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The strong emphasis on individualized education programs (IEPs) for the handicapped is relatively new in the field of special education. However, the concept of individualized instruction for the handicapped began with Itard, Sequin, and their successors who proposed in the 19th century that the handicapped have:

- Individualized instruction, in which the child's characteristics rather than prescribed academic content provide the basis for teaching techniques;
- A carefully sequenced series of educational tasks, beginning with tasks the child can perform and gradually leading to more and more complex learning;
- Belief that every child should be educated to the greatest extent possible, the assumption being that every child can improve to some degree. (Hallahan & Kauffman, 1978, p. 16)

Although individualized instruction was not reported to be a common practice at the beginning of the 1950s, Martens (1953) did discuss the education of the handicapped in terms of the individual child though the curricula and activities proposed were designed to be completed in groups. By the close of that decade there was evidence that special education teachers were becoming increasingly aware of the need for individualization of instruction in their classrooms. For example, in 1957, the ability to recognize individual differences was ranked first out of the 100 teacher competencies listed in a survey of competencies needed by teachers conducted by Mackie, Williams, and Dunn (1957). The 150 teachers of the handicapped who
responded to that survey also ranked the skill in individualizing the curriculum to meet the child's needs as fourth in priority of the 100 choices in the checklist.

Awareness of the need for individualized instruction of the handicapped increased during the 1960s. Garton (1961), Ingram (1960), and Peter (1965) indicated the foremost basic principle in the education of the handicapped to be the consideration of the needs of the child as an individual and the provision of services based on each child's ability. Early in the 1970s state laws and regulations were adopted to insure that every child was the recipient of both an individually designed educational plan and the services necessary to make that plan a reality (Weintraub, Abeson, Ballard, & LaVor, 1976). Weintraub, et al. (1976), indicated that the statutory language in the states' rules and regulations include such words as "'suitable,' 'appropriate,' 'specialized instruction,' 'appropriate to the child's capacity,' and 'designed to develop maximum potential of every handicapped person'" (p. 90).

During the same time period, that is the early seventies, the courts began to be involved in educational programs for the handicapped. Class action suits were being used to modify the status of education of handicapped children in the United States and the courts began to mandate that services be provided for children not previously served by the schools (Kirk & Gallagher, 1979). In 1972, the individualization of educational programs was mandated when a federal court decree indicated that education and training be provided to all handicapped children based on the needs and capacity of each child
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The initial response to individualization of instruction for the handicapped by the U.S. Congress was at first fragmentary and limited. However, the provisions in the federal legislation served notice to the states that the federal government was beginning to accept responsibility for providing support resources for the handicapped and the legislation that was enacted aided states in carrying out their basic responsibilities for such children (Kirk & Gallagher, 1979). The Congress later passed two specific pieces of legislation that directly affected the education of all handicapped children. They are: (a) Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap (Section 504, PL 93-112, [1973]), and (b) Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142, [1975]). The specific provisions of PL 94-142 are a forceful mandate for the education of all handicapped children (Harring, 1978). Section 504 contains provision in statute to limit the federal funds available to state and local education agencies from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW)* for being in noncompliance with the law (Holt, 1978a).

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (PL 94-142) was enacted by Congress to insure that all handicapped children have available to them a free appropriate public education which includes special education and related services to meet their unique needs. Additional purposes of the law are to insure that the rights of handicapped children and their parents are protected, and that the states

*The Education portion of HEW has since become the Department of Education.
and local education agencies are assisted in providing for the educa-
tion of all handicapped children (45 Compiled Federal Regulations
(CFR) 121a.1).

The legislation referred to above is affecting the education of
3.7 million children who participate in special education services.
This represents 7.4% of the school-aged population. As of 1979, the
federal government appropriated $245 million for services to the
handicapped. This amount is estimated to be only 5% of the total
cost of special education programs (State Program Implementation
Studies Branch of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (SPISB/
BEH, Note 1). These funds are available to state and local educa-
tion agencies to assist in their efforts to provide special education
and related services to the handicapped. The funds are provided to
these agencies only after they give assurance to the federal govern-
ment that each handicapped child has available a free appropriate
public education that is consistent with federal laws. These agen-
cies are then monitored to verify that the assurances are consistent
with the practices of the agencies.

