Child Outcomes Summary Process
Quality Assurance Checklist Directions

Quality assurance checks and data analysis by preschool special education supervisors must be conducted to ensure consistent high-quality data within each Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process. To ensure consistent high-quality data within each Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process, it is recommended that this checklist be completed by preschool special education supervisors.

Enter the child's name, the date of the review, the core team/staff completing the review and the supervisor who reviewed the file. If the child received at least six months of preschool special education service, check the box. Forms reviewed may be the initial/entry rating, the exit rating or any of the ratings completed while the child was in program.

1. **COS process was completed in a timely manner.**
   The initial COS process was completed no later than 30 calendar days following eligibility determination. Subsequent Child Outcome Summaries were completed at least annually with each IEP meeting, and within 30 calendar days of exit.
2. **A core group completed the COS process.**
   The Early Childhood Outcomes process should be completed with input from the preschool special education teacher, the general education teacher (if the child is served by one), the parent and related service personnel providing support. Other individuals involved with the child such as the teaching assistant, the bus driver, cook/cafeteria personnel, etc. should also be considered.
3. **All areas of the COS process were completed.**
   The cover page of the form should be complete and include:
   - Completion date
   - District and building
   - Child's name
   - Child's date of birth
   - A reference ID number (local records)
   - Child's age at the time of the rating
   - Child's first or last date of service if the child is entering or exiting the program.
     - If entering the program, then the IEP date that indicates the initiation of services is used here.
     - If exiting the program, then the IEP date that indicates the conclusion of services is used here or date of withdrawal.
   - The names of the team determining the ratings and their role.
4. **Sources of evidence are identified on the cover sheet.**
   Each area (3) should have a box checked. Mark "no" if any of the three areas does not have at least one box checked that describes the source of family information, evidence collected in variety of settings/situations or evidence collected using a variety of assessment methods.

5. **Each outcome has a rating.**
   A rating must be provided for each outcome. If an outcome area is missing a rating, consult with the team to provide the appropriate rating, 1-7.

6. **Supporting evidence statements for the ratings are recorded.**
   The sources cited or the age-expected behaviors should be described that support the rating given. Statements should be concise as to the types of behaviors that have been observed or assessed as they compare to age expected ones in that area. Information may be gathered through interviews, parental input, and staff observations in various settings or activities, formal or informal assessments.

7. **Multiple sources of information are documented.**
   Many types of quality information should be considered in determining a rating. The evidence statements should reflect how the child's functioning was documented with whom, where, and when (at a minimum).

8. **Evidence relates to the outcome area.**
   - **Does the evidence correspond to the appropriate outcome area?**
     The evidence for Outcome 1 relates to positive social-emotional skills; the evidence for Outcome 2 relates to acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; and the evidence for Outcome 3 relates to taking appropriate action to meet needs. The child's IEP goals that reflect the challenges the child faces are addressed across outcomes areas.
   - **Is the evidence functional?**
     Examples of the child's everyday functioning with emphasis on "how" the child is able to carry out meaningful behaviors in a meaningful context are documented, rather than a list of skills or items from an assessment tool. The Early Learning Development Standards include descriptions of child functioning and may be useful to the process.

9. **Evidence includes performance across settings and situations.**
   The documentation includes evidence of the child's performance across settings and situations. The information should provide an overall picture of how the child functions for each outcome area across a variety of typical settings and people in the child's life.

10. **Evidence supports the rating criteria.**
    Based on the guidance given in the COS process training, the information provided clearly supports the rating 1-7. For example, for ratings of 1 and 2, the child's skills and behavior reflect those of a much younger child. For a rating of 5, the evidence reflects a mixture of age-appropriate and not age-appropriate skills and behaviors the majority of the time. A person who does not know the child can easily determine that the rating is appropriate.

11. **Each outcome has the progress question answered.**
    This does not apply to **entry** rating forms. **All other COS** forms should have a "yes" or "no" marked for the progress question for each outcome. If "yes" is marked, then a description of the progress should be documented.

12. Progress was described.

- **Does the evidence support the progress rating for children?**
  The evidence supports the progress rating for each outcome. Progress is defined as the acquisition of at least one new skill or behavior related to the outcome. If the team checked "yes," the child made progress, then the team must describe the general nature of the progress in the space provided.