



## Team Decision-Making Study Video Coding Form

Child ID \_\_\_\_\_ Child First Name \_\_\_\_\_

Filename(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Child DOB \_\_ - \_\_ - \_\_ Approx age: \_\_ yr \_\_ mo

Meeting Timing \_\_ entry \_\_ exit \_\_ dual (exit C & entry B) Meeting Date \_\_ - \_\_ - \_\_ Coding Date \_\_ - \_\_ - \_\_

EI/ECSE Program \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Program Name \_\_\_\_\_ Coder Name \_\_\_\_\_ Coding: \_\_\_\_\_

Video Format: \_\_\_\_\_ Team Discussion, including of child's functioning \_\_\_\_\_ Team discussion, not whole meeting on the tape  
(select one) \_\_\_\_\_ Individual explanation \_\_\_\_\_ Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_

Comments about team approach:

### Documentation

If missing entire COS form, check here \_\_\_\_\_ and skip to next section.

1. Team rating on COS form            O1 \_\_\_\_\_            O2 \_\_\_\_\_            O3 \_\_\_\_\_  
 2. Progress                                O1 \_\_\_\_\_            O2 \_\_\_\_\_            O3 \_\_\_\_\_  
(Only if exit or dual on meeting type)

	No	No, indicates evidence is in IFSP or IEP	Yes, minimally	Yes, more than minimally
<b>3. Evidence is documented with rating on COS</b>				
Outcome 1				
Outcome 2				
Outcome 3				

If no on 3 a, b, & c then auto code as "No evidence on COS for three questions below" & skip presenting question 4a.b.c and 5 a, b, c.

	No evidence on COS	No	Yes
<b>4. Evidence anywhere on COS sufficient to justify rating?</b>			
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			

	No evidence on COS	No	Yes
<b>5. Evidence anywhere on COS consistent with the rating?</b>			
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			

6. Across the form, does <b>evidence</b> on the <b>COS documentation</b> categorize skills with <b>wrong outcomes</b> ?	
Yes, more than minimal	
Yes, minimal	
No, no mistakes	
No, no evidence on form	

	No	Yes, but likely from earlier part of meeting not on tape	Yes	No Evidence on COS	Can't Tell
<b>7. More information on COS form than discussed on video</b> <i>(Inconsistency - expect more info in video than form. Inconsistent if there is info on form that was never in the discussion or evidence is assessment scores, but video never mention assessment tool, etc.) Includes new sources of info as well as specific content.</i>					
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					

8. Comments:

## Meeting Length

### 1. Length of discussion/decision

Outcome #1 \_\_\_\_\_ minutes      Outcome #2 \_\_\_\_\_ minutes      Outcome #3 \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

OR \_\_\_\_\_ minutes integrated across outcomes if outcomes discussion is too integrated to distinguish by outcomes

2. Key COS process taped \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

3. Length of video/audio full meeting \_\_\_\_\_ hours \_\_\_\_\_ minutes

## Meeting Type

1. **COS Meeting Type:** \_\_\_\_\_ Embedded in IFSP/IEP      \_\_\_\_\_ At End of IFSP/IEP  
 \_\_\_\_\_ COSF only meeting      \_\_\_\_\_ COS combo with some other meeting, can't tell mtg type  
 \_\_\_\_\_ No meeting \_\_\_\_\_ at the end of evaluation meeting ( if IFSP/IEP, COS, eval meeting combo, code as IFSP/IEP      Other: *(specify)*: \_\_\_\_\_

1a. Comments:

2. Information from **parent** gathered by (*check all that apply*):
- participation in team meeting where COS decided *Based on video* (if checked, complete next section) (count even if parent is there, but says nothing)
  - separate discussions (video/documentation)
  - through assessment tools (video/documentation)
  - parent questionnaire of COS content (video/documentation)
  - other (*specify*): \_\_\_\_\_ (video/documentation)
  - can't tell     parent info not included in video
- (code based on info from documentation form not evident in video)
3. **Decision Approach:**  Team discussion  Team discussion starting with COS form already completed by 2/more people  
*(This question triggers skip patterns below)*     Asynchronous     Individual only decision     Other (*specify*): \_\_\_\_\_