The individualized education program element of PL 94-142 is
considered by many to be the single most important part of the law
(Meyen, 1978). The IEP is a written document that is developed by a
committee of school personnel and parents which indicates the special
education and related services the student is to receive. PL 94-142
specifies the content of the IEP (see page 8 for the definition of
IEP) and specifies that an IEP must be developed for every handi capped
child who is receiving special education services if the state
and local education agencies are to receive federal funds. Once the
IEP is developed, the local education agency or school district must
then provide the special education and related services in accordance
with that IEP (45 CFR 121a.346).

Monitoring

In addition to the specifics of the IEP, PL 94-142 requires
state and local education agencies to "assess and insure the effec­
tiveness of efforts to educate handicapped children" (45 CFR 121a.1).
PL 94-142 requires both state and local education agencies to monitor
their efforts to educate handicapped children. The IEP can serve as
a focal point for compliance with the law (Meyen, 1978). A review by
this investigator of the monitoring procedures implemented by several
states and the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the
Handicapped (BEH) indicated a lack of consistent and comprehensive
criteria for monitoring IEPs. The focus in the current literature
(Jenkins, Deno, & Mirkin, 1979; Jenkins & Parry, 1978; Meyen, 1978)
tends to be on the evaluation of the student's progress in attaining
the stated goals through the evaluation of the short term instruc­
tional objectives rather than on an evaluation of the IEP itself.

The need is, then, for a comprehensive monitoring procedure for
IEPs which will assess the extent to which education agencies are in
compliance with PL 94-142. The monitoring procedure is needed at the
state and local levels to assist administrators in documenting their
compliance with the federal mandate. This need is supported in a re­
port to Congress by BEH in which it was stated that "many states have
had difficulty establishing systems by which to monitor implementation [of PL 94-142] in local agencies" (SPISB/BEH, Note 1, p. 3).

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to develop a monitoring procedure for determining whether the minimum components of the IEP are in compliance with PL 94-142. The focus of this investigation was on the development and validation of a process for monitoring IEPs. Specifically, this investigation: (a) developed a checklist to serve as a monitoring instrument, and (b) field tested the checklist and the instruction for its use.

The specific objectives for the investigation were:

1. To itemize compliance requirements for the IEP based upon PL 94-142.
2. To develop monitoring questions and associated criteria.
3. To develop a checklist and the instructions for monitoring IEPs.
4. To establish the validity and reliability of the checklist.
5. To field test the checklist and its instructions.
CHAPTER II

CONTEXT OF THE NEED FOR A MONITORING CHECKLIST

The three sections of Chapter II will provide the context of the need for a monitoring checklist. First, the terms used in the study will be operationally defined. Secondly, an in depth review of the IEP requirements will be presented including the current problems relating to today's monitoring procedures. The final section will focus on the need for a comprehensive system for monitoring IEPs.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions were located in the general literature or in the rules and regulations issued for PL 94-142.

Agency: "includes the State educational agency, local educational agency, intermediate educational units and any other political subdivisions of the State which are responsible for providing education to handicapped children" (45 CFR 121a.11).

Checklist: "A checklist is often used in making observations to insure that the observer looks for every bit of evidence that has been previously determined as essential" (Rummel, 1958, pp. 68-69).

Compliance: In this investigation, compliance shall mean that the agencies shall observe the rules and regulations of PL 94-142.

Handicapped children: means those children who have been evaluated . . . as being mentally retarded, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally impaired.
disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, deaf-blind, multihandicapped, or as having specific learning disabilities, who because of those impairments need special education and related services. (45 CFR 121a.5(a))

Include: means that the items named are not all possible items that are covered, whether like or unlike the ones named" (45 CFR 121a.6).

