**IL- Child Outcomes Summary Process Checklist**

**SC Name: \_\_\_\_**JC**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Meeting Type (circle one):** Initial Annual Exit

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Please indicate the extent to which the team used these practices:** | Yes/No (Y/N) | Evidence/Notes |
| Including the family: The team | | |
| Communicates with the family about the COS process in an unbiased way by:   * discussing the meaning of the three outcomes | Y | A way to measure progress and see how the program is doing; provided descriptor of each outcome |
| * describing the rating criteria, and | Y | Described what odd number items mean |
| * explaining how the family will be involved in the process | Y | Talked about hearing from interventionists and then from the mother |
| Shares what data is collected and that it is used to evaluate the program | Y | Shared that she would be looking for information from both interventionists and family and used to evaluate program |
| Uses the “COS at IFSP” document to explain the process at the ISFP meeting | N |  |
| Discusses the types of information that will be useful for the process. Examples (as appropriate) may include:   * reports from parents and/or other caregivers, * information from intake (RBI and ASQ:SE), * information from the referral source, * evaluations, * observations, and * progress reports | N | Used multiple sources but did not discuss; also this was an annual, so intake and referral source info would have been old |
| Both listens to the family and shares information to build respectful partnerships that are responsive to the family’s cultural practices and beliefs | Y | Listens and shares; whole team good at this; mentioned that other daughter used bottle longer (family/cultural? Practice) |
| Uses an EI enrolled interpreter when needed to ensure understanding | Y | Used an interpreter and paused for interpretation of information |
| Routinely checks for understanding by team members before moving on | Y | Makes sure that the mom doesn’t have questions and that she is in agreement with what has been shared. |
| Understanding child functioning: The team | | |
| Shares information they have about the child’s functional skills for each of the 3 child outcomes | Y | DT and PT both described skills that they have observed and mentioned others that they would be expecting to see given his age; really nice examples of how expected skills will help with functioning in day to day environment!! |
| Discusses the child’s current functioning in each outcome area, including gathering information from the family about the child’s participation in everyday activities across settings. | Y | PT references that mom shared that he is more reserved and serious when in newer settings; SC asked for mom’s input on what she sees |
| Ensures that information from multiple sources is considered for each outcome, e.g., family input, other observations, assessment, progress monitoring, child care providers, specialists, etc. | Y | Family input, intervention information, and assessment information |
| Discusses the child’s current use of skills related to age-expected development (incorporating age anchors as necessary), including skills the child has and has not yet developed. | Y | Some discussion of skills expected; described some skills as being like that of a younger child; noted foundational skills |
| Building Consensus: The team | | |
| Uses available resources/materials to reach consensus and provide accurate ratings. | N | Team reached consensus without the use of resources/materials; not sure about accuracy of ratings given limited labeling of skills as AE, IF or F |
| Discusses the rating for each outcome in descriptive terms, NOT using a number. | Y | 1. Between emerging and somewhat 2. Emerging 3. Emerging |
| Reaches consensus for each outcome’s rating. | Y | Checked in with all team members to check for shared understanding of rating; gained consensus before moving to next discussion |
| Ensures that the ratings are consistent with the information shared and discussed, verifying that sufficient evidence has been discussed to support the rating. | y | Don’t know age of child so hard to age anchor; only know that he is more than a year old; many of the examples shared were under appropriate outcome area |
| Documentation: The team | | |
| Documents the rating in Cornerstone (ASO3 screen) | Y | After the meeting due to no internet |
| Includes sufficient evidence for the rating in the documentation (e.g., captures the reason for the rating) | Y | SC took notes in Word document as meeting progressed |