

CHILD OUTCOMES SUMMARY FORM

Program Name: Preschool

Rating purpose (choose one): (Entry) Periodic # _____ Exit

Date: 10 / 7 / 09

Mon Day Yr

Child Information

Name: _____ Tony _____

Date of birth: 6 / 28 / 06
 Mon Day Yr

ID: _____ xxxxx _____

Persons involved in deciding the summary ratings:

Name	Role
	Early Childhood Special Education Teacher
	SLP
	Teacher

Family information on child functioning (Check all that apply):

- Received in team meeting
- Collected separately
- Incorporated into assessment(s)
- Not included



We start the COSF review process by asking, ‘Is anything missing?’

Missing information --

- No family name – perhaps because information was collected separately from the family and incorporated into assessment?

Note on cover sheet --

- Place to record ‘entry’ versus ‘periodic’ on the form – some state and local programs have made the decision to use the COSF periodically in order to 1- collect interim data that will show progress patterns, 2- for practice doing the COSF ratings, 3- to integrate the COSF into the IEP process

1. POSITIVE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL SKILLS (INCLUDING SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS)

To answer the questions below, think about the child’s functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- *Relating with adults*
- *Relating with other children*
- *Following rules related to groups or interacting with others (if older than 18 months)*

1a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7

Supporting evidence for answer to Question 1a

Source of information	Date	Summary of Relevant Results
Vineland	x/x/xx	Indicated a mild social delay
Brigance	x/x/xx	Able to engage in simple pretend play with others, participate in group activities, show preferences for some friends over others, respond to adults, often follow directions with some reminders, and begin to share and take turns with assistance. Social weaknesses include demonstrating some aggression and defiance at times.

1b. (If Question 1a has been answered previously): **Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to positive social-emotional skills (including positive social relationships) since the last outcomes summary?** (Circle one number)

Yes	1 →	Describe progress:
No	2	

Anything missing for Outcome 1?

- Should have a bigger variety of assessment data sources, because ECO always recommends that COSF ratings include family report and observation, as well as more formal assessment tool information. But if the Vineland was used, that may count as parent input? Was the ‘social weaknesses’ described above found as part of the administration of the Brigance or were they observed or reported? If they were observed or reported, they should be recorded in a different row with a different assessment data source listed (observation or parent report).

Does the evidence match the outcome area?

- Because we’re looking at functional everyday behaviors and skills – those skills do often cross outcomes. For example, ‘simple pretend play’ might be part of Outcome 2. Also ‘following directions with some reminders’ would inform Outcome 2.

Does the evidence match the rating?

- A rating of ‘6’ was decided for Tony’s social-emotional skills. According to the guidance at this link -- http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~eco/assets/pdfs/Documentation_Key-Mecklenburg.pdf -- a rating of 6 means that the evidence should:
 - Provide examples of the child’s age-appropriate functioning.
 - Note concerns
 - If there is evidence of functioning that is not age appropriate, a rating of 6 or 7 should not be assigned

These were addressed as follows:

- ‘Provide examples of the child’s age-appropriate functioning.’
 - Examples of age-appropriate functioning, from the Brigance, include
 - show preferences for some friends over others, -- 3-0
 - begin to share and take turns with assistance -- 3-0, 3-6
- Note concerns.’ Some concerns might include the mild social delay and the social weaknesses. It would be easier for the reviewer if these were labeled, ‘concerns.’
- ‘If there is evidence of functioning that is not age appropriate, a rating of 6 or 7 should not be assigned. Some of the other skills are actually listed in the Brigance under earlier age levels, such as
 - Able to engage in simple pretend play with others, -- with adult supervision = 2-6
 - participate in group activities, -- group games = 2-6
 - respond to adults, 2-0

- Aggression and defiance are difficult to age anchor, though the CDC milestones say that 3 year olds ‘demonstrate a wide range of emotions.’