Individualized education program: means (A) a statement of the present levels of education performance for such child, (B) a statement of annual goals, including short term instructional objectives, (C) a statement of specific educational services to be provided to such child, and the extent to which such child will be able to participate in regular education programs, (D) the projected date for initiation and anticipated duration of such services, and (E) appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining on at least an annual basis whether instructional objectives are being achieved. (PL 94-142, Section 602 (19); 20 USC 1402)

Monitoring: means "to attend to any activity or operation, whether machine or organism, giving warning when the operation is not proceeding properly" (English & English, 1958, p. 328).

Parent: "means a parent, a guardian, a person acting as a parent or a surrogate parent" (45 CFR 121a.10).

Questionnaire: "means almost any kind of instrument that has questions or items to which individuals respond" (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 487). "The response on a questionnaire may range from a checkmark to an extensive written statement" (Wiersma, 1975, p. 136). Based on this definition, the literature relating to questionnaires was directly applied to checklists.

Related service: means transportation and such developmental, corrective [sic] and other support services such as are required to assist a handicapped child to benefit from special education, and includes speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and
occupation therapy, recreation, early identification and assessment for diagnostic or evaluation purposes. The term also includes school health services, social work services in schools and parent counseling and training. (45 CFR 121a.13)

Reliability: "means there is consistency or accuracy of measurement" (Wiersma, 1975, p. 75). In this investigation, reliability will consist of stability over time and agreement between judges.

Special education: means specially designed instruction at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction and instruction in hospitals and institutions. The term includes speech pathology or any other related services if the services consists of specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child, and is considered "special education" rather than a "related service" under state standards. Special education also includes vocational education if it consists of specially designed instruction at no cost to the parents, to meet the unique needs of a handicapped child. NOTE: The definition of "special education" is particularly important under these regulations, since the child is not handicapped unless he or she needs special education. The definition of "related services" also depends on this definition, since a related service must be necessary for a child to benefit from special education. Therefore, if a child does not need special education, there can be no related service and the child (because not "handicapped") is not covered under this Act [PL 94-142]. (45 CFR 121a.14 and Note)

Validity: means the extent to which the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure (Wiersma, 1975). In this investigation, validity of a monitoring instrument for IEPs shall indicate that it measured how well the IEP complied with PL 94-142.

Individualized Education Programs Mandate

Individualized education programs (IEPs) were mandated by Public Law 94-142 for all handicapped children receiving special education.
and related services. A review of the legislative history of PL 94-142 indicates that the following premises governed the Congressional inclusion of the IEP requirement (Weintraub et al., 1976):

1. Each child requires an educational blueprint customized tailored to achieve his/her maximum potential.

2. All principles in the child's educational environment, including the child, should have the opportunity for input in the development of an individualized education program of instruction.

3. Individualization means specifics, timetables for those specifics, and the need for periodic review of those specifics—all of which produce greatly enhanced fiscal and educational accountability. (p. 90)

The premises stated above relate directly to the phases of IEP development; namely, process, product, and compliance. The process phase is the development of the IEP where the results of the student's evaluation are utilized by a committee of school personnel and the parents to write the IEP. The product phase is the written IEP document and its implementation. The final phase is compliance which specifies that the school is accountable for the service(s) that is specified in the IEP and that the IEP has all the components required by PL 94-142.

Process

Each agency that is a recipient of federal funds from the U.S. Office of Education has to assure to the state education agency and the U.S. Office of Education that an IEP is in effect at the beginning of each school year for every handicapped child receiving special education services. For a handicapped child who has not
previously had an IEP prepared for him, one shall be developed within 30 calendar days after the child has been determined to be eligible for special education and related services (45 CFR 340.343(b) and (c) and 45 CFR 84.33(b)(2)).

Each agency shall initiate and conduct IEP meetings with the following representatives present:

1. a representative of the agency, other than the child's teacher, who is qualified to provide or supervise the provision of special education,

2. the child's teacher,

3. one or both of the child's parents,

4. the child, where appropriate, and

5. other individuals at the discretion of the agency or parents. (45 CFR 341a.344(a)).

Additionally, if the IEP is being developed for a child who has been evaluated or assessed for the first time, the IEP committee must include a representative of the agency, the child's teacher or some other person who is knowledgeable about the evaluation procedures used with the child and is familiar with the results of the evaluation (45 CFR 341a.344(b)).

