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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The decade of the seventies has experienced a quiet revolution. The goal of this revolution has been the right to an education for all American children, and particularly those known as handicapped. This revolutionary period has been characterized as the era in which the battle cry for public policy regarding the handicapped changed from charitable solicitations to a declaration of rights established by mandated law. The efforts to obtain a free and appropriate education have been occurring throughout this nation, in state and local education board rooms, state legislative chambers, and probably most importantly in our judicial system.

The effect of legislative mandate and judicial decisions on the organizational structure, operation, and professional responsibility for the delivery of services within local, intermediate, and state educational agencies has been dramatic. The legislative culmination of this revolution occurred on November 29, 1975, when President Ford signed Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This represented a major new commitment by the federal government and has been hailed as the most important education legislation enacted since the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

A major challenge facing public schools is the successful implementation of special education programs which are responsive to legal
mandate.

Problem Statement

With the passage by Congress of Public Law 94-142 and Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as well as Michigan's Mandatory Special Education Law, Public Act 198 of 1971, an era has been launched to provide every American handicapped child with a free appropriate education. The intent of these Acts and similar state mandates on local, intermediate, and state education agencies, is to bring into existence sound educational practices for children which have long been sought by special and general educators alike.

Although these recent federal and state directives have made clearer the responsibilities of American education to these children, some education agencies have been operating effective special education programs for some handicapped children for years. The basis for operation of these programs has been rooted in the establishment of clear written procedures. Unfortunately, in many agencies, well developed and consistent procedures governing the education of handicapped children do not exist.

The absence of appropriate procedures that serve to control, regulate, and direct the organization, administration, and provision of educational services to children may reduce the efficient and effective operation of the public schools. Written procedures contribute to the consistent operation of the public schools and make official school positions on significant issues clear to school employees and the public.
General and special educators are currently faced with the problem of initiating organizational change in providing for educational services to handicapped students due to the two major external forces: (a) legislative mandates and (b) judicial litigation. Concurrent with these external forces, general and special educators have begun to realize the inadequacies of present organizational structures and service delivery systems. In response to these social forces and professional criticism, there is a demand for the development of consistent procedures to allow for program effectiveness, efficiency, and legal compliance.

Specifically, the problem is that intermediate and local school districts lack a consistent procedural approach to the delivery of special education programs and service.

Purpose

In education, studies receive attention when they address some previously identified problem. The problem as previously stated, relates to the need for the development of consistent procedures to ensure program effectiveness, efficiency, and compliance to existing laws. This document is reflective of this stated need.

The initial focus of this document is to examine the statutory and regulatory requirements of Public Law 94-142 and Michigan's Public Act 198 in that this examination provides the basis for the procedural development. This examination will additionally serve to delineate the various dimensions of local and intermediate district administrative responsibilities relative to the successful
implementation of special education programs reflective of governing laws.

The major purpose of this document is to provide a procedural manual which:

1. Has been validated and field tested.
2. Informs special education administrators through the use of sequential procedures of the statutory and regulatory requirements for implementing Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.
3. Provides a model for procedural implementation which ensures legal compliance to Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.
4. Assists special education administrators as a resource in examining the decision-making process as it relates to special education program implementation.

Rationale/Significance

The United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sees the development of procedures for implementing Public Law 94-142 and Michigan's Public Act 198 as being an evolutionary process which will continue over a period of several years. The actual impact and consequences of the statutory provisions and problems which states and local school districts may have in implementing these provisions are not fully known at this time. However, the basic facts of implementation and legal compliance are a present day reality.

The state of Michigan completed the public hearing process during the 1978-79 school year in order to merge the provisions of Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198 into a singular legal document.
This was a positive state directed development. However, little direction or assistance has been given to intermediate and local school districts as to the more practical need for procedures and forms which ensure legal compliance. At the present time, each intermediate and local district is left to their own interpretation of statutory requirements. The result has been clear as more and more intermediate and local districts have been forced into the process of hearing and litigation.

These increasing levels of litigation as well as the increasing compliance activities of federal and state governments support the need for consistent and well developed procedures. This kind of development will assist intermediate and local school districts in fully complying with the intent of law.

This procedural manual was designed to respond to these often stated needs. It will also assist future attempts to respond to the ongoing changes of legal mandates.

Assumptions

1. While this manual responds to the interface of federal and Michigan laws, it has applicability to all other states as they are regulated by Public Law 94-142.

2. The manual will be open to revision as statutory regulation changes through new rules or court decisions.
Limitations

This manual is responsive to the procedural demands placed on local school districts by mandated law. A reader who is knowledgeable about special education process is aware that the law addresses many other areas not directly affected by procedural implementation. Some of these areas are referred to as relationships with private schools, state plans, intermediate school district plans, flow-through money distribution in addition to many other areas.

In relationship to this understanding, a limitation needs to be identified which is reflective of reality, but does not in any way detract from the purposes of this document.

The limitation is that this manual is not intended to be a complete planning document for every aspect of federal and state law. This is simply not feasible.

Overview

The balance of this report will contain a discussion of related literature, the developmental aspects of the manual, results of the validation process, and recommendations for future study. It is the intent of this report to serve as a basis for responsible procedural development reflective of future changes in the area of special education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The search for appropriate educational practice demands, first, an examination of legislated mandates and judicial decisions that have provided the impetus for special education programming and, second, an examination of the basic assumptions or premises underlying the expectations of program delivery.

The first section of this chapter examines the historical, legislative, and judicial aspects of special education development. The second section of this chapter summarizes the basic assumptions and premises of program delivery.

Legislative Beginnings

The beginnings of special education programs in this country occurred in the 1880's and can be traced to the development of state residential schools for the deaf and blind, public day school classes for the deaf, and numerous programs for the retarded. Until recently, the federal role, as it pertains to the handicapped, was limited to providing monetary assistance to state and local educational agencies to meet the needs of various handicapped groups. The initial step was taken in 1954 with the passage of Public Law 83-531, the Cooperative Research Act. This act was designed to foster a spirit of cooperation between the federal government and institutions of higher learning and represented a rudimentary awareness by Congress of the
need for categorical aid for special education programs. In 1958, two bills were passed that established categorical support for the education of the handicapped. These bills became Public Law 85-905, Captioned Films for the Deaf, and Public Law 85-926, Training of Professional Personnel. Public Law 85-905 established a loan service aimed at cultural enrichment and recreation for deaf persons, while Public Law 85-926 focused on the training of university level persons in the area of mental retardation who would in turn train teachers.

Although these legislative enactments were significant accomplishments, there was a paucity of legislative action until 1963 when Public Law 88-164 was passed. This law, considered an administrative milestone, resulted in the establishment of the Division of Handicapped Children and Youth within the United States Office of Education. This division brought together under one unit all the previous acts and units set up to serve handicapped children. In 1965, with the passage of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the first sizable commitment by the federal government to support K-12 education, was undertaken. The federal monies, authorized in five titles, were designed to lend assistance to local and state education agencies in providing programs and services to educationally deprived children. In 1966, Public Law 89-750, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1966, created Title VI which established the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to handle all federal programs designed to meet the needs of the handicapped, and provided categorical funds for the support of approved programs at the local district level.
The 1970's saw a dramatic increase in congressional attention to the handicapped. Hundreds of bills were introduced that directly affected the handicapped. Two of the bills were of major importance. Public Law 93-380, the Education Amendments of 1974, Congress authorized massive increases in the grants to the states under Title VI Part B. More important, the amendments included assurances of an education in the least restrictive environment and of due process procedures for parents and their handicapped children. A year later, on November 29, 1975, President Ford signed into law Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. This landmark legislation commits the federal government to a level of funding that provides for a free appropriate public education for all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 21. Furthermore, Public Law 94-142 is permanent legislation with no expiration date and commits the federal government to a level of funding that should allow state and local education agencies to attain the full educational opportunity goal.

During the seventies, the state of Michigan was also actively involved in the development of special education legislation. The Michigan Legislature passed the Mandatory Special Education Act (P.A. 198 of 1971) which required the State Board of Education to promulgate Administrative Rules for the delivery of special education programs and services. These rules, known as the Michigan Special Education Code, became effective on October 10, 1973, and were amended on January 14, 1977.
As federal government financial support for the education of the handicapped has increased, so, too, has state financial support increased. By 1975, all but two states had adopted some form of mandatory legislation. Nearly all of this legislative movement occurred at the same time as two important right to education cases were being adjudicated in the courts.

Judicial Decisions

There are two landmark cases supporting equal protection and due process in the area of the right to education for the handicapped: (a) Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (PARC, 1972) and (b) Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (Mills, 1972). In PARC, the state association for retarded children and parents of 14 retarded children brought a class action suit seeking declaratory judgment against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's statutes pertaining to the exclusion of retarded children from the state's educational program. Plaintiffs alleged that:

1. These statutes offend due process because they lack any provision for notice and a hearing before a retarded person is either excluded from a public education or a change is made in his educational assignment within the public system,

2. The premise of the statute which necessarily assumes that certain retarded children are uneducable and untrainable, lacks a rational basis in fact [and, therefore, violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment], and

3. Because of the Constitution and laws of Pennsylvania guarantee an education to all children, [the statutes violated due process] in that they arbitrarily and
capriciously deny that given right to retarded children.  
(PARC, 1972)

In District Judge Masterson's opinion, order, and injunction declara-
tion, he stated that due process required a hearing before retarded 
children could be denied public education and that the state having 
undertaken to provide public education to some children, could not 
deny it to retarded children.

Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (1972) 
was a civil action brought on behalf of seven children of school age 
for a declaration of rights and an injunction restraining the Board 
of Education of the District of Columbia from excluding children who 
had been labeled as behavioral problems, mentally retarded, emotion-
ally disturbed, or hyperactive from publicly supported special educa-
tion.

The focal point of this case is found in the failure of the 
District of Columbia to provide publicly supported education and 
training to plaintiffs and other exceptional children. Additionally, 
the failure of excluding, suspending, expelling, reassigning, and 
transferring of exceptional children from regular public school 
classes without affording them due process of law, was a central 
issue (Mills, 1972, p. 868).

The court declared that the board of education has the responsi-
bility of administering that system in accordance with law and of 
providing such publicly supported education to all of the children 
of the district including exceptional children (Mills, 1972, p. 870).
Both the PARC and Mills cases found that total exclusion of handicapped children violates the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth and Fifth Amendments (Mills, 1972, p. 875). The judicial impact of these two cases was in deciding that no handicapped person, no matter how severely involved, could be denied equal protection of the law.

Legislative Intent

The intent of mandated legislation is based on certain findings and purposes as expressed in congressional hearings. It is important to consider these findings as an insight into the outcomes that the legislation is supposed to address. Some of these findings and purposes as stated in the introduction to P.L. 94-142 can be summarized as follows:

1. There are more than eight million handicapped children in the United States.

2. The special education needs of such children are not being fully met.

3. More than half of the handicapped children in the United States do not receive appropriate educational services which would enable them to have full equality of opportunity.

4. One million of the handicapped children in the United States are excluded entirely from the public school system and will not go through the educational process with their peers.

5. There are many handicapped children throughout the United States participating in regular school programs whose handicaps...
prevent them from having a successful educational experience because their handicaps are undetected.

6. Because of the lack of adequate services within the public school system, families are often forced to find services outside the public school system, often at great distance from their residence and at their own expense.

7. Development in the training of teachers and in diagnostic and instructional procedures and methods have advanced to the point that, given appropriate funding, state and local educational agencies can and will provide effective special education and related services to meet the needs of handicapped children.

8. State and local educational agencies have a responsibility to provide education for all handicapped children, but present financial resources are inadequate to meet the special educational needs of handicapped children.

9. It is in the national interest that the federal government assist state and local efforts to provide programs to meet the educational needs of handicapped children in order to assure equal protection of the law.

The response of Congress to these findings and purposes was to enact Public Law 94-142 as a vehicle to move schools in a positive direction of service to handicapped individuals.

Philosophical Position

Embodied within the structure of law are a variety of statutory and regulatory requirements that represent the current philosophical
position of special educators relative to the civil rights and educational services necessary to appropriately provide full equality of opportunity for handicapped children. Some of these philosophical positions are:

1. That handicapped children be guaranteed the same constitutional rights provided all other individuals in our society,

2. That these rights include the right of equal protection, the right to procedural and substantive due process, and the right to participate in all educational programs and activities in the least restrictive environment,

3. That it is the responsibility of general and special education to meet the educational needs of handicapped children,

4. That appropriate educational opportunities for handicapped children be based on identifying, assessing, providing, and evaluating educational services based on the unique needs of each handicapped child,

5. That the identifying, assessing, providing, and evaluating of educational services be determined through the use of a systematic planning process,

6. That parents of handicapped children and concerned individuals have the right to actively participate in the planning and decision-making process of providing educational services,

7. That the importance of appropriate identification, assessment, placement, instruction, and evaluation of handicapped children necessitates a prescribed procedural due process system,

8. That handicapped children and their parents should be protected concerning the information and data collected by the public schools, and that a prescribed system of confidentiality be guaranteed to all parents and children,

9. That to the maximum extent appropriate handicapped children should be educated with children who are not handicapped, and that removal of handicapped children from the regular education environment should occur only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids
and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily,

10. That professional and legal requirements are necessary to insure that children are not misclassified or unnecessarily labeled as being handicapped because of inappropriate selection, administration, or interpretation of evaluation materials, and

11. That tests and other evaluation materials include those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely those which are designed to provide a single general intelligence quotient. (Barbacovi & Clelland, 1978, p. 7)

In summary, legislative mandates and judicial litigation, in concert with the current philosophical position of special educators, is providing impetus for examining the administrative process in terms of the implications of changing general and special education organizational structure, procedures, and service delivery objectives.

It becomes necessary to additionally address certain key basic assumptions and premises of program delivery which are reflective of the literature search perspective. These key areas are: (a) least restrictive environment, (b) procedural due process requirements, and (c) individualized educational program.

The Least Restrictive Environment

Public Law 94-142 requires states to establish procedures to assure that to the maximum extent appropriate handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped and that special classes or removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity is such that education in regular classes cannot be achieved satisfactory.
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To understand the least restrictive environment concept, it is necessary to examine the constitutional principle of the least restrictive doctrine in case law. Just as the constitutional principle of equal protection of the law provides a judicial foundation for the educational concept of equal educational opportunity, the least restrictive doctrine provides a judicial foundation for the educational concept of the least restrictive environment.

While the least restrictive doctrine has long been part of American jurisprudence, it did not begin to have a serious impact until the Warren Court years. Bastress (1974) has observed that,

The past two decades have witnessed enormous changes in both substantive constitutional law and the courts' approach to constitutional questions. The frequent application of the doctrine of less restrictive alternatives has been a factor in increasing significant proportions in effecting these changes. (p. 972)

Concomitant with the substantive due process principle, the least restrictive doctrine facilitates the regulation of the breadth of legislative and administrative enactments. The emergence of this doctrine was predicated on the assumption that "in due process cases, the objective of state legislatures can be achieved by a measure which trenches deeply into the value of liberty or property" (Wormuth & Mirken, 1964, p. 255).

Legal authorities have used a variety of terms to express the least restrictive doctrine. Some of these include: (a) the less drastic means (Shelton v. Tucker, 1960), (b) the reasonable alternative (Wormuth & Mirken, 1964, p. 254), and (c) the less intrusive alternative.
In general, these terms are held to be synonymous in meaning. These terms have been employed in both legal and educational literature.

Until recently, the least restrictive doctrine was defined in terms of what was least restrictive to that person injured by the state's action. However, the United States Supreme Court has ruled in three recent cases (American Party of Texas v. Brown, 1974; Lubin v. Panish, 1974; Storer v. Brown, 1974) in which "the court found a fundamental individual interest, and legitimate and compelling state interests . . . each of which turned upon the existence (or non-existence) of alternative means" (Bastress, 1974, pp. 1000-1001). The decisions reached in each case not only "evidence a concern for the effectiveness of suggested alternatives," but also show a "willingness of the court to accept an alternative that was less restrictive (for the plaintiff) even though it was clearly not the least restrictive" (Bastress, 1974, p. 1001). The significance of this is that in the future, the Supreme Court may be examining a wider range of alternatives that balance both an individual's rights and the state's compelling interests.