The evidence shows a mix of age appropriate functioning and functioning like that of a younger child, which may mean the rating could be a 5. The quality reviewer follow up with the team to ask them what made them decide a rating of 6 rather than 5.

2. ACQUIRING AND USING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

To answer the questions below, think about the child’s functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Thinking, reasoning, remembering, and problem solving
- Understanding symbols
- Understanding the physical and social worlds

2a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely
1	(2)	3	4	5	6	7

Supporting evidence for answer to Question 2a

Source of information	Date	Summary of Relevant Results
Speech eval	Xx/x/xx	Danny’s verbal speech is unintelligible with or without context cues

2b. (If Question 2a has been answered previously): Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to acquiring and using knowledge and skills since the last outcomes summary? (Circle one number)

Yes	1 →	Describe progress:
No	2	

For Outcome 2 we are looking at another preschooler, Danny, who is 4 years – 3 months.

Is anything missing?

- Should have multiple sources of assessment as part of the documentation. There is a speech eval, but no parent report or observation. Not sure if the speech eval includes those. It may, but this is not explicit.

Does the evidence match the outcome?

- Verbal speech is definitely considered to be part of Outcome 2 (interactive speech in a conversation with others would help us understand Outcome 1, verbal speech to express wants and needs would help with Outcome 3). But there are other important parts of Outcome 2 that are not described here, including receptive language and cognitive skills. The description of Danny’s verbal speech could be more functional, such as, ‘Danny vocalizes while in circle time and while playing with other children and adults, but it is difficult to understand what he is saying even when toys and situations are familiar to the listener.’

Does the evidence match the rating?

- Documentation for a rating of ‘2’ means that the COSF user should
 - Provide a few examples of the child’s functioning at the immediate foundational skill level
 - Provide examples of the child’s functioning that is not yet age appropriate or immediate foundational
 - Evidence should show more functioning that is NOT immediate foundational than is immediate foundational for a rating of 2

Since Danny is 4 years, 3 months, there should be a few examples of immediate foundational skills, which are those skills that come right before age expectations. At 4 years plus, Danny should speak clearly enough for strangers to understand (according to CDC milestones). At 3 years, strangers should understand most of his words (according to CDC milestones). It is not clear if Danny is demonstrating immediate foundational skills in other areas of this outcome (receptive language, cognition, etc.).

The evidence provided does show examples of skills that are like that of a much younger child.

Evidence should also include more functioning that is like that of a much younger child. Without evidence about how Danny seems to be thinking, reasoning, problem solving, and

without any evidence of Danny’s pre-academic skills (counting, learning letters and sounds) there is not enough information to support a rating of 2.

3. TAKING APPROPRIATE ACTION TO MEET NEEDS

To answer the questions below, think about the child’s functioning in these and closely related areas (as indicated by assessments and based on observations from individuals in close contact with the child):

- Taking care of basic needs (e.g., showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.)
- Contributing to own health and safety (e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing, avoids inedible objects) (if older than 24 months)
- Getting from place to place (mobility) and using tools (e.g., forks, strings attached to objects)

3a. To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations, on this outcome? (Circle one number)

Not Yet		Emerging		Somewhat		Completely
1	2	3	4	5	(6)	7

Supporting evidence for answer to Question 3a

Source of information	Date	Summary of Relevant Results
Mother	x/xx/xx	Fine at home
Teacher	x/x/xx	Fine in classroom
ECSE	x/x/xx	DAYC 13% percentile below average

3b. (If Question 3a has been answered previously): Has the child shown any new skills or behaviors related to taking appropriate action to meet needs since the last outcomes summary? (Circle one number)

Yes	1 → Describe progress:
No	2

For Outcome 3 we are looking at Jim who is 4 years, 11 months.

Is anything missing?

Not sure if ECSE mean ECSE eval.

Does the evidence match the outcome?

There is no detail so it is difficult to judge.

Does the evidence match the rating?

There are no skills described that can be age anchored. If the 13th percentile is way below average the rating could be a 5. But it is difficult to know without any descriptive information provided.