The agency has a responsibility for encouraging the parents to participate in the meeting to develop their child's IEP. The rules and regulations for PL 94-142 specify that the agency must notify the parents of the meeting early enough to insure that they will have an opportunity to attend. The notice to the parents must also indicate the purpose of the meeting, the time and location of the meeting, and who will be in attendance at the meeting. The agency is to schedule
the meeting at a mutually agreed upon time and place (45 CFR 121a.345 (a) and (b)). The agency does have the responsibility to convince the parents that they should attend the IEP meeting and in its attempt to convince the parents to attend, the agency must document its efforts by keeping detailed records of phone calls, copies of correspondence sent to the parents and received from the parents, and visits made to the home or place of employment (45 CFR 121a.345(d)).

In the event neither parent can attend the IEP meeting, the agency still has the responsibility to use other methods to insure the parents' participation. These methods can include individual or conference telephone calls (45 CFR 121a.345(c)). If the parents are able to attend the IEP meeting to develop the IEP, the agency has a responsibility to assure that the parent(s) understands the proceedings at the meeting. This can include the agency making arrangements for an interpreter for the parents who are deaf or whose native language is other than English (45 CFR 121a.345(e)).

The IEP process is, then, a committee's effort to develop an individually tailored educational program. The program is to be developed with the parents' input and suggestions and should be based on the unique needs of the handicapped child for special education and related services. The IEP, then, is the key to assurance that each handicapped child receives a free appropriate public education.

Product

The IEP can vary in format and complexity. Regardless of the format or design of forms, the IEP must include the following
components:

1. A statement of the child's present levels of educational performance,

2. a statement of annual goals, including short term instructional objectives,

3. a statement of the specific special education and related services to be provided to the child, and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular education programs,

4. the projected dates for initiation of services and the anticipated duration of services, and

5. appropriate objective criteria and evaluation procedures and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved. (45 CFR 121a.346).

It is required that the IEP be a written document that can be referred to during the time it is in effect. The parents may also request a copy of the IEP (45CFR 121a.345(f)).

The agency must provide the special education and related services to the handicapped child which are detailed in the IEP (45 CFR 121a.349). These services can be provided directly or by contractual agreement with another agency or individual. However, PL 94-142 does not require that any agency, teacher, or other person be held accountable if the handicapped child does not achieve the growth projected in the annual goals and objectives.

The IEP is basically a document that indicates the child's present levels of performance, what services shall be provided to the child, and what the anticipated outcomes of the services could be. The IEP must be reviewed periodically (at least annually) and revised, if necessary.
Monitoring Procedures for IEPs

The monitoring activities required by PL 94-142 (45 CFR 121a.601) have an impact on state and local educational agencies by requiring those agencies to

. . . develop procedures, including specific timelines for monitoring and evaluating public agencies involved in the education of handicapped children. These procedures must include:

a. collection of data and reports;

b. conduct of on-site visits;

c. audit of Federal fund utilization; and

d. comparison of sampling of individualized education programs with the programs actually provided. (45 CFR 121a.601(2))

Of those items listed above, the collection of data and reports and the audit of federal fund utilization are completed on forms approved by the Office of Management and Budget. These forms are used by the U.S. Office of Education to generate reports to the U.S. Congress. The information that is collected relates directly to the statute that specifies the content of these reports. However, the legislation does not provide any guidance to the state or local education agencies on how to monitor or evaluate PL 94-142 during the on-site visits or when completing a comparison sampling of IEPs (Midwest Regional Resource Center, 1978). It has been left, then, for the state and local education agencies to develop their own monitoring and evaluation procedures.

State monitoring procedures are to be specified in each state's annual program plan that is to be submitted to the U.S. Office of
Education (45 CFR 121a.135). In reviewing the literature relevant to the development of IEPs, it was found that considerable emphasis has been placed in the regulations for PL 94-142 on the monitoring of IEPs (45 CFR 121a.130(a)(2); 121a.235 and 121a.601(b)) and that the IEP is considered by many to be the single most important part of PL 94-142 (Meyen, 1978).