### Participants (in COS portion of meeting)

1. **Number of people present** in COS meeting (Video/Audio) \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_ can't tell
2. **Number of parents/guardians** present in COS meeting (Video/Audio): \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_ can't tell
3. Based on all sources, **how many people contributed information to the COS process?** (Meeting information form list, documentation, or at the meeting, may share info that led to decision but not even participate in the meeting or the rating itself.) \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_ can't tell
4. **Number of parents/guardians** who contributed information to the COS process. \_\_\_\_\_ or \_\_\_\_\_ can't tell
5. **Roles** of those **present in video** (*select all that apply from drop down menu*): \_\_\_\_\_
6. Are those who contributed information **the same as those present in the video?**  
 Yes, they are the same  
 No, More contributed information
7. **Roles** of those who contributed information to the **COS process** (*Check all that apply from drop down menu*): \_\_\_\_\_
8. Was there a **service coordinator present?**  no (*or at least nothing is checked on forms*)  yes
9. Comments:
-

**When Parent is Included on Team**

*(If no parent participation in team meeting where COS decided, skip to next section)*

- 1. Explain why data are being collected (check all that apply):
 - No, not explained
 - Referenced earlier conversation about why
 - Yes, explain data are collected to observe child's progress
 - Yes, explain data are collected for program improvement/accountability
 - Yes, explain, but give other reason (If so, specify)
 - Can't tell
 2. Describes meaning of each outcome (check all that apply):
 - No, not described
 - Referenced earlier description
 - Yes, for some, but not all, outcomes
 - Yes, for each outcome
 - Can't tell
 3. Describes what skills are expected for a child this age: (count if give list of skills and then say age level, even if not directly tied with words)
 - No, not described
 - Generically, not linkable to outcomes
 - Yes, for some, but not all, outcomes
 - Yes, for each outcome
 - Can't tell
 4. Describes idea of sequences in development
 - No
 - Yes
 - Can't tell
 5. Parent spontaneously offers information about child or rating during meeting
 - No
 - No, but can't confirm if nonverbal agreement/head nodding from video
 - Yes, head nodding/agreement only
 - Yes, spontaneously speaks up/shares ideas
 - Can't tell
 6. Providers invite parent to comment/speak during meeting (select one):
 - No
 - Yes, just ask if agree
 - Yes, open-ended questions/statements, but not during COS discussion
 - Yes, open-ended questions/statements encourage sharing information during COS part of meeting
 - Can't tell

**Quality of Team Process**

*(If individual only decision under decision approach, skip this section)*

1. Overall, what was the quality of the general team process?
lowest quality 1 2 3 4 5 highest quality
or can't tell

2. Comments:

Table with 6 rows and 6 columns. Rows include: 3. Amount of parent input, 4. How parent input was described, 5. What was the extent of relevant contributions and dialogue between team members (Professionals) ? and rating categories: 1-Low rating, 2-Mid rating, 3-High rating, Only 1 professional/no team, Can't tell.

	No	Yes	Appeared to agree based on form	Only 1 Professional	Can't Tell
<b>6. Professionals on team agreed on rating</b> (e.g., seems to be genuine consensus, no signs someone did not agree at end)					
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					

### Quality of Child Outcomes Specific Process

1. What was the <b>quality of the Child Outcomes</b> specific process?	1 <i>Lowest quality/terrible example</i>	2 <i>Mid Rating</i>	3 <i>Moderate</i>	4 <i>Mid rating</i>	5 <i>Highest quality/training tape</i>	Can't Tell <i>(not enough info to select #)</i>
Outcome 1						
Outcome 2						
Outcome 3						
Overall						

Consider individual components of the Child Outcomes process for each outcome. **ONLY do overall if you can't do it by outcome...** Or use overall only in situations where you can't really code each outcome individually

2. Comments:

3. Considered Multiple settings /Situations appropriate for the child:

3a. Settings/situations for Outcomes 1, 2, and 3: (Check all that apply)

	Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Overall
Home (or parent report)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment/eval (or professional report)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preschool	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Child care, including family day care situations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With other relatives (e.g., grandma's house, cousins, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With sibling(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community (church, store, restaurant, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Community park, playground	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Neighborhood situation (playing with friends who live next door, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
With strangers (other than the assessment team)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other 1 (then specify for each of the "other" ratings) _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other 2 _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other 3 _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3b. For **Outcome 1**, was consideration of settings/situations appropriate for the child?