The least restrictive doctrine has been applied in court cases in which issues relative to equal protection, substantive due process, and procedural due process have been applied. In general, the standard used to test "substantive due process cases has been similar to or identical with tests (used) in equal protection cases" (Bastress, 1974, p. 981). For both substantive due process and equal protection, the "strict scrutiny test" has been employed when a fundamental right
implicit in the Fourteenth Amendment is challenged or when a legislative classification is considered suspect. With the strict scrutiny test,

[The] state must satisfy a three pronged standard: (1) the means selected are necessary (2) to further a compelling interest (3) aimed at a legitimate goal. As the requirement of necessity indicates, available alternatives must be investigated in every case applying to the strict review. (Bastress, 1974, pp. 996-997)

In summary, the least restrictive doctrine provides a judicial foundation to administrative decision-making which requires that official actions such as educational placement must not without appropriate examination of alternative actions, unnecessarily exceed or infringe upon the rights of the individual.

In writing A Primer on Due Process: Education Decisions for Handicapped Children, Abeson, Bolick, and Hass (1975) examined the application of the least restrictive doctrine to the delivery of special education services. They concluded that the relationship between due process and placement in the least restrictive alternative educational setting is extremely close. Due process establishes the procedures that require the schools to consider all program alternatives and to select that setting which is least restrictive. The basis of this entire concept is the existence of a variety of options or program settings that can be used to provide education to handicapped children depending on their individual needs. Some legal theorists have indicated that a decision to place a handicapped child in any setting other than that used for his nonhandicapped peers is inherently restrictive, and consequently, a deprivation of individual
liberty, a circumstance which demands due process of law.

Johnson (1975), in discussing the least restrictive doctrine as applied to education, concluded that this doctrine represents, for handicapped children, the right to be educated in the regular class, however defined, unless clear evidence is available that partial or complete removal is necessary. Factors relating to each school district such as differences in delivery systems and/or financial difficulties may not be considered as reasons for abrogating the right of an individual child to the least restrictive alternative necessary to meet his/her unique educational needs.

In providing a conceptual framework for the implementation of the least restrictive environment that encompasses statutory, regulatory, and administrative responsibilities of Public Law 94-142, the following definition by Kaufman, Gottlieb, Agard, and Kukic (1975) is appropriate:

Mainstreaming refers to the temporal, instructional, and social integration of eligible exceptional children with normal peers based on an ongoing, individually determined, educational planning and programming process and requires clarification of responsibility among regular and special education administrative, instructional, and supportive personnel. (p. 4)

Procedural Due Process

The significance of procedural due process in the education of handicapped children was enunciated by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the preamble to the proposed regulations for Public Law 94-142:
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A basic tenant of the American system of government as provided by the United States Constitution, is that any individual who is threatened or becomes subject to serious or adverse action by public authorities must be provided with full rights of due process of law. Such procedures provide to the individual the opportunity to contest the proposed action within a series of proceedings which ensure that fairness and good judgment govern the entire decision-making process. (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976, p. 56972)

The procedural due process principles mandated by Public Law 94-142 follow in the tradition of the general development of due process safeguards. For a thorough understanding of the legislative intent, an examination of the judicial development of the constitutional principle of due process is appropriate.

A traditional controversy has centered around the issue of constitutional rights. The questions of to whom they should be accorded and how broad their coverage ought to be have occupied the time of numerous courts. The decisions handed down by courts have set precedents for the extension of constitutional rights, including procedural due process, to situations previously excluded from protection. What can be termed a "changing concept of childhood" has developed as a result of the courts acting as policy makers for educational institutions through the gradual recognition of the constitutional rights of children.

In general, substantive and procedural rights for children as a discrete interest group were not constitutionally guaranteed. However, influenced by the Civil Rights Movement of the last two decades, state and federal courts have been compelled to re-examine the legal status of children in accordance with fundamental constitutional
guarantees and privileges.

The definition of due process presents a concept which has a recognizable form, yet maintains a flexibility in its application to particular situations. The definition is stated as follows:

Its exact boundaries are undefinable and its content varies according to specific factual contests. . . . Whether the Constitution requires that a particular right obtains in a specific proceeding depends upon a complexity of factors. The nature of the alleged right involved, the nature of the proceeding, and the possible burden on that proceeding are all considerations. (Hannah, 1960, p. 442)

The Constitution provides for due process in the wording of the Fifth Amendment: "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law." Similarly, the Fourteenth Amendment states: "... nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law."

The courts recognized early that the majority of litigation over the due process guarantee involved the Fourteenth Amendment. In education, the Fifth Amendment has appeared most frequently in cases concerning self-incrimination by teachers and pupils, and in cases involving loyalty oaths for teachers and school administrators. The Fourteenth Amendment has appeared in an extensive array of court cases concerning the school's authority to regulate teacher and student behavior, racial integration, equal educational opportunity, and the funding of public schools (Sweezer, 1950).

While the guarantee of procedural due process requires no particular form of procedure, some principles of justice ranked as fundamental have emerged. These principles include: (a) the right to notice, (b) the right to a hearing, (c) the right to personal presence,
(d) the right to counsel, (e) the right to raise issues, (f) the right to protection against arbitrary rulings and the right to fairness and impartiality, (g) the right to a hearing time, (h) the right to proof of damages, (i) the right to introduce evidence, and (j) the right to a hearing before a tribunal of jurisdiction. Each of these elements is provided for in the legal mandates of special education legislation.

Specifically, administrative agencies "must" pursue the same general conduct that a court would exercise in safeguarding the fundamental constitutional right of the citizen (Cook, 1923). While recognizing that due process does not always necessitate a judicial process, and that all the formalities of judicial proceedings are not essential to constitute due process of law in an administrative proceeding, the courts are nonetheless, demanding that administrative agencies exercising adjudicative, judicial, or quasi-judicial powers, meet most of the elements deemed fundamental to guarantee due process (e.g., in re Gault, 1967; Kent v. United States, 1966; Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia, 1972; PARC v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 1972). Since the public schools are administrative agencies of the state, the movement for more formal procedural due process safeguards also applies to educational decision-making. The procedural due process requirements of Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198 clearly mandate that fundamental civil rights are to be observed in the public schools.

A number of courts have ruled as to the applicability of procedural due process rights in relation to the placement of handicapped

Individual Education Programs

As defined in Section 602 (18) of Public Law 94-142, the term free appropriate education means special education and related services which are provided in conformity with the individualized education program required under Section 614 (a) (5). This section requires that each school district will establish or revise, whichever is appropriate, an individualized education program for each handicapped child at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate, revise its provisions periodically, but not less than annually.

Section 4 (a) (4) of Public Law 94-142 defines individualized education programs to mean a written statement for each handicapped child developed in any meeting by a representative of the school, the teacher, the parents or guardian of the child, and the child, if appropriate. The statement shall include the present levels of educational performance, annual goals, short-term instructional objectives, related services, participation in regular education, starting date, duration of services, and evaluation criteria.
This requirement encompasses two fundamental philosophical concepts. First, special education involves specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of handicapped children. This philosophical concept is indicative of the commitment by special educators to move away from the medical model of conceptualizing diagnosis and treatment in terms of intervention approaches for specific handicapping categories and move to a more functional analysis of the behavioral patterns and unique learning environments necessary for "individualizing" each individual's program. Second, special education involves the integration, when appropriate, of handicapped children with their nonhandicapped peers in the normal educational environment. Based on the judicial foundation of the least restrictive doctrine and the belief that handicapped individuals need to participate in the normalizing activities of everyday life, the application of this principle will lead to changes in existing service delivery systems.

Emerging concurrently, these two philosophical concepts have been employed in a wide variety of educational programs and projects. Scalon (1971) has described an individually prescribed instruction system (IPI) in which specific behavioral and instructional objectives are interlinked with diagnostic tools and teaching materials.

As Bruininks and Rynder (1972) note "the teacher's role in an IPI program becomes that of progress analyzer, tutor, and instructional manager, in contrast to the more conventional teaching role of dispenser of instruction" (p. 49).

Stillwell, Artuso, Taylor, and Hewett (1972) have described what has come to be known as the "engineered classroom" (p. 59-79). The
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instruction premise of this classroom is that an educational model as a developmental sequence needs to provide for the merging of individualized instructional techniques with the fundamental principles of behavior modification theory.

And finally, Peter and Wisely (1972) describe the prescriptive teaching system which recognizes "that the systems approach is also a suitable methodology for dealing with certain human and social problems (and that) it can provide the unifying or integrating mechanism for utilization of . . . scientific knowledge about teaching and learning" (p. 83). The prescriptive teaching system operates to optimize instruction for the handicapped child while providing a systematic program of teacher education. Furthermore, "the prescriptive teaching system is an organization of definable and observable components of the process of instruction to achieve a predetermined or prescribed objective" (Peter & Wisely, 1972, p. 84).

While Public Law 94-142 does not prescribe any specific approach for providing instruction to handicapped children, several basic characteristics of individualized educational planning (IEP) emerge that are in concert with the general movement examined before as well as with the various programs described. Gott (1976) lists 12 of these characteristics:

1. Some means of assessing a child's performance in all areas thought to be relevant to successful outcomes on long term program goals.

2. Some conceptual framework - perhaps related to chronological age expectancies - which permits: (a) the interpretation of assessment data in terms of personal, familial, and cultural demands; and (b) prioritization of goals and objectives.
3. Development of a concise summary of interpreted data.

4. Formulation of goals and objectives based on assessed needs or deficits.

5. Some means of communicating summarized and interpreted assessments and the goals and objectives based on them to the individuals responsible for developing the program.

6. A collection of ideas for strategies, activities, materials, instructional arrangements, and the organization and sequencing of these into a plan of action which reasonably may be expected to facilitate the child's optimal learning, growth, and normalization.

7. Some means of summarizing the overall plan of action for those working directly with the child and those who assist direct line personnel so as to facilitate accomplishments of stated goals and objectives.

8. Some built-in feedback loops that serve to test current outcomes of instruction against desired outcomes.

9. Some means of modifying the plan of action when feedback shows significant objectives - outcome discrepancies or when more complete information accrues as the result of the ongoing assessment - instruction - evaluation of instruction cycle.

10. When individualizing within group contexts, a system for orchestrating the integration of individualized plans into an overall workable and manageable group instructional plan.

11. Personnel who have knowledge, skills, and values that ensure the application of the individualized process.

12. Institutional structures and procedures that facilitate the application of the individualization process.

(p. 62)

These 12 basic characteristics for any individualized education program should also be basic characteristics of the total service delivery system for providing free appropriate public education to handicapped children.
In summary, this chapter has examined the legislative, judicial, and philosophical background related to the development of the mandated functions of special education delivery systems. This chapter has also examined the three major constructs which provide the strength of mandated legislation. These have been identified as the least restrictive doctrine, due process procedures, and the individualized educational planning. This review of the literature has served to provide insight and clarification as to the need as well as the contents of a well-developed procedural manual.
CHAPTER III
THE PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION

The external social forces of legislative mandates and judicial decisions have forced many public schools into a reactive posture as it relates to programming for the handicapped. Each issue that has surfaced as a result of these social forces has tested the ability of school administrators to respond in ways that will keep school organizations on a sound management basis.

The current movement of social advocacy for the handicapped is having great impact on the administrative structures of the school. In efforts to carry out their respective responsibilities, school administrators are increasingly engaging in internal management conflict, resulting in a lack of understanding and disunity within the management team.

Concurrent with this conflict is the continuing concern over lack of fiscal resources for public schools, the increased level of litigation against public schools by handicapped consumers, and declining school enrollments forcing layoffs in general education while special education staffs and programs continue to increase. These elements all have impact on schools and serve to reinforce the need for a consistent approach to special education programming which is efficient and legally responsive.

The development of this procedural manual is an attempt to assist local school districts and intermediate school districts in
coping with this social phenomenon. Concern for some level of consistent structure has been expressed by many special education and administrative populations.

The Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education have repeatedly called for greater consistency and efficiency from the State Department of Education. This type of concern has become greater since the state has been attempting to merge, through the public hearing process, federal legislation, Public Law 94-142, with state legislation, Public Act 198. At a more local level, the Macomb County Association of Administrators of Special Education for the last 3 years have continually interacted with the struggle for effectiveness, efficiency, and legal compliance. Their struggles and concerns have provided the impetus for this manual. Practically speaking, their administrative futures as well as their livelihoods would be enhanced by providing structure to the chaos and stress that are ever present. This local administrative organization is responsive to 21 local school districts serving nearly 18,000 handicapped students. Macomb County is the third largest Intermediate School District in Michigan.

At the time that these concerns are being expressed, Macomb County is facing the situation of declining general education programs and population, while special education programs and populations increase. This situation coupled with the state's inability to reimburse fully special education costs has created a delicate fiscal problem for local school districts. In view of this rather difficult fiscal situation, all Macomb County superintendents have voiced the
need for procedural consistency between the 21 districts as a measure of control against the social forces that exist.

All of these elements taken collectively coupled with the demands of program implementation have served as a catalyst for the development of this manual.

Research Questions

The major purpose of this document is to provide a procedural manual which:

1. Has been validated and field tested.

2. Informs special education administrators through the use of sequential procedures of the statutory and regulatory requirements for implementing Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.

3. Provides a model for procedural implementation which ensures legal compliance to Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.

4. Assists special education administrators as a resource in examining the decision-making process as it relates to special education program implementation.

The support for these areas of concern are to be found in the review of literature and in practical experience. The review of literature served to establish a legal basis as to the statutory and regulatory requirements. The practical experience of the panel, identified in the following sections, in regards to their professional responsibility served to underscore these requirements and also to provide insights into a model for meeting the stated purposes of this document. The value of this panel was that these individuals
were representative of the professionals who have responsibility for legal interpretation, procedural development, procedural implementation, and compliance within the local districts and intermediate school district.

The validation process used special education administrators whose primary responsibilities are legal interpretation, procedural development, procedural implementation, and compliance with the local districts they represent.

Manual Development

The manual was developed in three distinct stages. The first stage was the development of forms that would assure basic legal compliance for any district that would decide to use them. The forms were developed over a period of 2 months. The forms were developed as a result of interchange between the administrators and the compliance individuals. They influenced each other in terms of what could be implemented and what would stand the test of a legal audit. The administrators influenced the sequential nature of the procedural manual. The compliance individuals influenced the legal detail contained within each form. Several individuals served as participants and respondents to this stage of manual development. These individuals included:


Oversees the compliance activities for 21 local school districts.

Three years of experience at this position.
Sixteen years of administrative experience in special education in Mt. Clemens, Michigan.

**Joan Watts:** Compliance Auditor, Macomb Intermediate School District.

Does the auditing for compliance in 21 local school districts.

Two years of experience at this position.

**Bob Hawkins:** Director of Special Education, Chippewa Valley Public Schools.

Responsible for implementation of special education programming in Chippewa Valley, a school district of 6,000 students.

Nine years of administrative experience at this position.

**Tom Fenoseff:** Supervisor of Special Services, Utica Community Schools.

Assists in procedural development in Utica, a school district of 30,000 students.

Two years of administrative experience at this position.

These individuals interacted with the process of form development in a committee structure for a period of 2 months. There was a standard process for each meeting:

1. Review the appropriate laws and regulations.
2. Discuss interpretation of those laws and regulations.
3. Provide verbal and graphic components to be contained in any specific form to be created as described in law.
4. Formalized reaction to form development from the previous meeting. This usually resulted in re-creation of that form if it was deemed necessary.
5. Each meeting focused on a specific component of law:
(a) referral procedure, (b) notice of intent to conduct an evaluation,
(c) notice to M-team, (d) invitation to attend the individual educational planning committee meeting, (e) the individual educational planning committee report, (f) parent permission for placement,
(g) postponement procedures, (h) parents' rights, (i) records procedures, and (j) hearing procedures.

