not an exhaustive list but are select items from the System Framework and includes key questions about the governance and personnel structures to better understand how meaningful family engagement is embedded in the system.

Existing Data: Looking at family outcomes data by demographic variables

Look-Think-Act is a simple protocol for the process that teams and practitioners might use when analyzing their data. This protocol involves three steps:
1. Look – Examine data for trends, meaningful associations
2. Think – Ask questions related to the data that might help with interpretation
3. Act – Make decisions as a team and identify the action plan needed to put the decision in place

In the "Look" step, teams should refrain from jumping to an inference about the data. In the initial review of the data, teams should identify what they see factually without coming to conclusions. As teams examine the data, they might:
• Identify patterns
• Identify discrepancies
• Look for unexpected results
• Identify questions that result from the data review
• Identify the need to access additional data

In the "Think" step, teams engage in a discussion to make interpretations about the data. The team records notes to begin to identify their inferences or conclusions based on the data that offer evidence for those conclusions. During the "Think" step, teams might ask:
• What factors might be associated with the results indicated by the data?
• What areas of the data need more inquiry or additional data to understand?
• What are major themes or conclusions that we are ready to make from our review of the data?

In the "Act" step, teams identify actions that will be implemented in response to conclusions from the data. Team action steps might include multiple actions, the collection of additional data, or a decision to continue to monitor a particular situation or data set. Actions might involve steps related to:
• Changes to policy or procedures
• Providing training or coaching
• Strengthening family engagement
• Improving data collection and analysis procedures

A few critical questions specific to the family outcomes data:
- What are the different groups we would expect to be represented in the family outcomes data? Are we analyzing the data by these groups?
- Which groups have higher or lower family outcomes data?
- What might be possible explanations for differences in family outcomes? How would we investigate those possible explanations?
- Have family outcomes data changed for some groups over time? If yes, how? Can those changes be related to any state activities/approaches or current context?
- What system or service barriers exist that may lead to lower family outcomes? What activities would address those barriers?
- Who else might we included in the interpretation of these data before we determine appropriate actions?

- What other data can you connect to your family outcomes data (that could be helpful for drilling down into improving the system and services and ultimately outcomes)? E.g., Is there a correlation between family outcomes and family visit cancelations? Are family outcomes higher for some practitioners? Is there a correlation between family outcomes and discharge reasons?

New Data: Reflecting on the current family EI System

To what extent is the state's EI system set up for accomplishing equitable outcomes across all families served? The items presented here are intended to help examine the state infrastructure to understand the extent to which the current system is set up to promote equity in services and outcomes. The items in this self-assessment are not an exhaustive list but are select items from the System Framework and includes key questions about the governance and personnel structures to better understand how meaningful family engagement is embedded in the system. Next to the framework item is an additional 'equity focus' that digs deeper into the self-reflection about the current system.

Put an X in the column that best matches the team self-assessment of the system. The state team should ask themselves – is this item in place Y/N. If yes, is it fully in place or only partially. If no, is that state working on it or not? Use the Evidence column to provide information that explains the rating selected and other details the team would like to capture.

GOVERNANCE: State, regional and/or local system entities are designed to maximize meaningful family engagement in the development and implementation of the system (GV5).

		NO		Yes		
		Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence:
FRAMEWORK ITEM	**EQUITY FOCUS**					
Decisions about system structures support equitable representation of families on the state Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC), local ICCs, task forces, and committees.	Groups include families that are diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					
Part C and 619 state staff or representatives support (e.g. through stipends, transportation, information and preparation, convenient time and location, mentoring, FTE, consulting fee) family members' active roles on councils, committees, and task forces to allow their full	The system supports families that are diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					

participation and input into system decisions related to areas such as policies, training and TA, monitoring, and program improvement.			
There are ongoing system-wide efforts to recruit families that are representative of the demographics of the state and local communities and support their leadership development.	The system recruits families that are diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.		

PERSONNEL: A cross-sector leadership team is in place that can set priorities and make policy, governance, and financial decisions related to the personnel system (PN1).

		NO		Yes		
FRAMEWORK ITEM	EQUITY FOCUS	Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence: (Questions/Probes for TA providers):
The composition of the leadership team represents key partners from cross-sector early childhood systems, technical assistance programs, institutions of higher education, parent organizations as well as any other relevant stakeholders across disciplines.	Key partners are also diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					
Additional stakeholder input, including from families, is actively solicited and considered by the leadership team in setting priorities and	Stakeholders are diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					

determining governance decisions.						

PERSONNEL: State personnel standards across disciplines are aligned to national professional organization personnel standards (PN3).

		NO		Yes		
		Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence:
FRAMEWORK ITEM	**EQUITY FOCUS**					
State personnel standards are based on core knowledge and skills needed for working with young children and their families in cross-sector early childhood systems.	This includes knowledge and skills related to cultural competencies and working with diverse families.					

PERSONNEL: A statewide system for inservice personnel development and technical assistance is in place for personnel across disciplines (PN7).

		NO		Yes		
		Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence:
FRAMEWORK ITEM	**EQUITY FOCUS**					
Inservice personnel development employs evidence-based professional development practices that incorporate a variety of adult learning strategies including job embedded applications such as coaching, reflective supervision and supportive mentoring.	This includes PD opportunities related to cultural competencies and working with diverse families.					

		NO		Yes		
		Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence:
Families and/or parent organization participate in the design and delivery of inservice personnel development.	This includes families diverse by race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					

PERSONNEL: Comprehensive recruitment and retention strategies are being implemented across disciplines (PN10).

		NO		Yes		
FRAMEWORK ITEM	**EQUITY FOCUS**	Not working on it (1)	Working on it (2)	Partially (3)	Fully (4)	Evidence:
(No one specific item here.)	A variety of strategies are used to recruit and retain personnel who bring diverse backgrounds including race, ethnicity, primary language, income, literacy level, etc.					