- No (not sufficient, including no probing to no possible settings)  
 Yes (mostly or completely)  
 Can't tell/Poor understanding of outcome, cannot rate (rate overall)

3c. For **Outcome 2**, was consideration of settings/situations appropriate for the child?

- No (not sufficient, including no probing to no possible settings)  
 Yes (mostly or completely)  
 Can't tell/Poor understanding of outcome, cannot rate (rate overall)

3d. For **Outcome 3**, was consideration of settings/situations appropriate for the child?

- No (not sufficient, including no probing to no possible settings)  
 Yes (mostly or completely)  
 Can't tell/Poor understanding of outcome, cannot rate (rate overall)

3e. Overall, was team consideration of settings/situations appropriate for the child?

- No (not sufficient, including no probing to no possible settings)  
 Yes (mostly or completely)  
 Can't tell/Poor understanding of outcome, cannot rate (rate overall)

	Ratings			Can't tell	Poor understanding of outcomes, can't rate for this outcome (still rate overall)
	1 Not functional (only discrete skills or scores)	2 Limited references of functional skills	3 Mostly references functional skills		
4. Describe child's functional use of skills					
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					
<b>Overall</b> (use only if can't code by outcome)					

5. Description of <b>skills</b> which child is <b>not yet doing</b> <i>(but would be expected or that come next)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> No description
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, but only described on documentation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, describe in video
	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, describe on video and documentation
	<input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell

	Includes <b>major addition of irrelevant skills</b>	Includes <b>minor addition or only relevant skills</b>	No description of skills	Can't Tell
6. Description of outcome, functioning on outcome, and rating decision includes <b>skills relevant to that outcome area</b> <i>(major addition= has influence on the rating)</i>				
Outcome 1				
Outcome 2				
Outcome 3				

7. Comments/which inappropriate skills:

	Can't Tell	No Description of Skills	Ratings		
			1 Very limited breadth <i>(focuses almost entirely on one aspect of outcome)</i>	2 Moderate Breadth <i>(mixed, or missing one or more key areas)</i>	3 Good breadth <i>(has key outcome areas, broad enough for good decision)</i>
8. Considered/discussed <b>breadth of outcome area</b> <i>(enough aspects of the outcome to be able to make a good decision about the child's functioning – based only on the video)</i> <i>Bolded items = key areas</i>					
Outcome 1 <i>(check all that apply)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>relate with adults (parents/caregivers)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>relate with other adults (strangers, assessors, not primary caregivers)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>relate with peers (6mo plus)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>follow group rules/interacting with others (18 mo plus)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> social regulation of emotions/feelings <input type="checkbox"/> language use in social situation Other: _____					
Outcome 2 <i>(check all that apply)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>language</b> <input type="checkbox"/> memory/attention <input type="checkbox"/> <b>problem solving/reasoning (incl same/diff, matching)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> understanding physical/social worlds (incl cause/effect, self understanding, community helpers, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> <b>early concepts/symbols</b> <input type="checkbox"/> preliteracy/preacademic skills <input type="checkbox"/> general knowledge out of context other: _____					
Outcome 3 <i>(check all that apply)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>taking care of basic needs (showing hunger, dressing, feeding, toileting, etc.)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>contributing to own health/safety (24 mo plus)</b> <i>(e.g., follows rules, assists with hand washing, avoids inedible objects, car safety, playground etc)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>getting from place to place (6 mo plus) (mobility, intentional movement to achieve aim)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> using tools (12 mo plus) (forks, pencils, strings, etc) <input type="checkbox"/> using language/sounds to indicate wants/needs other: _____					