The second stage of manual development was the narrative sections. Each narrative section identifies the corresponding rule number in Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198. This allows any individual using the forms to check the components of the specific form against the regulatory requirements in law. The exact legal codes were used for easy reference and the law was the source of information for both the forms and the narrative section.

During this manual development, a third stage was established to provide a formal review procedure. The intent of this review procedure was to validate the manual with special education administrators. This review procedure gave support to the stated purposes of this document.

The Validation Group

Special education administrators were asked to react to the manual because of their knowledge and interaction with the total delivery of special education programs and services. Each local school district in Macomb County has one person designated as the director of special education. This person responded to the manual. All 20
local school districts in Macomb County participated in this validation process. The following is a breakdown of the local school districts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchor Bay</td>
<td>4,843</td>
<td>Mrs. Virginia Brown</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armada</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>Mrs. Carolyn Moser</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Line</td>
<td>4,534</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Sauer</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa Valley</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>Mr. Bob Hawkins</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clintondale</td>
<td>5,262</td>
<td>Dr. Ray Contesti</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Detroit</td>
<td>9,067</td>
<td>Mr. Tom Buran</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>Miss Shirley Clark</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Shore</td>
<td>6,849</td>
<td>Mr. James Smith</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview</td>
<td>5,030</td>
<td>Mr. Jerome Burman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Anse Creuse</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>Dr. Harold Siebert</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Clemens</td>
<td>4,999</td>
<td>Dr. William Pistono</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Totin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>Mr. James Chopp</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romeo</td>
<td>5,064</td>
<td>Mr. Fred Christinidis</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseville</td>
<td>9,837</td>
<td>Mr. Albert White</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lake</td>
<td>3,343</td>
<td>Mr. Fredric Troff</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utica</td>
<td>29,981</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Mette</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Dyke</td>
<td>5,681</td>
<td>Mrs. Geraldine Doutt</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Con.</td>
<td>28,942</td>
<td>Mr. Paul Mason</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren Woods</td>
<td>6,969</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Angileri</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macomb Int.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Frances LaPlante</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dr. Frances LaPlante is a representative administrator from the Macomb Intermediate School District who participated in this validation process.

Manual Review

The content of the manual was reviewed as to the following two characteristics: (a) legal—viewing the sections of the manual as meeting the legal requirements as prescribed by law—and (b) implementation—viewing the sections of the manual as being able to be implemented by the director or his/her designee.
Each participant interacted with these two characteristics for each section identified on the Manual Evaluation Form (Appendix B) according to a 5-point scale with 1 indicating excellence and 5 indicating not acceptable. Additionally, participants were asked to make suggestions wherever they felt appropriate. Scores falling between 4 and 5 indicate that a specific section needs to be altered in terms of its legal format or its ability to be implemented. It was felt that a content area judged to be below average or not acceptable was a clear indication by the panel that the content area could not fulfill the need for which it was intended.

The participants, all special education administrators, were familiar with the basic demands of special education operation. As a result of this familiarity, the information provided to the panel was condensed to a simple overview. The exact content of the information can be found in Appendix B, Evaluation Form. The information as described in this evaluation form was read to the panel. There were no questions.

Additional Validation

Several local school districts were asked to pilot these procedures in accordance with the provision of special education programs and services. These districts included the Utica Community Schools, Chippewa Valley Schools, East Detroit Public Schools, and the Mount Clemens Public Schools representing 50,000 students. The director of special education of each of these local school districts filled out the intensive evaluation instrument (Appendix B). Additionally, they
provided narrative information regarding their implementation experiences on the Evaluation of Implementation Form (Appendix C). This form was given to the directors of special education in person. Each director was told simply to respond to the statement in the form in accordance with their own perspective of the experience of implementation.

Additionally, school districts who have interacted with the formal hearing process were asked to respond to whether these procedures would have assisted them in preparation for the hearings. The director of special education provided the narrative information for these districts on the Hearing Process Form (Appendix D). Additionally, these directors responded on the more intensive evaluation instrument (Appendix B). These school districts were Warren Woods and the Utica Community Schools.

Analysis of Data

This is an example of descriptive research using frequencies and percentages as a means of statistical presentation. Tables have been used to present the statistical information for each content area of the manual identified on the Evaluation Form (Appendix B). The tables contain the following information for each content area:

1. Frequency of responses for familiarity with area indicating exactly how many of the 21 members of the professional panel were or were not familiar with the particular content area being reviewed.

2. The percentages of responses for familiarity with area indicating what percentage of the 21 panel members supported the content
area and the percentage of panel members rejecting the content area.

3. Frequency of responses for legality indicating exactly how many of the 21 members of the professional panel were or were not supportive of the content area being reviewed.

4. The percentage of responses for legality indicating what percentage of the 21 panel members supported the content area and the percentage of panel members rejecting the content area.

5. Frequency of responses for implementation indicating exactly how many of the 21 members of the professional panel were or were not supportive of the ability to implement the content area being reviewed.

6. The percentage of responses for implementation indicating what percentage of the 21 panel members supported the content area and the percentage of panel members rejecting the content area.

The data outlined above and displayed in the tables in Chapter IV were held against a critical value of 76.2%. This value was determined by the fact that each content area needed support from at least 16 of the 21 panel members in order to be viewed as acceptable and this yields a percentage of 76.2. Each content area and each element of the content area were held against this critical value for familiarity, legality, and implementation. This information, when viewed in relationship to the critical value of 76.2%, provides an understanding as to the panel's perception of the content area as to validity (legality) and reliability (implementation).

The data presented in the following chapter demonstrate which content areas were viewed as valid and reliable. Each content area
taken separately lends itself to looking at the manual in light of the conceptual threads of due process, least restrictive environment, individual educational planning, and administrative decision-making.

The manual is an interpretation of law. As our judicial system provides evidence, laws are not considered absolute. In light of the fact that laws lend themselves to varying interpretations, the critical value of 76.2% support to each content area was thought to be a very high standard. A high level of support from a panel of professionals would serve to attest to the fact that the manual would stand the test of validity and reliability by itself as well as its component parts. This high standard would also attest to potential users of the manual that the manual is responsive to the purposes for which it was established.

Additionally, any content area which was not found to meet the critical value of 76.2% would have been subjected to the process of redevelopment equal to the initial developmental stages. This would include submitting the content area back to the original panel members to be reconstructed and then resubmitted to the administrators for validation. The professionals who have responsibility for the procedural development would interview those administrators who judged the content area as unacceptable.

In summarization, the procedural manual was reviewed by a professional panel consisting of 21 administrators of special education. The responses of each panel member were collected on the evaluation form shown in Appendix B. Each section of the manual was viewed in relationship to the critical value of 76.2%. Descriptive statistics
using frequency and percentages were used to demonstrate the panel's responses.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter is a presentation and discussion of those results obtained in the formal review process. A response was obtained from each member of the professional panel. The results are presented in accordance with the discussion in Chapter III dealing with the analysis of data. A table depicting frequency and percentages of responses is presented for each content area with corresponding discussion. Each content area is discussed in terms of the relationship of familiarity, legality, and implementation to the critical value of 76.2%. Additionally, comments from the panel members are summarized as they relate to each of the content areas presented. Those sections of the manual where the percentage is equal to or greater than the critical value were viewed as acceptable to the panel members.

Flow Chart

The initial content area in the manual is a flow chart which is a graphic representation of the entire scope and sequence of special education procedure. The flow chart serves as an overview of procedure as well as the manual. A general operational sequence with the interface of calendar days and school days was presented allowing for accountability to legal timelines. Additionally, the visual graphic movement into the legalized hearing process is outlined as an extension of those decision-making areas where a hearing can be formally
requested. The panel's perception regarding this flow chart has been identified in Table 1.

Table 1

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Flow Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow Chart</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced by Table 1, the professional panel indicated their total familiarity with the content area. They perceived the flow chart as depicting the sequence of special education procedure as prescribed in law by providing a legal percentage of 95.2. Implementation was also viewed at a high percentage of 85.7 although this percentage was lower than that given for legality. Each of these areas exceeded the critical value of 76.2% and were viewed as acceptable to the panel members.

This section generated few comments. The comments were basically positive sighting that the graphic presentation was clear and concise. A statement was given asking that legal references be identified on the flow chart.
Least Restrictive Environment

A major construct of special education involvement is the provision of the least restrictive environment to handicapped students. While this requirement established by federal law extends throughout the procedural context of special education, the least restrictive environment is presented in the manual as a philosophical as well as legal overview of the entire provision of program and services. This section of the manual also serves to establish the crucial basic relationship between general and special education. The perception of the panel regarding this content area is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Least Restrictive Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Restrictive Environment</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The content area was completely familiar to the professional panel. A percentage of 100 given to legality indicated the unanimous perception of the special education administrators as to the content of this section and the requirements of the least restrictive environment. The response given to implementation of 95.2% was also high. Each of these areas exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.
Two comments were provided by panel members to this content area. Each comment was a positive endorsement of the framework provided in this section as to the implementation of strategies by general education.

Referral Procedures

Perhaps no other area is as crucial to administrative control as is the process of referral. The legal deadlines and diagnostic requirements are extensive and demand that an administrator have an understanding of what is occurring daily within the content of total program operation. The referral procedures identified within the manual account for this crucial need. Each of the four levels is responsive to building adequate documentation to ensure the least restrictive environment. Each of the levels provides the special education administrator insights into the allocation of his personnel resources. Additionally, the levels provide an awareness as to the number of cases in transition allowing him/her to make appropriate decisions in accordance with legal demands. There is a sequential flow of movement from Level I defining the problem; Level II involving the building principal; Level III is the crucial stage of documenting attempted strategies; and Level IV where the referral is actually made.

The varying levels of this referral procedure were viewed by the professional panel in accordance with Table 3.

All four levels were completely familiar to the professional panel members. The members also viewed each of the levels as having
a high rating in accordance with their meeting the requirements pre-
scribed by law. Greater variability was evidenced by the panel's
responses to implementation. However, in each case the levels ex-
ceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

Table 3
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses
to the Referral Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Procedures</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This particular content area generated comments from six panel
members. Generally, the comments provided support to the logical and
sequential nature of the levels. A few comments focused on areas to
be considered for general changes or improvements. Specifically,
question No. 8 on the SE-12 in the manual was seen as being too
ambiguous. One panel member indicated that the heavy use of social
worker involvement in the level procedure may not be necessary. In
each of these cases, the comments did not detract from the overall acceptance of the levels. A comment was made as how to handle written parent referrals since they may not be subjected to the general referral procedure. All parent referrals are handled by legal procedures which require schools to respond within 30 school days of the referral as a special education consideration.

M-Team Process

The multidisciplinary team process provides a step by step outline as to how the forms presented in the manual should be used in a sequential fashion. The forms are coded (SE) in accordance with the sequence that they are to be used. The forms identified as special considerations are forms that are provided to respond to needed aspects of procedure but not actually included in the sequential operation. This section of the manual was judged by the panel and the panels responses are in Table 4.

Table 4

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the M-Team Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-Team Process</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The special education administrators demonstrated their familiarity with this content area as evidenced by the data disclosed in Table 4. Percentages of support were high in both the area of legality and implementation. Each of these areas were found to exceed the critical value of 76.2%.

There were only a few comments to this section of the manual. One comment declared the outline form to be excellent, while one comment raised concern about the use of a building principal as a building coordinator.

Referral Form

Federal and state audit procedures served as a basis for the development of the referral form. Departments of special education offer services to both general education and special education. Legal deadlines are not in place for services to general education, but legal deadlines are immediately in place when a referral is designated as a special education referral. An administrator of special education needs to be able to demonstrate which referral has been presented to the department and if the legal deadlines have been met. As a building coordinator, the signature at the bottom of the form of the principal is of significance in that it testifies to the documentation of the least restrictive environment. The judgment of the panel is reflected in Table 5.

Familiarity with this area was a uniform expression by the panel members as evidenced by the results contained within Table 5. An expression of support was also provided for legality for general
services and special education services. The percentage rate was 100 for both areas. An equal percentage of 95.2 was obtained for implementation in both areas leaving each area beyond the critical value of 76.2%

Table 5
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Referral Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only three comments were expressed about this content area. One comment called for a change of terminology from general services to related services. Another comment wanted greater space given to a written expression as to why the referral was being made. A similar comment was made indicating that there was general support for the form but might want some detail changes.

Notice of Intent

Responsibility for due process is significantly afforded with the notice of intent to evaluate for suspected handicapped conditions. The purpose of the notice is to inform parents of their rights as
prescribed by law. The notice is also used as official permission given by parents to conduct an evaluation. For a specific special education referral, the legal deadlines are extended from the date of parent permission. Administratively, this form or a copy of it should be kept in a permanent file to provide evidence to the official audit procedures as to parent permission. These forms could be simplified and consolidated allowing for administrative convenience. Results from the formal review process are presented in Table 6.

Table 6
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Notice of Intent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice of Intent</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the four notices of intent were familiar to the administrators. Of the four notices, only the social work notice was not given a 100% rating as to legality. The social work notice was given
a rating of 95.2%. Percentages for implementation demonstrated some degree of variability. The teacher consultant notice was given a percentage of 90.5. All other notices received a value of 95.2%. In every case the percentages for the notices of intent exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

Consolidation was a central theme of five of the eight comments providing insight as to the need to combine a single page describing evaluation services offered and a single page providing parent permission. Additional comments were pointed toward the need citing legal references and a preference for the director's signature as opposed to the principal's signature at the bottom of the page.

Due Process

As a part of the notice of intent, the due process rights were written on the back side of the form. This was done to ensure that each parent was given a copy of their rights. These due process rights were developed after an exhaustive search of federal and state law. It is necessary that due process rights are built into the notice procedure. Perceptions of the professional panel are demonstrated in Table 7.

Evidence is provided in Table 7 as to complete familiarity with each of the due process elements by the respondents. The data also demonstrate a relatively high level of acceptance by the respondents in both the area of legality and implementation. With the exception of three areas of due process, each of the areas received a percentage of 100. Records received a legal percentage of 95.2 and an
implementation percentage of 90.5. Independent evaluation was also
given an implementation percentage of 90.5. When each one of these
areas was compared to the critical value of 76.2%, it was clearly
demonstrated that each of these areas was completely acceptable to
the panel.

Table 7
The Frequency and Percentages of
Responses to Due Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Due Process</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due process did not generate much in the way of comments. A reference was given to providing legal citations and a question as to where these due process elements should be filed. As evidenced by the panel's responses, this section was judged to be acceptable.

Notice to the M-Team

This notice was developed to assist administrators in their record keeping operation by allowing the legal meetings to be handled by a central office person. The form itself is not a legal requirement but the assignment to a multidisciplinary evaluation team is legally required. The panel's view of this form is demonstrated in Table 8.

Table 8

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Notice to the Multidisciplinary Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice to the M-Team</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The requirement of notice to the M-Team was familiar to all panel members. They acknowledged the legality of this area with a percentage of 95.2. Direction was also given to some variability of handling the implementation of the area as a rating of 85.7 was given. Each of these areas was judged to exceed the critical value of 76.2%.
However, few comments were provided to this area. Generally the comments attested that this could be handled in a number of different ways.

**Invitation to the Individual Educational Planning Committee**

The invitation to the Individual Educational Planning Committee is the responsibility of the local school district. This invitation is the formal request to obtain parent participation in the certification and planning mechanisms formulated for a handicapped student. Each local school district should retain a copy of this invitation as documentation of their attempts to gain parent involvement. The invitation was reviewed by the panel and the results are demonstrated in Table 9.

**Table 9**

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Invitation to the Individual Educational Planning Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Invitation to the IEPC</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The professional panel was totally familiar with this requirement and viewed its legality and implementation at a rating of 100%. This clearly exceeded the critical value of 76.2%. The two comments...
were supportive of the written form and procedure.

