**Indicators of quality COS team discussions….**

* All team members participated
* Minimal jargon was used and ideas were explained to allow everyone to fully participate
* Input from everyone, including parents, was encouraged
* Input from everyone, including parents, was respectfully considered
* Multiple sources of assessment information are considered (e.g., family report, observation, authentic assessment, standardized ‘testing’)
* Content, not just summary scores, from assessment information is considered
* The team discusses the child’s functioning before jumping to the rating discussion
* The team describes the child’s functioning across the full range of settings and with the diversity of people where the child spends time (e.g., home, child care/preschool, with siblings, with peers, with extended family, with unfamiliar adults, in community locations [store, church, park, restaurants] assessment situation, etc.)
* Discussion includes the child’s full range of functioning (what child does and does not yet do across settings)
* Description of the child’s functioning provides enough depth to ensure the team paints a rich picture of the child that reflects best information from everyone participating
* Discussion examines the full breadth of each outcome
* Team ensures that decisions only are based on content relevant to the appropriate outcome
* Team description of child’s functioning is age-anchored; specific skills are considered relative to what is age-expected, immediate foundational, or foundational
* More than one COS rating is considered
* COS rating is consistent with rating criteria
* Team reaches consensus on rating
* The team identifies a rationale for the rating
* Rating, rationale, and evidence are reflected in the documentation for the rating
* Rating discussion focuses on the child’s current status
* Team discussion does not confuse progress compared to own skills in the past with progress in trajectories (i.e., growth relative to that of children growing at age-expected levels)