9. Considered/discussed <b>enough depth</b> to have a good sense of the child skills in areas talked about	Ratings			No Description of skills	Can't tell
	1 No- Cursory or global discussion	2 Yes mixed <i>One aspect described in depth, others brief</i>	3 Yes, Appropriate <i>For any areas discussed – there is depth about skills</i>		
Outcome 1					
Outcome 2					
Outcome 3					
<b>Overall</b> <small>(code only if can't code by outcome)</small>					

10. Anchors skills using <b>rating criteria language</b> <small>(age appropriate, immediate foundational, foundational or like peers, younger child, much younger child)</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No description of skills <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell
--	--

11. Anchoring of skills using <b>sequences or ages</b> <small>(anchors, regardless of accuracy of anchors)</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No description of skills <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell
--	--

12. Professionals on team <b>inappropriately age-anchor skills</b> <small>(Major =did it wrong and it impacted rating)</small>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Major <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, Minor <input type="checkbox"/> No inappropriate age anchoring <input type="checkbox"/> No age anchoring at all, regardless of whether or not appropriate <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell
--	--

If yes, provide next questions (type of misunderstanding and influence) for completion. For no and can't tell, skip to the next question.

**Types of misunderstanding with use of rating criteria observed:**

13. Any indication that the professionals on the team do not understand the rating criteria?	Yes	No	Can't tell due to limited process information
On each outcome was there any indication of misunderstanding or misapplication of rating criteria?			
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			



**13a. Tell us about the following types of misunderstanding or misapplication of rating criteria observed.**

	Outcome 1		Outcome 2		Outcome 3	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Verbal reference suggests applying criteria the wrong way (e.g.), balances each other out						
Verbal reference overemphasizes one aspect of rating criteria too much (e.g., EVER)						
Application of rating criteria based on child's progress instead of distance from age-expected criteria						
Poor application of rating criteria due to problems with sequencing or anchoring age-level skills						
Poor application of rating criteria any other reason (e.g., may verbally describe criteria correctly but then rating doesn't match)						
Other misunderstanding (includes odd examples)						

**13b. In what ways did misunderstanding seem to interfere with a quality rating?**

	Outcome 1		Outcome 2		Outcome 3	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
It led to categorizing child on the wrong side of the decision tree (1, 2/3, 4/5, 6/7)						
It led to confusion/error in decision between neighboring numbers						
Limited elicitation of examples or discussion						
It led to other influences						
	If Yes, specify _____		If Yes, specify _____		If Yes, specify _____	
No apparent influence on rating						

<b>14. Decision tree explicitly used</b> <i>(read, shown, in words, not just attached to COSF)</i>	___ No ___ Yes, minimal reference _____ ___ Yes, considerable use _____ ___ Can't tell
	<i>(throughout all parts, consistent use, clear reliance on it)</i>

	No	Yes	Can't Tell
<b>15. More than one rating was considered</b>			
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			

	No	Yes
<b>16a. Did one or more team members articulate a rationale for the rating the team gave?</b> <i>(Note: if gave a rationale but not for the final rating option it does not count).</i>		
Outcome 1		
Outcome 2		
Outcome 3		

*For each outcome, if yes, go on to the next two questions. If no, skip further.*

	No	Yes
<b>16b. Was Rationale sufficient to justify the team's rating?</b> (e.g., rationale gives enough information for why rating was given, provides enough information to discriminate significant of difference between neighboring scores; if can't tell, use no)		
Outcome 1		
Outcome 2		
Outcome 3		

	No	Yes
<b>16c. Was rationale consistent with the rating the team gave?</b> (if consistent, use of rationale on the decision tree would lead to an option that included the rating given; inconsistent rationale of giving a child a 4 because she is almost ready to show age-expected behavior when it is expected she already has some for a rating of 4)		
Outcome 1		
Outcome 2		
Outcome 3		

Comments in response to Q16, Q16b, and Q16c:

---



---

<p>17. Any indication of an <b>explicit intent to alter ratings</b> (deflate entry ratings or inflate exit)  <i>(based on comments and legitimacy in the rating direction – requires strong evidence) .</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No intent to alter ratings <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell</p> <p>17b. If yes, which, <input type="checkbox"/> deflate entry <input type="checkbox"/> inflate exit <input type="checkbox"/> other (<i>specify</i>)          _____</p>
---	--