Individual Education Plan Report

The Individual Education Plan Report is a major component in the delivery of special education program and services. This document serves as the basis for a school district's commitment to the educational needs of a handicapped student. This document also serves as the basis for the federal and state audit procedures. Details contained within the report are legal requirements. Exact means of documenting these legal requirements can be flexible allowing for individual district creativity. This particular format as presented in the manual allows districts to develop their plans in either one or two stages of development. Analysis of this format is provided in Table 10.

Table 10

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Individual Educational Planning Committee Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEPC Report</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All members of the professional panel expressed their familiarity with this content area. Each page of this report was viewed as acceptable in terms of the legal requirements prescribed by law. Only one exception was noted in the table and that was for Page 1 which received a rating of 95.2%. Variability was again noted in the area of implementation as each page was judged different according to the presentation of results in Table 10. Each page both in terms of legality and implementation exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

A number of comments addressed this particular section of the manual. The comments also displayed a degree of variance. Some suggestion was made as to the space given to write on these particular forms. Some comments indicated that the styling of the forms could be improved to relate to specific legal requirements for certification. A question was also raised as to the director's role in approval or disapproval of the particular plan developed by the M-Team. Generally, the comments provided additional insights into positive changes which did not in any way detract from the intent of this section.

**Individual Educational Planning Committee Postponement**

This postponement form was developed simply as a convenience to administrators in the event a legal meeting needs to be postponed. This allows the administrator to provide a specific answer to an auditor if a question of legal deadlines is presented. Table 11 represents the responses of the professional panel to this content area.
### Table 11

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses 
to the Individual Educational Planning 
Committee Postponement Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEPC Postponement</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This was one of four content areas to receive complete endorsement from all panel members. The results as depicted in Table 11 show each area to exceed the critical value of 76.2%. The only comment provided focuses on the question of whether this would cover a long-term postponement.

**Parent Permission**

The parent permission form is used following the planning meeting to obtain permission to implement the program as designed by the planning committee. An outline of agreed to program and services are identified along with the building principal responsible for program implementation. Table 12 indicates the responses of the panel to this content area.

Both areas of familiarity and legality were given a rating of 100%. Implementation was given a rating of 85.7%. In all of these areas, the manual scored in excess of the critical value of 76.2%. The few comments focused on the possibility of inclusion of parental...
permission at the time of the planning meeting. Another comment raised the question if the parent failed to return the parent permission form within the specified 7 days. As a response, the program would go into effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Permission</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area F %</th>
<th>Legal F %</th>
<th>Implementation F %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 100</td>
<td>21 100</td>
<td>18 85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>3 14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hearing Process

The formal hearing process goes into effect when the school district and the parent cannot reach agreement as to certification or programming. Under federal and state law, either party has the right to request a hearing. This section of the manual represents the forms used by either party to request such a hearing. The panel was unanimous in their perceptions of this content area and this section did not generate any comments. The results of the panel are displayed in Table 13.
Table 13
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Hearing Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hearing Process</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th></th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records Procedure

Developed procedures regarding records is often overlooked and misunderstood by local school districts. An extensive outlook of records procedure was developed in order to assist local districts to comply with the varying laws that govern this content area. Some expression was given by the professional panel as to the difficulty to understand all of these rules even for knowledgeable educators. Basically, the panel was appreciative for this concise interpretation of all these laws. Additional comments also raised some questions to which the laws do not address specific answers.

Each school district is to have on file a basic record policy. The responses of the panel are displayed in Table 14.

The viewpoint of the panel was very positive to this content area. The panel expressed familiarity to this content area with the exception of the request for a hearing which was given a percentage of 95.2. Legality was viewed with total acceptance and implementation
had one section rated at 95.2%, while the other sections were rated at 100%. All areas of the records procedure exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

Table 14
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Records Procedure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Records Procedure</th>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Record</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who Can Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Log</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary Sheets

The summary sheets were developed to serve two distinct purposes. If these sheets were used as part of the referral system, they would assist in the identification of each student’s needs as well as
documentation of the least restrictive environment. Additionally, these sheets would serve as the general education report to the multidisciplinary evaluation team as prescribed by law.

This particular content area demonstrated the greatest degree of variance in terms of responses on the part of the panel members. However, this content area only generated a few comments. The results of this content area are disclosed in Table 15.

Table 15
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Summary Sheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Sheets</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that each section of this content area exceeded the critical value of 76.2%. Generally, the panel felt they were familiar with the area with each of the summary sheets given a percentage of 95.2. Legality for this content area was viewed to be 90.5% for both summary sheets. The implementation for the elementary summary sheet was given a percentage of 85.7 while the secondary summary sheet was judged at 80.9%.
One panel member viewed the summary sheets as extensive but workable while another member felt the elementary summary sheet was too negative.

**Surrogate Parent**

This form was developed to request the assignment of a surrogate parent. The criteria as identified on the form must be met so as to require such an assignment. This section did not generate any comments. Each section was given a rating which exceeded the critical value of 76.2%. The results are in Table 16.

**Table 16**

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Surrogate Parent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrogate Parent</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpreter/Translator**

All communication with parents of children referred for possible special education program and services should be conducted in the mode and primary language of the home. This form was developed to respond to this need. This section also did not generate any comments. It was viewed to exceed the critical value of 76.2%. The
results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Interpreter/Translator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpreter/Translator</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21  100</td>
<td>21  100</td>
<td>17  80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0   0</td>
<td>0   0</td>
<td>4   19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance Checklist

Compliance to mandated law is essential for local school districts. This checklist was developed to assist the local administrator obtain information on a case by case basis as to which areas may be in compliance and which ones might not be in compliance. The comments generated by this section called basically for some modification of content as alternative ways of obtaining the same information. Table 18 displays the viewpoint of the panel to this section.

Each section of this content area was viewed to exceed the critical value of 76.2%.
Table 18
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses
to the Compliance Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Checklist</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speech and Language

Speech and language services account for the largest single involvement in special education programs. Laws that govern speech and language services are more directly related to federal regulation than state regulation. Therefore, speech and language procedures have been developed as a complete separate system within the manual. The sequence of procedures is similar to the other special education operations but the information is specifically different from other areas of programming. The content of this section was developed by speech therapists and therefore the familiarity by the administrative panel demonstrated some variance. The perceptions of the panel are displayed in Table 19.

Speech and language services were viewed by the panel to exceed the critical value of 76.2%. Familiarity with the content area was generally high, however, certain panel members indicated they were familiar with the need for each form but not necessarily the expertise
Table 19
The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to Speech and Language Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech and Language</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step by Step</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to Evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to IEP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to Implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Consent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
demonstrated in each form. With only one exception, the procedures developed to respond to speech and language requirements were viewed as being completely legal. Case summary was given a percentage of 95.2. Implementation showed some differences with all sections receiving either a percentage score of 90.5 or 95.2.

A number of comments were directed at this particular process. Nearly all the comments indicated that some level of consolidation would be helpful. One comment addressed some descriptive language modifications.

Summary of the Manual

Direction was given to the professional panel by way of the evaluation form to provide a summary of the manual in relationship to purposes of this document. This summation was also directed to the overall effect of the manual and the major themes developed in the

---

**Table 19—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Language</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
<td>F  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19  90.5</td>
<td>21  100.0</td>
<td>20  95.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2   9.5</td>
<td>0    0</td>
<td>1   4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Summary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20  95.2</td>
<td>20  95.2</td>
<td>19  90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1   4.8</td>
<td>1    4.8</td>
<td>2   9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21  100.0</td>
<td>21  100.0</td>
<td>19  90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0   0</td>
<td>0    0</td>
<td>2   9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Specific elements related to the summation have been discussed more intensely in the last chapter. However, evidence obtained from the evaluation form clearly indicates that the summary perception of the professional panel was unanimous. Their findings are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

The Frequency and Percentages of Responses to the Overall Effect of the Manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Manual Provides For:</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Educational Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in Administrative Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total declaration of familiarity was given by the professional panel to the major themes identified in this overall evaluation of the manual. Likewise, total support was given to the evaluation
areas of legality and implementation. All areas of this particular section exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

This section generated the most comments related to the evaluation form. Thirteen members of the panel provided insights into their perception of this procedural manual. Nearly all of the comments indicated that the manual was an excellent administrative resource. Members of the panel expressed their views that the manual was thorough and would allow for operational consistency. A few comments indicated that the next step should be to try and consolidate a few of the content areas. The content areas related to this comment are the Notice of Intent to Evaluate forms and the speech and language procedures. This consolidation implies that some simplification could be accomplished without losing any of the documentation for legality and providing for easier implementation. Overall, the panel endorsed the manual both in terms of its legality and also its ability to be implemented.
CHAPTER V
A FIELD TESTED MANUAL

Several school districts agreed to field test the procedural manual in accordance with the provision of special education programs and services. These districts included the Utica Community Schools, Chippewa Valley Schools, East Detroit Public Schools, and the Mount Clemens Public Schools. Each of these schools is located in Macomb County and are part of the suburban spread of the city of Detroit. The Utica schools are the largest in Macomb County with a school population of nearly 30,000 students. East Detroit is a large district of approximately 9,000 students. Chippewa Valley is a relatively new school district and the fastest growing district in Macomb County with a school population of 6,300 students. The Mount Clemens School District is in the city of Mount Clemens with a school population of 5,000 students. The director of special education for these school districts provided information as to their experience with the process of manual implementation. This information was recorded on the evaluation form identified in Appendix C. Additionally, personal conversations were held with the directors weekly at the beginning of implementation and approximately every 2 weeks throughout the period of implementation until May 1, 1980.

Implementation was accomplished at varying times during this present school year. The Utica schools and the Chippewa Valley schools began their implementation in October, 1979. East Detroit

In each of these school districts, the implementation of the manual was regarded as a smooth transitional process. This was accomplished because each of the directors of special education had provided their districts with an organizational structure in response to existing laws. This meant that the implementation of this manual occurred with school staffs already somewhat familiar with the requirements of special education procedure. In the state of Michigan, P.A. 198 has been in effect for 7 years and Federal Law 94-142 has been in effect for 3 years.

The process of implementation was formally reviewed on May 1, 1980. At this time, the directors filled out the evaluation form and a personal interview was conducted with each one of the administrators. A summary of their experience and comments is contained in the remaining portions of this chapter.

Legal Content

The experience of implementation supported the posture of legality as demonstrated by the results of the formal review process established in Chapter III. Each of the directors felt that the manual provided for the legal requirements as prescribed by law and recommended no changes in terms of the legal content.

During the process of implementation, each of these districts received a compliance audit from the Macomb Intermediate School District. This audit is prescribed by law and is an extensive
examination of process and procedure afforded to certain students selected randomly by the computer. While this was not a planned part of the field testing component, it did afford the opportunity for the manual's forms and procedures to be subjected to further examination. In all cases, the compliance unit judged the forms and procedures to meet the standards set by the state of Michigan's audit package approved in Washington, D.C., by the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped.

Implementation

The experience of implementation was reviewed as smooth but there were difficulties encountered. The involvement with implementation served to reinforce the results of the formal review process established in Chapter III. The ability to implement consistently provides greater difficulty just as the results of the formal review process showed greater variability. In all cases, however, the implementation was found acceptable.

Communication with necessary personnel was identified as the major obstacle to implementation. This difficulty presented itself proportionately to the size of the school district involved. The larger school districts, Utica Community Schools and the East Detroit Public Schools, experienced greater difficulty in this area. They depend on more formal communication systems and their communication networks are very complex. The availability of time to communicate with appropriate staff was largely controlled by regulations in the teachers' contract and a lack of financial support for released time.
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The smaller school districts, Chippewa Valley and Mount Clemens, demonstrated more informal communication systems and were able to achieve implementation easier.

Each of the directors expressed the concern that the implementation of special education laws is difficult even with a well developed manual. It was the feeling of these directors that implementation in general meets resistance simply because it is mandated by law.

There was also an expression that most special education staff were only familiar with their particular level of responsibility. The specificity to which the manual was written exceeded most of their current levels of understanding. This was not seen to present a contradiction to the need for detail in that the personnel having obtained exposure to the structure would become comfortable with the detail as a result of experience. Supporting this understanding the directors all felt that the manual served as a good resource for them to upgrade the skills of all their personnel. In actuality, the manual was seen as easier to digest than the law.

The format of the manual in terms of sequence seemed logical to most staff members. Operationally, the requirements of the manual were congruent with the districts' systems already in effect.

All of the directors were in agreement that the procedures presented by the manual did not cause them any greater difficulty than the normal day-to-day problems resulting from general special education operations.
Strengths of the Manual

A major strength of the manual was seen to be its detailed content which responded thoroughly to the dictates of law. While detail can be seen as burdensome, the directors generally felt that the manual responded appropriately to legal requirements.

The manual was viewed as a good resource for new administrators coming into the field. A new special education administrator could establish a complete operational program simply from the use of the manual.

Prevention of legal conflict was a considerable strength as generated by the directors in response to their implementation. This manual would assist school districts in present compliance activities to ensure adherence to legal standards.

The sequence of the manual would allow it to be used in a training program with appropriate school personnel in order to establish their greater understanding of procedures. A provision for in-service would be necessary to accomplish this task.

All directors provided supportive evidence that school personnel could become easily familiar with the forms and procedures identified in the manual.

An area of strength was identified in that the format of the manual allowed for easy change of a form or procedure if it were found necessary to do so.
Suggestions for Improvement

Comments provided for improvement were quite specific in relationship to the manual. An initial suggestion called for consolidation of the Notice of Intent to Evaluate section. All districts supported this desire and Chippewa Valley offered a solution in making the notice no more than two pages yet covering the same information. It was felt that this would make implementation of this section easier for school districts.

Chippewa Valley and Mount Clemens suggested that each local school district develop their own Individual Education Planning forms which would meet the basic requirements of the manual. Since this form is used so extensively, each district might favor its own graphic structure with direct teacher input.

All of the districts requested a consolidation of the speech process although each of the districts felt that implementation was quite easy. The basic element to be consolidated was the Speech Individual Education Plans where the districts felt it should be left more specifically to the local district.

The Utica Community Schools and the East Detroit Public Schools felt that the manual needed more narrative description. In their particular districts where communication was more formal, this would allow the manual to be used with more populations attached to the special education process. Additionally, the capability for in-service would be greatly improved.
Each of the districts supported the need for the forms in the manual to be printed on multiple copy paper for record keeping purposes.

Hearing Process

Warren Woods Public Schools and the Utica Community Schools were asked to respond to the interface of the formal hearing process with the use of the manual's forms and procedures.

At no time during this school year were either of these districts involved with the hearing process. However, each of these districts have been involved with the hearing process within the previous school year.

The directors of special education of these two systems responded to the evaluation form found in Appendix D. Their comments were brief.

Generally, they felt that the manual provides for the legal requirements and that they would be well prepared for a hearing using the manual. In each of their particular past hearings, the forms and procedures would have assisted their efforts. In each of their cases, the elements of due process were not the central issue.

They offered no additional comments for improvement.
Introduction

Efforts to obtain a free and appropriate education for handicapped students have been occurring throughout the United States. The decade of the seventies has experienced a quiet revolution. This quiet revolution has become louder as movement into the decade of the eighties has taken place.

The effect of legislative mandate and judicial decisions on the organizational structure, operation, and professional responsibility for the delivery of services to handicapped populations within local, intermediate, and state educational agencies has been dramatic.

The balance of this chapter serves to restate the purpose of this document, its findings, implications, and recommendations.

Problem Statement

Absence of appropriate procedures that serve to control, regulate, and direct the organization, administration, and provision of educational services to children may reduce the efficient and effective operation of the public schools.

General and special educators are currently faced with the problem of initiating organizational change in providing for educational services to handicapped students due to the external forces of
legislative mandates and judicial litigation. Concurrent with these external forces, general and special educators have begun to realize the inadequacies of present organizational structures and service delivery systems. In response to these social forces and professional criticism, there is a demand for the development of consistent procedures to allow for program effectiveness, efficiency, and legal compliance.

The development of the procedural manual was directly responsive to these often stated needs. The contents of this document are also related to the specific purposes of this study.

Purpose of this Document

The initial focus of this document was to examine the statutory and regulatory requirements of Public Law 94-142 and Michigan Public Act 198 in that this examination provides the basis for procedural development. The major purpose of this document is to provide a procedural manual which:

1. Has been validated and field tested.
2. Informs special education administrators through the use of sequential procedures of the statutory and regulatory requirements for implementing Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.
3. Provides a model for procedural implementation which ensures legal compliance to Public Law 94-142 and Public Act 198.
4. Assists special education administrators as a resource in examining the decision-making process as it relates to special education program implementation.
Findings of the Study

The procedural manual was formally reviewed by a professional panel consisting of 21 administrators of special education. Responses from each panel member were recorded on the evaluation form in Appendix B. All 21 panel members responded on the evaluation form provided.

Each content area of the manual was subjected to the formal review process. Content areas were reviewed according to their familiarity to the panel members, legality, and ability to be implemented by appropriate school personnel. Each content area in the manual was held against the critical value of 76.2% for the characteristics of familiarity, legality, and implementation. In other words, each content area needed to receive at least 16 supportive rankings from panel members in each characteristic. An opportunity to provide a narrative description of difficulties or suggestions for improvement were afforded each panel member.

Generally, the panel expressed complete familiarity with the content areas of the manual. Exceptions to familiarity were noted in isolated instances such as the hearing procedure for records, elementary and secondary report forms, surrogate parent, and elements of the total speech process.

A high percentage of support was given to content areas of the manual in relationship to the characteristic of legality. In all instances, the content areas were judged to exceed the critical value of 76.2% for legality. Panel members felt that each section of the
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manual met the requirements prescribed by federal and state law. Little variation to the percentages for legality was noted in the content areas. Only the areas of elementary and secondary summary sheets had two panel members raise some concern relating to legality. Few comments were generated regarding legality.

Greater variation of responses was noted for the content areas in relationship to the characteristic implementation. In all instances, the content areas were judged to exceed the critical value of 76.2% for implementation. Panel members felt that each content area of the manual could be implemented to meet the requirements prescribed by federal and state law. The comments for this characteristic of implementation were generally suggestions for improvement. Consolidation was an underlying theme for improvement. The variation of responses to implementation also suggest that the procedures are difficult to implement in and of themselves.

As a summary of perception, the panel members were asked how this manual related to the overall themes of manual development as expressed in the last section of the evaluation form in Appendix B. In each case, the panel members judged the manual as being completely familiar to them, as being legal, and as being able to be implemented.

These findings support the intentions of validity and reliability. In every instance, the manual exceeded the critical value of 76.2%.

Additionally, the information from the field testing component provided supportive evidence as to legality and implementation. The manual withstood the legal audit procedure from the state and was
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able to be implemented in four school districts. While difficulties were noted in the process of implementation, the difficulties did not detract from the overall usefulness of the manual.

Conclusions

As a result of this developmental process, certain conclusions based on the findings are evident. These conclusions are in direct relationship to the purposes for which this document was intended. These are:

1. This manual was validated as evidenced by the data collected in the formal review process. A field testing component was also achieved in four local school districts.

2. The data obtained in the formal review process relating to legality demonstrated that the manual provided for the statutory and regulatory requirements found in Public Act 198 and Public Law 94-142.

3. The information obtained from the formal review process relating to implementation demonstrates the manual's capability as a model for procedural implementation.

4. The results from the review process and the field testing component serve to underscore the manual's usefulness as a resource to administrative decision making as it relates to special education programs and services.

Implications

Certain implications are evident as a result of the manual's development and the formal review process. Each of the implications
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taken specifically create a level of impact upon the field of special education. The implications taken collectively significantly alter the compliance activities of school districts in response to legal demands.

Implications resulting from the manual are:

1. This manual would effectively eliminate school districts being taken to a formal hearing based on a lack of procedural technicality. Hearings are lost when procedures have been overlooked. Hearings dealing primarily with issues of professional expertise are usually advantageous to the school district.

2. Each school year local school districts are subjected to a formal compliance audit. This manual would allow school districts to more adequately document their compliance activities thus ensuring legal provisions to handicapped consumers.

3. Future changes in legal perspectives relating to special education operations could be dealt with on a collective basis. This operational mode would continue to assure legal compliance on a larger level or program operation than simply a local school district. At least respondent behavior to crisis would be uniform instead of isolated.

4. This manual would provide a more consistent standard between local school districts. This is often a problem as students move between school districts. Implementation of the manual would provide a perspective that each child was provided programming elements and due process on a similar standard without regard to school residence.
5. Potential administrators in the area of special education could receive a specific standard of study related to administration and procedural development. Many of the comments of the professional panel alluded to the use of this manual as an administrative resource.

6. Standardization of communication to parents and teacher unions could be afforded as a result of this manual's development. This is especially important because of the advisory relationship that often exists with these populations.

Recommendations

The recommendations stemming from this entire process are as follows:

1. There should be an extension of the review process into other areas with the state of Michigan. This would provide other perspectives reflecting other interpretations and levels of understanding.

2. A provision should be made for other field testing locations. Considerations should be given to size of the school district and locality. In addition, other demographic elements should be considered.

3. Some thought should be given to possible consolidation of certain content areas as was supported in the comments of the professional panel.

4. Extension of the manual should occur providing for greater narrative description of the procedural content areas. This would allow the manual to be used as an in-service tool to more specific
populations.

5. Follow-up should be afforded to local school districts who implement the manual on a long-term basis to adequately judge the impact the manual has had in regard to legality and implementation.

6. There should be an attempt to validate the manual with other populations such as teachers and parents in order to determine how the manual would affect their understanding of the process of implementation.
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Short Term Remediation-Functional
Summary Caseload
Dismissal Form
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It is imperative that each local district develop some type of system which assists in documenting what has been done in general education for an individual as a preliminary to making any type of referral. The type of system is left to the local district to develop reflective of the uniqueness of each district operation. Relating to any movement for special education, certain legal requirements are evident. While interpretations may vary as to methods of documentation, the intent of documentation is specifically clear.

Public Law 94-142 provides legal assurance that each individual considered to be handicapped is educated in the "least restrictive environment."

Specifically the law states that each public agency shall insure:

1. That to the maximum extent appropriate handicapped children are educated with children who are not handicapped, and

2. That special classes, separate schooling or other removal of handicapped children from the regular educational environment occurs only when the nature or severity of the handicap is such that education in regular classes, with the use of supplementary aids and services, cannot be achieved satisfactorily.

All individuals are first the responsibility of general education. Special education is a support system to general education. The responsibility for all students is mutual. The documentation of what strategies have been attempted in general education is essential if the promise of the "least restrictive environment" is to become reality. Above all else, it is each child's right.

Guidelines for the delivery of special education programs/services in Michigan requires that the planning committee reviews the educational diagnosis and determine if the student is in need of special education programs and/or services. If the planning committee agrees that non-special education services will resolve the problem, then the responsibility remains with general education.
REFERRAL PROCEDURES

Each level is to be followed as outlined:

Level I - Defines the Problem

Person Responsible: Teacher

1. Fill out SE-11 or SE-12. These are elementary and secondary report forms.

2. Provide a narrative statement relating to the following:
   a. Is the major concern behavioral or academic?
   b. Identify the specific concerns, how often, when and in what situations it occurs.
   c. What does the teacher think is causing the behavior?
   d. Outline what has been done to meet the child's needs.

Level II - Teacher and Principal Meeting

1. Review the information contained in Level I. Major concerns are the things that have been done to assist the child and the particular strengths of the child.

2. Principal sets Level III meeting date.

3. Principal to record date of Level II meeting with teacher.

Level III - Meeting to Discuss Educational Strategies

Persons Responsible: Teacher
Principal
Social Worker

as needed: Psychologist
Teacher Consultants
Speech Therapists
General Education Supportive Staff
(Reading, etc.)
Possible Suggestions

1. Give an assignment where child cannot fail.
2. What praise or reward is given for success?
3. Reduce length of assignment - individualize.
4. Determine child's interests.
5. Make a performance contract.
6. Re-assign seating to improve social relationships.
7. Use a quiet corner.
8. Ask another child to read the assignments and/or material child is having difficulty with.
9. Make a chart to show the child's daily progress in words or problems learned - show results to child.
10. Allow longer time periods for completion.
11. Space problems further apart on a page.
12. Use aids such as, tape recorders, etc.
13. Provide substitute projects for written assignments.
14. Give child opportunity to make oral reports.
15. Help students organize his/her work.
16. Practice following directions with the student.
17. Use resources available -
   Reading consultant
   Math consultant

Determine a definite time limit to use when strategies are identified and keep a record or chart.

Level IV - Review of Educational Progress

Persons Responsible: Teacher
                    Principal
                    Social Worker
                    Parent

as needed: Psychologists
           Teacher Consultants
           Speech Therapists
           General Education Support Staff

1. Evaluation of progress and strategies used -
   a. How many?
   b. How successful?
   c. Changes of attitude
   d. Progress
2. What changes has parent been noting in child's attitude toward self and school?

3. Should strategies be continued – for how long?

4. If further help is needed: Refer at this time for a Social Work evaluation.

(Parent signs referral at this time)
THE MULTI-DISCIPLINARY TEAM PROCESS

STEP BY STEP PROCEDURE

1. Principal serving as building coordinator enacts district referral procedure.

2. Special Education Department is in receipt of a referral which indicates a student has a suspected handicapping condition. (SE-1)

3. Appropriate school personnel notify parents of intent to conduct an evaluation, due process procedures, and obtain parent permission. (SE-2 A-D)

4. Department of Special Education designates the Multi-disciplinary team to conduct the needed evaluation. (SE-3)

5. A Notice of Invitation for parent involvement in the IEPC is sent. (SE-4)

6. The IEPC fills out (SE-5) its report identifying eligibility criteria and programming needs.

7. If an IEPC postponement is necessary, (SE-6) should be filled out and distributed.

8. The parents grant permission for program implementation (SE-7) or file for a hearing (SE-8).

9. The school district, if necessary, may request a hearing (SE-9).

SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Any release of information will require parental consent recorded on SE-10A – C


4. Request for Assignment of a Surrogate Parent SE-13

5. Request for Interpreter/Translator SE-14

6. Compliance Check List SE-15
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SPECIAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

REFERRAL FORM

GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parent's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>Teacher/Counselor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grade ___________________________ Birthday ________________ Age ________________

REASON FOR REFERRAL (check one box)

Check either General Service or Special Education, but not both

□ GENERAL SERVICES REQUESTED (explanation required)

________ School Social Worker

________ School Psychologists

________ Other ____________

□ SPECIAL EDUCATION - If there is reasonable cause to suspect that this child is in need of special education services, please indicate the area (check only one)

________ Physically or Otherwise Health Impaired

________ Educable Mentally Impaired

________ Speech and language Impaired

________ Emotionally Impaired

________ Hearing Impaired

________ Learning Disabled

________ Visually Impaired

________ Pre-primary Impaired

________ Other

Explanation (required)

Principal's Signature ___________________________ This signature certifies that general education strategies were identified and documented as a prerequisite to this referral.
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NOTICE OF INTENT

The Notice of Intent to conduct an evaluation is the second step following the referral. The purpose of this notice is to inform parents of their rights as described by law. Additionally, this form serves as the parent permission form allowing the educational evaluation to be completed. The Notice of Intent has been developed reflecting each major area of responsibility. A school district could combine these forms, but each element as presented in these forms is required.

This form should be developed on multiple copy paper for record keeping purposes. The full text of parental rights are printed on the back side of each notice. The following rules are covered:

**State**

Rule 380.201 to Rule 380.205
Rule 380.301 to Rule 380.370

**Federal**

Rule 121 a. 500 to 121 a. 513
Rule 121 a. 530 to 121 a. 534
NOTICE OF INTENT TO CONDUCT A
PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATION

Requested by: ________________________________
Student's name ____________________________
Home school district _______________________
Birthdate _______ Sex _______ Grade _______
School ________________________________
Home address ____________________________
Teacher or counselor _______________________
Parent or guardian _________________________
Home telephone ___________________________
Work telephone ___________________________

REASON FOR REFERRAL:
( ) Special Education — Suspected Handicap
( ) General Education — Referral for Educational Diagnosis only

DEFINITION OF SERVICES: The school psychologist evaluates a student in the areas of intelligence, academic achievement, eye-hand coordination and looks for possible emotional problems. Of those listed, the tests that are checked will be given. Occasionally, it may be necessary to give tests which are not listed. The session usually lasts two hours during the school day. Upon completion of the tests, parents and the school personnel involved will be notified of the results. For further information, call the school psychologist at ____________________.

SERVICES AVAILABLE:

INDIVIDUAL STANDARDIZED INTELLIGENCE TESTS
Measures the student's overall ability to understand and cope with the world around him.
e.g. Cattell Infant Scale of Intelligence
denver Developmental Test
Leiter International Perform. Scale
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (WISC-R)
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale (WAIS)
Stanford-Binet Form L-M
Other ____________________________

LANGUAGE TESTS...
Assesses abilities to understand information presented verbally or non-verbally.
e.g. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)
Other ____________________________

PERSONALITY TESTS...
Evaluates emotional stability.
e.g. Sentence completion
Children’s Apperception Tests
Draw A Person
Thermatic Apperception
draw A Family
Other ____________________________

ACHIEVEMENT TESTS...
Provides a measure of achievement in specific academic areas such as spelling, reading and arithmetic.
e.g. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test
Key Math
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test
Other ____________________________

VISUAL MOTOR TESTS...
Evaluates eye-hand coordination.
e.g. Sensory Motor Integration
Bender Visual Motor Gestalt
Other ____________________________

PARENT CONSENT:
I understand the results of this evaluation may be used to recommend a change in my 'child's educational program. Recommendations may be: 1.) No change in his present program; 2.) Modifications within general education; 3.) Support services while the 'child remains in the regular classroom; 4.) Consideration for placement in a full or part-time special education classroom.

Please check the appropriate statements.

☐ I have read a copy of Parental Rights and Due Process as stated on the back of this form.
☐ I agree to the necessary services.
☐ I refuse permission for the above evaluation.

Legally responsible adult ____________________ date ____________________
Coordinator or principal ____________________ date ____________________

Copy Distribution: White — Special Services Green — Parent Canary — Psychologist Pink — Case Manager/Coordinator Goldenrod — Other
Notice of Intent to Conduct a Social Work Evaluation

Requested by: _______________________

Student's name ____________________ Home school district ____________________

birthdate _______ Sex _______ Grade _______ School _____________________________

Home address_________________________ Teacher or counselor_____________________

Parent or guardian______________________ Home telephone_________________________

Work telephone________________________

Reason for Referral:

( ) Special Education — Suspected handicap Compliance date _____________________

( ) General Education — Referral for educational diagnosis only.

Definition of Services: The school social worker evaluates a student's social and emotional adjustment. Often used in making this determination are 1.) Family consultation 2.) Student conferences 3.) Teacher conferences 4.) Observations 5.) Coordination with other agencies (if appropriate). This evaluation may be used to aid the school district. For further information, contact the school worker at __________________________.

Services Available:

Student Assessment: Background information provided by school and family sources.

Individual Counseling: Deals with student's identified problems.

Group Counseling: Parents share concerns and learn child management.

Family Counseling: Conferences with student and family members in an attempt to solve problems.

Parent Consent:

I understand the results of this evaluation may be used to recommend a change in my child's educational program. Recommendations may be: 1.) No change in his present program; 2.) Modifications within general education; 3.) Support services while the child remains in the regular classroom; 4.) Consideration for placement in a full or part-time special education classroom.

Please check the appropriate statements.