18. Comments:

<p><i>(Ask only if exit or dual meeting type)</i>          19. At exit, <b>child's entry ratings</b> were described/<b>discussed</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No entry ratings discussed <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell</p> <p>19b. . If yes, which outcome (check all that apply)  <input type="checkbox"/> can't tell <input type="checkbox"/> O1 <input type="checkbox"/> O2 <input type="checkbox"/> O3</p>
--	---

<p><i>(Ask only if exit or dual meeting type)</i>          20. At exit, <b>Child's progress</b> was discussed</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Progress not discussed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, for some but not all outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, for each outcome <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell</p>
---	---

<p><i>(Ask only if exit or dual meeting type)</i>          21. At Exit, evidence of confusion with <b>"any progress"</b> idea</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes, evidence of confusion <input type="checkbox"/> No, no evidence of confusion <input type="checkbox"/> Can't tell</p>
---	--

<p>22a. References <b>specific assessment tools</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Neither <input type="checkbox"/> On documentation <input type="checkbox"/> In video <input type="checkbox"/> In video and documentation</p> <p>22b. Names of tools: (<i>drop down menu</i>)          _____          _____</p>
---	---

23. Scores or age-levels on assessment tools mentioned	No	Yes
In Video		

	On Documentation		
--	------------------	--	--

24. Specific <b>assessment tool content other than scores/age levels mentioned in video</b> <i>(only code yes if very clear pulling it from tool, clear item not just behavior during assessment situation.)</i>	<b>1 – No specific Content</b>	<b>2 – Some specific content from assessments</b>	<b>3- Many instances of specific content from assessments</b>

## Consensus

<i>Ask only if parent is part of team (same question triggers as parent section)</i>	Yes	No unresolved disagreement	Can't Tell
1a. Active and <b>unresolved disagreement</b> on rating from one or more members of whole team <i>(team that includes a parent):</i>			
Outcome 1			
Outcome 2			
Outcome 3			

<i>(If yes to any of 1a, 1b, 1c)</i>	Yes	No
1b. Was unresolved disagreement <b>parent vs. professional?</b>		

2. Comments:

## Ratings

### Team Ratings *(1-7 options)*

1. Team rating in video O1 \_\_\_ Can't tell \_\_\_ O2 \_\_\_ Can't tell \_\_\_ O3 \_\_\_ Can't tell \_\_\_

### **Coder range for ratings** *(1-7 options) (Based on video, comment if additional information could consider on ABILITIES, COS, etc.)*

2a. O1 Single \_\_\_ RANGE: Low \_\_\_ High \_\_\_ Can't determine \_\_\_ Coder confidence in amount/info available low 1 2 3 high no rating  
*(Rating confidence based on amount/type of info)*

2b. O2 Single \_\_\_ RANGE: Low \_\_\_ High \_\_\_ Can't determine \_\_\_ Coder confidence in amount/info available low 1 2 3 high no rating

2c. O3 Single \_\_\_ RANGE: Low \_\_\_ High \_\_\_ Can't determine \_\_\_ Coder confidence in amount/info available low 1 2 3 high no rating  
*available*

2. Comments:

### Video Characteristics/Future Reference:

1. Sound quality \_\_\_ good \_\_\_ ok \_\_\_ poor

2a. Video quality \_\_\_ good \_\_\_ ok \_\_\_ poor \_\_\_ audio only

2b. Is everyone visible on the video? \_\_\_ no, miss a lot \_\_\_ no, miss some \_\_\_ yes

3a. Flag to consider when developing guidance document? \_\_\_ yes \_\_\_ no

3b. Comments:

4. Future training usefulness:

Useful example of **what not to do** not at all useful

Useful example of **what is good to do** not at all useful

5. Comments/noteworthy features (discussion, introducing topic, reaching consensus, etc.):

### Additional comments/Coder notes:

1. About child/child characteristics:

2. About meeting/age-expectations/team rating:

3. Noteworthy for guidance documents:

4. Other notes:

5. Coding complete? \_\_\_ yes \_\_\_ no