---

Legally responsible adult _______ date _______

Coordinator or Principal _______ date _______

Copy Distribution: White - Special Services Green - Parent Canary - Social Worker Pink - Case Manager/Coordinator Goldenrod - Other
NOTICE OF INTENT TO CONDUCT A
TEACHER CONSULTANT EVALUATION

Requested by: __________________________

Student's name ___________________________ Home school district __________________________

Birthdate _______ Sex _______ Grade _______ School __________________________

Home address ___________________________ Teacher or counselor __________________________

Parent or guardian ___________________________ Home telephone __________________________

Work telephone __________________________

REASON FOR REFERRAL:

( ) Special Education -- Suspected handicap Compliance date __________________________

( ) General Education -- Referral for educational diagnosis only

DEFINITION OF SERVICES: A teacher consultant primarily evaluates academic achievement
and looks for possible indications of other educational needs. Additionally, they
may be involved in observations. For further information, contact the teacher con­
sultant at ________________________________

SERVICES AVAILABLE:

ACHIEVEMENT TESTS ... Provides a measure
of achievement in specific academic areas
such as spelling, reading and arithmetic.
e.g. Woodcock Johnson Psycho-educational
Woodcock Reading Mastery
Key Math
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
Other __________________________________

PERCEPTUAL MOTOR ... Provides a
measure of ability to integrate
visual and auditory processes
e.g. Slingerland Frostig
Slingerland
Wepman
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
VHI
Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
Other __________________________________

PARENT CONSENT:

I understand the results of this evaluation may be used to recommend a change in my
child's educational program. Recommendations may be: 1.) No change in his present
program; 2.) Modifications within general education; 3.) Support services while the
child remains in the regular classroom; 4.) Consideration for placement in a full or
part-time special education classroom.

Please check the appropriate statements.

_____ I have read a copy of Parental Rights and Due Process as stated on the
back of this form.

_____ I agree to the necessary services.

_____ I refuse permission for the above evaluation.

_________________________ __________________________
Legally responsible adult date

_________________________ __________________________
Coordinator or principal date

Copy Distribution: White - Special Services Green - Parent Canary - Teacher Consultant
Pink - Case Manager/Coordinator Goldenrod - Other
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NOTICE OF INTENT TO CONDUCT A
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE EVALUATION

Requested by: ____________________________

Student's name ________________________ Home school district: ____________________________

Birthdate __________ Sex __________ Grade ______ School ____________________________

Home address ___________________________ Teacher or counselor ____________________________

Parent or guardian ___________________________ Home telephone ____________________________

Work telephone ____________________________

REASON FOR REFERRAL:

( ) Special Education — Suspected Handicap Compliance Date ______________________

( ) General Education — Referral for educational Diagnosis only

DEFINITION OF SERVICES: The teacher of the speech and language impaired diagnoses and
remediates speech and language difficulties which interfere with learning. Tests to
diagnose the problem and determine possible future service will be administered.
Generally, testing will not take more than two hours to complete during the school
day, although several sessions may be required. If there are any questions, call the
teacher of speech and language impaired at ____________________________.

TESTS OR SERVICES AVAILABLE:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT: Assesses the student's ability to process, understand and
communicate verbal ideas. Examples: Oral Motor Examination, Northwest Syntax
Screening Test, Test of Language Development (TOLD), Zimmerman Pre-school Language
Scale, Hearing Evaluation. Other ____________________________

ARTICULATION: Assesses the student's ability to speak clearly and effectively without
substitutions, omissions of sound for his age (developmental) level. Examples: Oral
Motor Examination, hearing evaluation, Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation, Photo
Articulation Test. Other ____________________________

VOICE: Assesses the student's ability to utilize appropriate vocal pitch, loudness
or quality of speech. Examples: Possible medical examination of the vocal mechanism
by an ear, nose and throat specialist; tapes sample of the student's speech; appraisal
of the student's vocal quality by the teacher of the speech and language impaired.
Other ____________________________

FLUENCY (Stuttering): Assesses the student's ability to speak without excessive
Interruptions (blocks); repetition of sounds, words, phrases or sentences which
Interfere with effective communication. Examples: A taped speech sampling and the
appraisal of fluency by the teacher of the speech and language impaired.
Other ____________________________

PARENT CONSENT:

I understand the results of this evaluation may be used to recommend a change in my
child's educational program. Recommendations may be: 1.) No change in his present
program; 2.) Modifications within general education; 3.) Support services while the
child remains in the regular classroom; 4.) Consideration for placement in a full or
part-time special education classroom.

-Please check the appropriate statements.

I have read a copy of Parental Rights and Due Process as stated on the
back of this form.

I agree to the necessary services.

I refuse permission for the above evaluation.

__________________________ ____________________________
Legally responsible adult date

__________________________ ____________________________
Coordinator or principal date

Copy Distribution: White - Special Services Green - Parent Canary - Speech
Pink - Case Manager/Coordinator Goldenrod - Other
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CONSENT: Consent means that you have been fully informed of all information relevant to the activity for which consent is being sought, in your native language, or other mode of communication.

That you understand and agree in writing to the carrying out of the activity for which your consent is being sought.

That you understand that the granting of consent is voluntary on the part of you and may be revoked at any time.

INDEPENDENT EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION: You, as parents, have the right to an independent educational evaluation if you disagree with the evaluation of the district; right to have that evaluation considered in any decision made in providing services to your child; right to be told where an independent evaluation may be obtained at no expense; right to have the district pay for the evaluation if the district's evaluation was not appropriate as determined by a hearing officer.

RECORDS: You have the right to inspect and review records; right to make copies of records; right to receive a list of all types and locations of records being collected, maintained or used by the district; right to ask for an explanation of any item in the records; right to ask for an amendment of any record on the grounds it is inaccurate, misleading or violates privacy rights; right to a hearing on the issue if the district refuses to make the amendment.

HEARING: You have the right to request an impartial due process hearing to question the district's identification, evaluation, placement of your child or provision of a free appropriate public education; right to have the hearing conducted by the district directly responsible for your child's education; right to be told of any free or low cost legal and other relevant services available; right to have the hearing chaired by a person not employed by the district involved in the education of your child or otherwise having any personal or professional interest in the hearing; right to see a statement of the qualifications of the hearing officer; right to be accompanied to the hearing and advised by counsel and individuals with special knowledge or training in problems of the handicapped; right to have your child present; right to have the hearing open to the public; right to present evidence and confront, cross-examine and compel the attendance of witnesses; right to prohibit the introduction of any evidence at the hearing that has not been disclosed at least five days before the hearing; right to have a record of the hearing; right to obtain written findings of fact and a written decision within 45 days after the district received the initial request for the hearing; right to appeal to the state educational agency and receive a decision within 30 days of the filing of an appeal; right to have a hearing and appeals which allow oral arguments, to be set at a time reasonably convenient to you; right to appeal a decision from the state educational agency into court; right to have your child remain in his present educational placement during the pendency of the administrative proceeding, unless you and the district agree otherwise.

NOTICE: Right to notice before the agency initiates or changes, or refuses to initiate or change, the identification, evaluation or placement of your child; right to have that notice in writing, in your native language or other principal mode of communication, at a level understandable to the general public; right to have the notice describe the proposed action, explain why it is proposed, describe the options considered and explain why those other options were rejected; right to be notified of each evaluation procedure, test, record or report the agency will use as a basis for any proposed action.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES: Right to have a full and individual evaluation of your child's educational needs; right to be assured that testing does not discriminate on the basis of language or culture; right to have more than one criterion used in determining the appropriate educational program; right to have the evaluation performed by a multidisciplinary team; right to have your child assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability; right to have a re-evaluation every three years or more frequently if conditions warrant or if you or the teacher request it.
NOTICE TO THE MULTI-DISCIPLINARY TEAM

The Notice to the Multi-disciplinary Team allows for record keeping as to who is involved with the M-Team. It also administratively allows for the IEPC meeting to be set in advance to secure adherence to specified legal timelines. This form allows for members of the M-Team to organize their schedules by the date of meetings identified at the bottom.

This form is perceived as helpful, but is not a legal requirement. However, the assignment to the M-Team is.

State

R 380.215

Federal

121 a. 344
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SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
MULTI-DISCIPLINARY TEAM

Student Name _______________________________________
Parents' Name _______________________________________
School ____________________________________________

Case Manager __________________ Position _______________

Date ______________

Personnel:

Director __________________
Building Principal ___________
Teacher (s) _______________
Guidance Counselor(s) _______
Psychologist _______________
Social Worker _______________
Special Education Specialists ___________
Other _______________________

Place _______________________
Time _________________________
Date _________________________
INVITATION TO ATTEND INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Invitation to attend the Individual Educational Planning Committee (IEPC) is the parent's formal invitation. The purpose is to keep the parent thoroughly informed about the development of the individualized education program and to invite parental participation.

Administrators should keep a copy of this form in the official records file to document attempt to invite parents. The following rules are covered:

State

Rule 380.220

Federal

Rule 121 a. 343
Rule 121 a. 344
Rule 121 a. 345
INVITATION TO ATTEND INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

Dear Parent:

Thank you for responding promptly and granting permission for ______________ to be evaluated for potential special education and related services. The evaluation(s) will be conducted exactly as it was described to you in the Notice of Intent to Conduct an Evaluation.

We have scheduled the meeting to develop your child's individualized education program for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

According to the requirements of P.A. 198, the Michigan Mandatory Special Education Act of 1973, the following persons are required to participate in the development of your child's individualized education program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relation to Child</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A representative of the local educational agency, other than the child's teachers, who is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child's teacher or teachers, special or regular, or both, who have a direct responsibility for implementing the child's individualized education program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or both of child's parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where appropriate, the child.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the M-Team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other individuals at the discretion of the parent or agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If, for some reason this schedule is not acceptable to you, please contact me as soon as possible. A representative of the school will contact you to review IEPC procedures prior to the meeting.

Yours truly,

Chairperson of the Evaluation Team
Telephone Number
The IEPC report allows districts some flexibility in determining whether or not they want to complete the IEP in one stage or two depending on their own particular interpretation of law. Specifically, the areas required by law are outlined in the form.

An area called Update on the first page is identified in that a formal review during conferences may be in order although this is not specifically required by law. The intent of this Update would be to review the progress of the IEP sometime during the school year.

The following rules are covered:

**State**

- Rule 380.215
- Rule 380.220
- Rule 380.225
- Rule 380.230

**Federal**

- Rule 121 a. 340
- Rule 121 a. 342
- Rule 121 a. 343
- Rule 121 a. 344
- Rule 121 a. 345
- Rule 121 a. 346
- Rule 121 a. 349
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SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLANNING COMMITTEE
REPORT

NAME ______________________ B.O. __________ C.A. __________ GRADE __________
ADDRESS ______________________ PHONE __________ HOME SCHOOL __________
PROGRAM ______________________ LEVEL __________

PERSONNEL INVOLVED: (Signatures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Were Parents Notified? Yes ____ No ____
How/When? Mail ____ Phone ____ Other ____

1. I understand that an individual implementation plan will develop this more intensively and that I will be involved in its development __________
   Case Manager

2. Diagnostic results have been explained to me __________

3. Any slight changes in time schedules will be communicated by the teacher in writing and given to the parent(s) __________

4. I have received copies of:
   1. Parental rights
   2. Organization and agencies

5. A representative of the school district has explained the IEPC process __________
   Parents

Approved ____ Disapproved ____
Signature of Director ______________________ Date __________
### Presenting Concern


### Evaluations of the M-Team considered:

- Psychological
- Social Worker
- Speech
- Teacher Consultant
- General Education Teacher
- Reading Consultant
- Title I
- Outside agencies
- Other

### Diagnostic and Eligibility/Ineligibility Statement


- Emotionally Impaired 380.110
- Hearing Impaired 380.115
- Educable Mentally Impaired 380.120
- Trainable Mentally Impaired 380.120
- Physically/Health Impaired 380.125
- Preprimary Impaired 380.130
- Multiply Impaired 380.13
- Specific Learning Disability 380.140
- Speech and Language 380.145
- Visually Impaired 380.15
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Present Levels of Performance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math_ Reading_ Spelling_ Socialization_ Speech_ Written Language_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Related Services:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiological_ Social Work_ Psychological_ Transportation_ Speech_ Other_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Percentage of Time:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education_ Special Education_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected Starting Date_ Duration of Services_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Term Objectives_ Materials &amp; Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Signature_ Parents Signature_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVALUATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Date_ Ending Date_ Achieved_ Not Achieved_ Standardized Testing_ Teacher Designed Testing_ Balanced Instruction_ Balanced Education_ Other_ Education Exemption_ English as a Second Language_ Basic Life Skills Not Relevant_ Basic Objectives Too Difficult_ Other_ General_ 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEPC POSTPONEMENT FORM

The IEPC Postponement form is simply a convenience to administrators in the event an IEPC is postponed. This allows for record keeping to answer questions of an audit or complaint in the event it becomes an issue.
SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

IEPC POSTPONEMENT

Case Manager/Coordinator ________________________________

Student's Name __________________________ D.O.B. _____________

School ________________ Date of Referral ________________

Scheduled IEPC Date _________________________________

Time _________________________________

Place _________________________________

This meeting is being postponed because of the following reason —

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Rescheduled For Date _________________________________

Time _________________________________

Place _________________________________

Dissemination of this notice —

( ) Director of Special Education

( ) Building Principal

( ) Parent

( ) Other
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PARENT PERMISSION

The Parent Permission form follows the IEPC and becomes the legal requirement for permission to place a child in a special education program and/or service.

The building principal is identified as having program responsibility in that Directors of Special Education, being Central Administrators, are removed from the day to day program operation.

The following rules are covered:

State

Rule 380.235
Rule 380.240
PARENT PERMISSION FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF THE INDIVIDUAL EDUCATIONAL PLAN  DATE __________

TO:

FROM:

As a result of the Individual Educational Planning Committee held for
____________________________, the individual was found to be eligible
as __________________________.

The following special education program and services will be imple­
mented by the building principal ________________________________:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Services</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Starting Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is necessary that this form be signed and returned within seven (7) calendar days from the receipt of this notice if you agree with the program and/or services recommended by the planning committee.

Date __________  ____________________  Legally Responsible Adult
HEARING PROCESS

In the event that some element of eligibility or programming is of conflict to either the parent or the school district, either party has the right to request a hearing adhering to the due process requirements identified in law.

State
R 380.320
R 380.325
R 380.330
R 380.345
R 380.355
R 380.360
R 380.365
R 380.370

Federal
121 a. 506
121 a. 507
121 a. 509
121 a. 510
121 a. 511
121 a. 512
121 a. 513
REQUEST FOR A HEARING

DATE ________________

In the event that you disagree with the identification, evaluation, program, educational placement, and the provisions of a free appropriate education for your child, you may request a hearing within seven (7) calendar days from receipt of this notice.

I have received a copy of my rights and I also understand that I may obtain additional information from the Director of Special Education.

I hereby request a hearing.

Date ______________________ Legally Responsible Adult
NOTICE OF THE FILING OF A REQUEST

FOR A HEARING - SCHOOL DISTRICTS

DATE __________

PURPOSE: To inform the parents that the local school district has filed for a hearing in response to a parent's refusal to permit an evaluation or placement or in response to a disagreement by the parents with the proposed individualized education program.

Dear Parent:

Since we have been unable to reach agreement on the proposed individualized education program for your child, this school district has today filed a request for a hearing before an impartial officer. It is hoped that this hearing will enable a fair and speedy resolution of our differences.

You already have received a copy of your rights. If you have a need for any further information, please feel free to call me.

We are looking forward to settling this quickly so that we are all assured that your child is receiving an appropriate education.

Sincerely yours,

Director of Special Education
The procedure for special education records is important and is often overlooked and misunderstood. The following narrative outlines the requirements of a formalized record procedure.

The Laws reviewed are:

4. USC54-142 Education for all Handicapped Act of 1975 (PL 94-142).

Records:

1. What is an educational record?

An educational record as opposed to a public record (As defined by the Freedom of Information Act General School Laws 15.231 - 15.246) is defined consistently as:

(A) Those records, files, documents and other materials which:

1. contain information directly related to a student, and
2. are maintained by an educational agency or institution, or by a person acting for such agency or institution.

(B) The term educational record does not include:

1. records of institutional, supervisory, and administrative personnel and educational personnel ancillary thereto which are in the sole possession of the maker thereof and which are not accessible or revealed to any other person except a substitute.

(c) "Record" means information or data recorded in any medium, including, but not limited to: handwriting, print, tapes, film, microfilm, and microfiche.

(d) Directory information relating to a student includes:

(a) the student's name
(b) the student's address
(c) telephone listing
(d) date and place of birth
(e) major field of study
(f) participation in officially recognized activities and sports
(g) weight and height of members of athletic teams
(h) dates of attendance
(i) degrees and awards received
(j) most recent previous educational agency or institution attended by the student

(E) Personally identifiable means: that the data or information includes:

(a) the name of a student, the student's parent(s) or other family members
(b) the address of the student
(c) a personal identifier, such as the student's social security number or student number
(d) a list of personal characteristics which would make it possible to identify the student with reasonable certainty
(e) other information which would make it possible

II. Who can access educational records?

(A) Parents' access rights include:

(a) the right to be provided a list of the types of education records which are maintained by the institution and are directly related to the student which could include, but not limited to:
   (a) CA 60
   (b) Special Education file
   (c) Emergency cards
   (d) Central registry
   (e) Title I file

(b) the right to inspect and review any educational records relating to their children which are collected, maintained, or used by the agency

(c) The agency shall comply with a request without unnecessary delay but no longer than 45 days from written request; or before any meeting regarding an IEP (94-142) or EPPC (PA 190), and have access to educational records prior to a hearing of the ISD or local district concerning the handicapped person and (R340.1723 1 (a) before effectuation of an educational placement, denial or change in status of a handicapped person.

(d) the right to a response from the participating agency to reasonable requests for explanations and interpretations of the records.
(e) the right to request that the agency provide copies of the records containing the information if failure to provide those copies would effectively prevent the parent from exercising the right to inspect and review records.

(f) the right to have a representative of the parent inspect and review the records.

(g) the right to an opportunity for a "hearing" to challenge the content of those records to insure that it is not inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights or the child. And to provide an opportunity for the correction or deletion of any such inaccurate, misleading, or otherwise inappropriate data contained therein and to insert into such records a written explanation of the parents respecting the contents of such records.

(h) The public agency shall inform parents when personally identifiable information collected, maintained or used under this part is no longer needed to provide educational services to the child, the information must be destroyed at the request of the parents. It can be maintained permanently by the agency unless otherwise specified. However, a permanent record of a student's name, address, phone number, grades, attendance record, classes attended, grade level completed may be maintained without time limitations.

(B) School officials including teachers with the educational institution or local educational institution or local educational agency who have been determined by such agency to have legitimate educational interests.

(C) Officials of other school systems in which the student seeks or intends to enroll, upon condition that the student's parents be notified of the transfer, receive a copy of the record if desired, and have an opportunity for a hearing to challenge the content of the record.

(D) Authorized representatives of:
   (1) The Comptroller General of the United States
   (2) Secretary of HEW
   (3) Administrative head of an education agency
   (4) State Educational authorities with certain restrictions.

(E) In connection with a student's application for, or receipt of financial aid.
(F) State and Local officials or authorities to which such information is specifically required to be reported or disclosed pursuant to State Statute e.g. Macomb ISD under Michigan Compiled Laws R.340.1731.

(G) Organizations of educational agencies or institutions for the purpose of developing, validating and administering predictive tests, if such information will not permit the identification of any person by the organization receiving such information.

(H) Parents of a dependent student of such parents, as defined in Section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(I) Subject to regulations of the Secretary, in connection with an emergency, appropriate persons if the knowledge of such information is necessary to protect the health or safety of the student or other persons.

(J) Other individuals, agencies or organizations with written consent or parents which specifies the records to be released, the reasons for such release, to whom, and with a copy of the records to be released to the student's parents and the student if desired by the parents.

(K) By judicial orders or pursuant to any lawfully issued subpoena upon condition that parents and the students are notified of such orders or subpoenas in advance of the compliance by the agency therewith.

(L) Eligible students reaching age 18.

III. Safeguards:

(A) Each participating agency shall protect the confidentiality of personally identifiable information at collection, storage, disclosure, and destruction stages.

(B) The building principal or administrator in charge of a department is responsible for assuming responsibility for insuring the confidentiality of any education record within his jurisdiction.

(C) All persons collecting or using personally identifiable information must receive training or instruction regarding the State's policies and procedures (generally outlined in this document.)
Each participating agency shall maintain for public inspection a current listing of the names and positions of those employees within the agency who may have access to personally identifiable information.

Each educational agency shall maintain a record, kept with the education record of each student, which will indicate all individuals (except those specified as having access rights) agencies, or organizations which have requested or obtained access to a student's education records maintained by such educational agency or institution, and which will indicate specifically the legitimate interest that each person, agency or organization has in obtaining this information.

Personal information shall only be transferred by an agency to a third party on the condition that such party will not permit any other party to have access to such information without the written consent of the parents of the student.

Each educational agency shall formulate and adopt a policy of annually informing parents of students or eligible students their rights.

The educational agency shall formulate and adopt a policy to be followed by a parent or an eligible student who requests to inspect and review the education records of the student.

Provide a schedule of fees for copies of records, but not charge a fee to search for or to retrieve information.

The educational agency shall permit access to educational records only by those legally entitled too.

The educational agency shall inform other individuals, agencies, organizations who request educational records authorized by the parent or legal guardian, the parents' right to access records that might be used for determining eligibility or placement of a child into a special education program.

Request for "hearings" regarding disputes that records are misleading, inaccurate, or otherwise in violation of the privacy or other rights of the student shall be handled first at the building level informally. If the dispute is not resolved, the Superintendent shall appoint a "hearing officer" who does not have direct interest in the outcome. The hearing officer will render a decision.
as to the disputed record based solely on the evidence presented by the district representative and parent and/or his representative. A written decision along with a rationale for the decision shall be given to the parent and district representative within 14 days of the conclusion of the hearing. If the decision is adverse to the parent or eligible student, they have a right to include a written explanation concerning the disputed information within the record which must be included when the record is transmitted to another agency, individual or organization.

(H) Parents or eligible students have the right to file a complaint with the FRPA office, Department of HEW, 330 Independence Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20201 regarding failure of the District to comply with the provisions of the Act.
CONSENT TO DISCLOSE EDUCATIONAL RECORDS

As parent and/or legal guardian of ____________________________
I hereby consent to the disclosure of the following educational record(s):

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Check as appropriate: Access to __________________________
Copy __________________________

TO:

Name: _________________________________________________
Street Address: ______________________________________
City ______________________ State: _____________ Zip: _____

For the Purpose of:

____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

I further desire to:

1. review the educational record prior to disclosure __
2. receive a copy of the record(s) disclosed which I may be charged the cost of reproduction __

Date _________________ Parent __________________________
or
 Eligible student

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
LOG OF EDUCATION RECORDS DISCLOSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Record Disclosed</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To Whom</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student ____________________________
HEARING REQUEST

DATE: ______________

TO: Office of the Superintendent

I hereby request a hearing to challenge the content of the educational record of:

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________
Birthdate __________________________
Phone _____________________________
School ____________________________ Grade ________

Specific record to be amended: __________________________________________

Amendment requested: _________________________________________________

Grounds for the request (inaccurate, misleading, violation of privacy or other rights of student: Explain:

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Parent

Date ____________________________ Eligible Student

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
SUMMARY SHEETS

A summary sheet for elementary and secondary teachers has been developed. The purpose of these summary sheets is twofold. First, if this sheet is used as part of a pre-referral system, it assists in the identification of each student's needs as well as the documentation of the least restrictive environment prescribed by law. Secondly, it serves as the general education report to the Multi-disciplinary Team which is required by law.
Elementary

**SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT**

**EPPC SUMMARY SHEET**

**DATE _____________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Student's Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Parent's Name</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address</strong></th>
<th><strong>School</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Teacher/Counselor</strong></th>
<th><strong>Telephone</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Level</strong></th>
<th><strong>Birthdate</strong></th>
<th><strong>Age</strong></th>
<th><strong>Siblings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** This form (both sides) is to be completed and given to the Case Manager at the EPPC meeting. If these completed forms are not available at the time of the meeting, the meeting will be postponed.

Check those that are applicable.

**Gross Motor Skills**
- ( ) adequate
- ( ) moves awkwardly running or walking, throwing, catching, hopping, jumping, kicking, skipping.
- ( ) loses balance, falls often, directionality, laterality, reaction-speed dexterity
- ( ) dislike for physically active games

**Fine Motor Skills**
- ( ) adequate
- ( ) poor paper/pencil work, erases, messy
- ( ) excessive time used for paper assignments

**Vision (Acuity)**
- ( ) adequate
- ( ) uses corrective lenses
- ( ) squints and rubs eyes
- ( ) eyes redden, seems to tire easily
- ( ) any school screening suggesting difficulty
- ( ) holds papers, looks too close
- ( ) holds papers, looks too far away
- ( ) coordination and pursuit difficulties
- ( ) form discrimination difficulties
- ( ) figure-ground difficulties

**Hearing (Acuity)**
- ( ) adequate
- ( ) uses corrective device
- ( ) inattentive
- ( ) inappropriate responses
- ( ) any school screening suggesting difficulty
- ( ) decoding difficulties
- ( ) association difficulties
- ( ) sequencing difficulties

Comments ____________________________________________________________________
Health ( ) adequate
( ) frequently ill
( ) allergies
( ) dental work needed
( ) high absenteeism
( ) clear speech
( ) medication(s)
Comments______________________________

Communication Skills ( ) adequate
( ) speech is not intelligible
( ) doesn’t speak in sentences
( ) doesn’t use an appropriate voice and inflection
( ) inability to follow and contribute to class discussions
( ) inability to carry on a conversation with an adult
( ) inability to follow directions given to the class
( ) inability to follow specific directions given to him/her individually
( ) has an inappropriate rate of speech
Comments______________________________

Intellectual Development:

Name of latest intelligence test______________________________

Date of test______________________________

Verbal Performance Full Scale __________

Comprehends what he reads ( ) generally ( ) sometimes ( ) seldom

Comprehends what he hears ( ) generally ( ) sometimes ( ) seldom

( ) able to apply new information to learning situations

( ) able to supply appropriate answers in classroom discussion

Comments:

Social Development: ( ) normal (Check if applicable

( ) acts out ( ) hostile ( ) fearful
( ) bizarre ( ) negative ( ) passive
( ) instigator ( ) scape goat ( ) conforms to limits
( ) manipulator ( ) infantile ( ) does not conform to limits
( ) aggressive— ( ) rejected— ( ) attention seeking
( ) conform to limits

Comments:
Emotional Development: (check if applicable)

( ) cheerful  ( ) frustrated  ( ) tense
( ) excitable  ( ) withdrawn  ( ) lacks expression
( ) depressed  ( ) repetitive speech  ( ) moody
( ) fearful  ( ) confused  ( ) boisterous
( ) anxious

Comments:

Academic Development:

Approximate Grade Level

Reading__________________
Arithmetic__________________
Spelling__________________
Language__________________

Receptive__________________
Expressive__________________

Indicate instrument(s) of measurement used__________________

Student complete ____% of the assigned tasks at the _______________ level.

a) 90-100%  d) 10-29%
b) 70-89%  e) 0-9%
c) 30-69%

Student requires help from the teacher and/or other students ____% of the time in order to complete assigned work.

a) 90-100%  d) 10-29%
b) 70-89%  e) 0-9%
c) 30-69%

( ) achievement lower than ability indicates
( ) achievement level lower than expected by teacher
( ) level expected by teacher
( ) difficulty with specific school subjects
( ) regular school attendance
( ) dislikes school

AREAS OF STRENGTH:
1.
2.
3.

AREAS OF WEAKNESS:
1.
2.
3.
LEARNING STYLES:
1.
2.
3.

ANY OTHER ASSESSMENTS AVAILABLE:

VISUAL
AUDITORY
PERCEPTUAL-MOTOR

Identify what learning strategies have already been attempted in the regular classroom. Results:
1.
2.
3.

Attach a narrative statement relating to the following:

a. Is the major concern behavioral or academic?
b. Identify the specific concerns, how often, when and in what situations it occurs.
c. What does the teacher think is causing the behavior?
d. Outline what has been done to meet the child's needs.

Signature Title Date

Use the rest of the page for any additional comments.
Secondary Teacher ____________________ Date: ____________________

Subject ____________________

Room #: ____________________

Students Name ____________________ Parents Name _________________

Address ______________________ Telephone #: ____________________

*Counselor ____________________ School _______________________

Grade Placement ________________ Birthdate ___________ Age _______

Please help us by providing the following information and returning it to the counselor*. Thank you.

1. Have you had any concerns about this student's functioning in your class?
   - yes
   - no
   If yes, in:
     - a. academic areas
     - b. behavioral areas (discipline problems, etc.)
     - c. peer relationships
     - d. attendance

2. Please explain: ________________________________________________

3. What is the student's present academic standing?
   - a. top third
   - b. middle third
   - c. lower third

4. If you were to give this student a letter grade right now, what would it be? _______

5. Is this grade based on regular course work?
   - yes
   - no
6. Identify the strategies that you have attempted to meet this student's needs.
   1. ________________________________
   2. ________________________________
   3. ________________________________
   4. ________________________________
   5. ________________________________

7. What strengths have you observed in this student? ________________________________

8. Do you feel that this student would benefit from special education services?
   ___ yes
   ___ no

9. If you are concerned having this student referred for special education services, please attach a narrative statement relating to the following:
   a. Identify how often, when and in what situations the specific concerns occur.
   b. What do you think is causing the behavior?
   c. Have the parents been made aware of the problem?

10. Would you like a conference with the school social worker regarding this student?
    ___ yes
        ___ no
        Convenient time______________________

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
SURROGATE PARENT

The purpose is to request assignments of a surrogate parent.

State
-----------------
R 380.103

Federal
-----------------
121 a. 514

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
REQUEST FOR ASSIGNMENT OF A SURROGATE PARENT

PURPOSE: To request assignment of a surrogate parent to the child. The request shall be filed with the local school district if:

— The child’s parents or guardians are not known.
— The child’s parents or guardians are not available.
— The child is a ward of the state.

CHILD

1. NAME: ________________________________________________________________
2. ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________
   Number Street
   City State Zip Code
3. TELEPHONE: ___________________________________________________________
   Area Code Number
4. WITH WHOM IS THE CHILD RESIDING?
   NAME: __________________________________________________________________
   RELATIONSHIP: __________________________________________________________

INQUIRER

1. NAME: __________________________________________________________________
2. POSITION TITLE: _________________________________________________________
3. EMPLOYER/AGENCY: ____________________________________________________
4. BUSINESS ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________
   Number Street
   City State Zip Code
5. BUSINESS TELEPHONE: _________________________________________________
   Area Code Number
6. WHY HAS THIS REQUEST BEEN MADE?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

SIGNATURE: ________________________
Person Making Request
REQUESTING AN INTERPRETER/TRANSLATOR

State
R 380.205
R 380.301 to 380.370

Federal
121 a. 532
REQUEST FOR INTERPRETER/TRANSLATOR

PURPOSE: All communication with parents of children referred for possible special education and related services or currently receiving special education and related services should be conducted in the mode and primary language of the home. If the special education administrator determines that the language is other than English or that the parents are blind or hearing impaired and an interpreter/translator is needed to facilitate communications between the evaluation team members and the parents and/or child, then this form should be completed.

1. CHILD's NAME: _________________________________________________
   PARENT's NAME: ________________________________________________
   ADDRESS: ______________________________________________________
   Number Street
   City State Zip Code

2. The mode or primary language of the home is ______________________

3. An interpreter/translator will be needed for the following:
   ____ Development of the individualized education program
   ____ Review of the written individualized education program
   ____ Review of student records (written)
   ____ Hearing procedure
   ____ Identification of a surrogate parent

4. An interpreter/translator is needed on the following date(s):
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________

DATE ____________________
COMPLIANCE CHECK LIST

This check list is used by either a case manager or a secretary to record the date of each sequential event. This provides the administrator with information as to the compliance of each case and makes staff more mindful of legal deadlines. The form should be kept in the central file for audit purposes.
## COMPLIANCE CHECK LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>1. Date of receipt of referral (SE-1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>2. Date of Notice to Conduct an Evaluation (SE-2A-D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>3. Date of Assignment to M-Team (SE-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>4. Date of Invitation to IEPC (SE-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>5. Date of IEPC (SE-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>6. Date of Postponement, if necessary (SE-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>7. Parent Permission (SE-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes____ No____</td>
<td>8. Hearing Request (SE-9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Speech and Language services are more directly governed by Federal Law P.L. 94-142 than State Law P.A. 198. The following section has been developed because of the high incidence of speech services provided by each local school district. The sequence of procedures is similar to other areas of special education, but the information is different.
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

STEP BY STEP PROCEDURES

1. Following the screening process, appropriate school personnel notify parents of intent to conduct an evaluation, due process, and obtain parent permission. (SP-1 - 2)

2. Invitation to develop the I.E.P. (SP-3)

3. If parent has been unable to attend, this notice will facilitate obtaining parental permission after the I.E.P. has been developed. (SP-4)

4. The I.E.P. Consent Form (SP-5 - SP-5A)

(SP-4 and SP-5 - 5A are sent out together if the parents are not in attendance at the I.E.P.)

5. The I.E.P. (SP-6A - 6D)

6. The Caseload Summary sheet allows the Speech Therapist to keep records of the current caseload and student requirements. (SP-7)

7. Dismissal Form in that termination is also high in this population. SP-8)
Dear Parent(s):

Through the screening process, your child has tentatively been identified as possibly being in need of speech and language therapy services. In order to determine your child's needs, further testing is required.

Attached is a list of tests that may be administered to your child.

This sheet must be returned with your signature before testing will be initiated. If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to call me at the Special Education office.

Thank you,

Teacher of the Speech and Language Impaired

____ I hereby grant permission for you to test my child.

____ I do not grant permission.

Parent/Guardian's Signature

School Date
### SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple-Darley Articulation Test</td>
<td>To assess your child's proficiency in producing the sounds in the English language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Articulation Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald Deep Test of Articulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictive Screening Test of Articulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination</td>
<td>To assess your child's ability to discriminate between sounds in the English language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindemoode Auditory Discrimination Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Agent</td>
<td>To assess your child's receptive and expressive language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Children's Language Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The A. B. C. Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrow Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota Test of Differential Diagnosis of Aphasia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of Language Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Test of Language Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test</td>
<td>To assess your child's acquisition of vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrow Elicited Language Inventory</td>
<td>To assess your child's ability to produce grammatically complete sentences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental Sentence Scoring Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern Syntax Screening Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineland Social Maturity Scale</td>
<td>To assess the milestones in your child's language development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimmerman Preschool Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Concept Inventory</td>
<td>To assess your child's ability to understand concepts relative to language development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.G.Y. Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination of oral structure and function</td>
<td>To assess your child's motoric function relative to speech and voice production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiological Assessment</td>
<td>To determine the level of your child's hearing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other

Other

Other
Dear Parent(s):

Speech and Language services are a part of Special Education programs provided by your child's school. Federal Law requires school districts to develop an Individual Educational Plan (I.E.P.) for each child before he may receive Special Education services or programs. It is also our responsibility to review and revise each child's plan at least once per year.

We would like to have the opportunity to meet with you to work together to develop the Individual Educational Plan for your child's Speech and Language program. A representative of the school district as well as a member of the Speech and Language staff will be present.

A meeting has been set for ______ on __________________ at (time) (date) (place). If this time is inconvenient, please call me at the Special Education office and the meeting will be rescheduled, if possible.

We consider your participation in providing this service to your child to be extremely important and will look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Teacher of Speech and Language Impaired
Dear Parent(s):

We regret that we have been unable to arrange a meeting with you to develop or review and revise your child's Individual Educational Plan (I.E.P.) for receiving speech and language services.

Although we would prefer to meet with you in person, since we have been unable to schedule a meeting, we have developed the enclosed plan for your child. We would like you to review the plan. If you find this plan to be acceptable, please sign each copy. Return the first two copies in the enclosed envelope; keep the other copy for your records. If you would like to discuss the plan further before signing, please contact me at the Special Education office.

Therapy Services cannot be initiated or continued until the signed plan has been returned.

Thank you for your help,

Teacher of the Speech and Language Impaired
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I.E.P. FORM
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

Name: __________________________ Address: __________________________

Age: __________ B.D. __________ City: __________________________

School: __________________________ Telephone: __________________________

Grade: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Your child has been screened and is eligible for Speech and Language therapy services. The communication problem is classified as a(n) -

1. Articulation
2. Voice
3. Rhythm
4. Language Disorder

This disorder is characterized by:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

The long term goal is to remediate for the above disorder. The short term objectives are listed on the attached sheet.

Your child will be seen (individually, in a small group) for _________ session(s) per week.

Date program will start ______________ anticipated duration ____________.

An annual review of your child's I.E.P. will be held within one year from the above date.
Initial Parental Consent for Placement

I give my consent to have my child (placed in, dismissed from) the Speech and Language Program -

Yes _____
No _____

I agree with the I.E.P. recommendation

Yes _____
No _____

This Individual Educational Program was developed by:

Teacher of Speech/Language Impaired  Signature of student, parent or guardian

School Representative

Other

If you do not agree to the I.E.P. as outlined above, please sign here. We will contact you to arrange a personal conference as soon as possible. You also have the right to request a hearing concerning this proposed I.E.P.

Signature of student, parent or guardian

______________________________
Date
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE THERAPY SERVICES
SHORT TERM REMEDIATION OF ARTICULATION DISORDERS

NAME: ___________________________ AGE: _______ SCHOOL: ______________________ DATE: ____________

Description of Problem:

In a variety of speaking situations, the student will use an acceptable sound with consistency as evaluated by the clinician, classroom teacher and him/herself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Phoneme</th>
<th>Designated Phoneme</th>
<th>Designated Phoneme</th>
<th>COMMENTS-TECHNIQUES-EVALUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Proj. Date</td>
<td>Accom.</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Ear Training: The student will

1. Discriminate gross sounds.
2. Discriminate between a correct and an incorrectly produced sound when presented by the therapist.
3. Discriminate between a correct and an incorrectly produced sound when produced by him/herself.

B. Production of sound: The student will

1. Produce his sound correctly in isolation.
2. Produce his sound correctly in nonsense syllables in the _ initial, _ final and _ medial positions.
3. Produce his sound correctly in the _ initial, _ final and _ medial positions of a word.
4. Produce his sound correctly in controlled sentences.
5. Produce his sound correctly and consistently in controlled connected speech.

C. Unstructured Speech: The student will

1. Consistently use a correct sound in all school situations.
2. Consistently use a correct sound in social situations.
3. Consistently use a correct sound at home.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR RECEPTIVE LANGUAGE</th>
<th>DATE INITIATED</th>
<th>PROJECTED DATE</th>
<th>DATE ACCOM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT WILL BE ABLE TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Attend to auditory cues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Recognize and respond appropriately to audi-
  tory cues                                   |                |                |             |
| a. Non-Speech sounds (Ex: bell, whistle)      |                |                |             |
| b. Speech sounds                              |                |                |             |
| c. Sequenced speech units of words            |                |                |             |
| 3. Comprehend the meaning of words by descrip-
  tion (Ex: Hand me the toy).                  |                |                |             |
| 4. Comprehend the meaning of words by function
  (Ex: Please give that bounces, can roll, or can be thrown). |                |                |             |
| 5. Respond appropriately to Yes or No questions
  (Ex: Are you a boy?)                         |                |                |             |
| 6. Follow spoken commands on singular levels   |                |                |             |
| Ex: Sit down.                                 |                |                |             |
| 7. Follow spoken commands and questions on a   |                |                |             |
| multiple level (Ex: Put the pencil on the desk,
  turn off the lights and say your name)       |                |                |             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES FOR EXPRESSIVE LANGUAGE</th>
<th>DATE INITIATED</th>
<th>PROJECTED DATE</th>
<th>DATE ACCOM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT WILL BE ABLE TO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase verbal output of nouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Increase verbal output of adjectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Increase verbal output of verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Increase verbal output of adverbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Correctly use regular and irregular verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Correctly use singulars and plurals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Correctly use pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Correctly use prepositions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. Use correct word order in sentences (Ex: Noun-
  Verb-Object: I eat cake)                     |                |                |             |
| 10. Use negative phrases in the appropriate manner |                |                |             |
| 11. Correctly and appropriately use questions  |                |                |             |
| 12. Appropriately respond to Yes - no questions |                |                |             |
| 13. Verbalize about objects, situations and or concepts in a grammatically appropriate conversational pattern |                |                |             |
# SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

## SHORT TERM OBJECTIVES FOR REMEDIATION OF FLUENCY DISORDERS

**Student:** ___________________  **Grade:** _________  **Therapist:** ___________________

**Diagnostic Evaluation:**
1. Disfluency Index ______  4. Adaptation ______
2. Frequency ______  5. Other ______
3. Consistency ______

**Goal:** To Eliminate Overt Mannerisms (Secondary Characteristics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Date Accomplished</th>
<th>Techniques and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify his overt mannerisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe his overt mannerisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze his overt mannerisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eliminate his overt mannerisms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** To Identify and Control the Stuttering blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Date Accomplished</th>
<th>Techniques and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify his stuttering blocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe his stuttering blocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Analyze his stuttering blocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Control his stuttering blocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** To Increase the student's Knowledge and Understanding of Himself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Date Accomplished</th>
<th>Techniques and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The subject will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Increase his knowledge of the process of speaking and the things he is doing that interfere with speaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluate his stuttering blocks and his reaction to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Modify his undesirable reactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Analyze and describe his behavior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analyze and describe his feared situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop an adequate self-concept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Goal:** To Enable Parents and Classroom Teachers of Stutterer's to Provide an Environment Favorable to the Development of Fluent Speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>Date Initiated</th>
<th>Date Accomplished</th>
<th>Techniques and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parents and Classroom Teachers will be able to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Discuss normal development of speech and language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Discuss &quot;normal&quot; non-fluency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Discuss common misconceptions about stuttering.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Discuss how severe stuttering blocks may develop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Listen to the subject's stuttering blocks without exhibiting unfavorable reactions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Develop insight into pressures which contribute to the student's non-fluency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Develop the use of preventive techniques.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Speech and Language Services

**Short Term Objectives for Remediation of Functional Voice Disorders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Objectives</th>
<th>Breathiness</th>
<th>Hoarseness</th>
<th>Aphonia</th>
<th>Hypernasality</th>
<th>Denasality</th>
<th>Harshness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject will be able to:</td>
<td>Date In.</td>
<td>Date Accom.</td>
<td>Date In.</td>
<td>Date Accom.</td>
<td>Date In.</td>
<td>Date Accom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. To develop self awareness of problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To differentiate characteristics of existing and target voice models.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To develop closest approximation of target voice in structured situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To reduce and/or eliminate environmental situations conducive to vocal abuse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To stabilize target voice production in structured situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To stabilize target voice production in non-structured situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To carry over target voice production in all situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJOR PROBLEM(S)  

CODE:  
A = Articulation  
H = Hearing  
L = Language  
R = Rhythm  
V = Voice  

REASON FOR DISMISSAL  

CODE:  
OC = Corrected  
DM = Moved  
OI = Optimal Improvement  
CO = Consultation Only  

SUMMARY OF SPEECH AND LANGUAGE CASELOAD  

SCHOOL:  
Teacher of Speech and Language Impaired  
School Year:  19___ - 19___  

NAME:  

Date Permission to Evaluate Received  
Date of Evaluation  
Major Problem(s)  
Other Special Placement  
Date of Certification  
I.E.P. #1  
Annual Review  
I.E.P. #2  
Annual Review  
I.E.P. #3  
Annual Review  
Dismissal Date  
Reason for Dismissal  
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SPECIAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
DISMISSAL FORM
SPEECH AND LANGUAGE SERVICES

Name ___________________ Address ___________________

Age ______ Birthdate ______ City _____________________

School ___________________ Telephone ___________________

Grade ___________________ Date ___________________

Your child has been re-evaluated and it has been determined that he/she no longer requires the services of the school speech and language therapist.

A. Your child has completed the goals listed in his/her I.E.P.

B. Your child has reached a sufficient level of performance and will be rechecked periodically.

C. Your child needs further speech help, but his/her lack of motivation and poor attitude are hindering his/her progress.

Continued awareness and use of correct speech in the home will be of great help in stabilizing the effect of previous speech, language, voice, stuttering therapy.

I give my consent to have my child dismissed from the Speech and Language Program.

Yes ______

No ______

Teacher of Speech/Language Impaired ___________________ Student, Parent, Guardian ___________________

School Representative ___________________

Other ___________________
Appendix B

Evaluation Form
PROCEDURES FOR USING THE EVALUATION FORM

Federal Law 94-142 and State Law Public Act 198 have created intensive demands upon public schools for the delivery of special education programs and services to handicapped individuals. The intent of this manual is to provide a procedural response to the new proposed rules in Michigan which attempt to merge P.L. 94-142 and P.A. 198. A panel of administrators and compliance auditors provided practical insight into the development of this manual.

The need is presently to review of the manual in terms of validity and reliability. The following two descriptive terms are used on the form:

1. Legal: viewing the sections of the manual as meeting the legal requirements as prescribed by law

2. Implementation: viewing the sections of the manual as being able to be implemented by the director or his/her designee

Each participant is to respond to each manual section according to a five point scale with one (1) indicating excellence and five (5) indicating not acceptable. The scale is as follows:

1 = Excellent  
2 = Above Average  
3 = Average  
4 = Below Average  
5 = Not Acceptable

Please circle the appropriate numerical selection for each item.

The space provided under each section is given to provide the opportunity to identify areas of problems or suggested improvements.
### EVALUATION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 1 Flow Chart</td>
<td>Yes No 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 2 Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>Yes No 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 3-5 Referral Procedure</td>
<td>Yes No 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 6 M-Team Process</td>
<td>Yes No 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 7 Referral Form</td>
<td>Yes No 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
### Content Area Familiarity With Area Legal Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 8-16 Notice of Intent</th>
<th>Family Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Consultant</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 8-16 Due Process</th>
<th>Consent</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consent</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 17-18 Notice to the M-Team</th>
<th>Yes No</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice to the M-Team</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 19-20 Invitation to the IEPC</th>
<th>Yes No</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to the IEPC</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P 21-24 IEPC Report</th>
<th>Page 1</th>
<th>Family Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 1</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 2</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page 3</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P 25-26 IEPC Postponement</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 27-28 Parent Permission</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 29-31 Hearing Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Request</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Request</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 32-40 Records Procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I What is an educational record</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Who can access</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Safeguards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent to Disclose</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Log</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Request</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 41-47 Summary Sheets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>Familiarity With Area</td>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 48-49 Surrogate Parent</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 50-51 Interpreter/Translator</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 52-53 Compliance Check List</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 54-67 Speech and Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-by-Step Procedure</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to Evaluate</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to IEP</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to Implement</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Form</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Consent</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation Disorders</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Disorders</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency Disorders</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice Disorders</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Summary</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal Form</td>
<td>Yes No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems/Suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, this manual provides for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Familiarity With Area</th>
<th>Legal</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due Process</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Restrictive Environment</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Education Planning</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in Administration</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Making</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problems/Suggestions
Appendix C

Evaluation of Implementation
EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. Describe your efforts to implement procedures identified within the Special Education Procedures Manual.

2. Identify any difficulties with either the legal content or the actual implementation of the procedures.

3. Identify strengths of the content area or the ability of appropriate staff to implement the procedures.

4. Suggestions for improvement.
Appendix D

Hearing Process
HEARING PROCESS

1. Would a school district using these procedures be in a positive legal procedural position during a formal hearing?

2. Would this manual have assisted or hindered your particular hearing?

3. Suggestions for improvement.
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