Foley and Holland (1978) reviewed the approved annual program plans of 12 states on their procedures for monitoring and evaluating IEPs. The 12 state plans were: Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Tennessee. In the Foley and Holland (1978) report there was no indication that the monitoring instruments in those 12 states were either valid or reliable. This investigator reviewed state program plans from Colorado (1979), Minnesota (1979), Nebraska (1979), Nevada (1978), North Dakota (1979), and Washington (1979) and no reliability or validity of the instruments used for monitoring was reported. At the state level, there is no evidence that an instrument has been developed for monitoring IEPs that is either valid or reliable, as indicated in the 18 state program plans that were mentioned above.

In studies or papers of Ameruosa (1978), Education Turnkey System, Inc. (1978), Parelius (1978, Reisman and Macy (1978) Schipper and Wilson (1978), Turner and Macy (1978), and Weber and Weber (1979) no reports were made on the validity or reliability of the monitoring systems. These studies and/or papers further demonstrate the need for monitoring systems that are valid and reliable.
The validity of IEP monitoring procedures are at times assumed, in a sense, because the individual(s) who writes the items or questions defines, to a degree, the IEP requirements to be monitored. Kerlinger (1973) indicated that it is dangerous to assume the adequacy of validity without systematic efforts to check that assumption. Even though the staff at a state or local education agency may feel that the compliance requirements are known and that they possess the skills necessary to design instruments to monitor IEPs, Kerlinger's (1973) statement on the assumption of validity seems to indicate that these instruments are not valid until proven so.

The reliability of a checklist has been difficult to establish to any degree. According to Mouley (1963), the question of the reliability of a checklist has often been ignored. Ten Brink (1974) indicated, however, that the test-retest procedure would indicate reliability over time. Another form of reliability that is important to monitoring procedures is consistency between judges. This form of reliability is necessary in monitoring IEPs as more than one person in a state or local education office is often involved in the monitoring procedures at any one time. As each person on the monitoring team evaluates IEPs, each may be perceiving something different. Van Dalen (1973) indicated that perceptions are subject to distortion because of "emotions, motivations, prejudices, sense of values, physical condition, and errors of inferences" (p. 14). It is, therefore, necessary to demonstrate reliability between judges to minimize the effects of perceptions. In fact Van Dalen (1973) states "No . . . project should get underway until the observers [judges] have achieved
a high percentage of agreement" (p. 348).

Mouley (1963) stated that, "The validity of a questionnaire [checklist] must be established prior to its use, for validation is an aspect of its development not of its use in the solution of a problem" (p. 254). "Reliability is not," according to Wiersma (1975), "a sufficient condition for good measurement but is certainly a necessary condition" (p. 75). Finally, Kerlinger (1973) stated, "There is a growing understanding that all measuring instruments must be critically and empirically examined for their reliability and validity. The day of tolerance of inadequate measurement has ended" (p. 473).

Because there is no evidence in the literature that the validity and reliability of monitoring instruments have been established, and because of the critical importance of such safeguards, it is imperative that a monitoring procedure which has validity and reliability be developed for IEPs. The state and local administrators of special education programs need a procedure that will legitimatize their efforts to comply with federal legislation which requires the provision of special education and related services. Validity and reliability need to be established to assure those administrators that the monitoring procedure documents the compliance of IEP requirements and is consistent over time and between judges. The present study was an effort to fill the void in instrumentation uncovered in the review of literature.
Summary

Federal legislation for the education of handicapped children mandates that each handicapped child have an individualized education program and that this program be based upon the unique needs of the child. Such a program is to be developed by a committee composed of agency personnel and the child's parents. All services specified in the program are to be provided by the local education agency. The program is to be reviewed and revised, if necessary. The systems currently being used to monitor compliance of the IEPs with PL 94-142 do not have documented validity and reliability which will permit adequate and consistent evidence that there is indeed compliance with the federal legislation. The purpose of this investigation, then, was to develop a monitoring procedure that is valid and reliable and which will determine whether the minimum components of the IEP are in compliance with PL 94-142. Specifically, this investigation was designed to develop a checklist which can serve as a monitoring instrument and to field test the checklist and the instructions for its use.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The three basic purposes of this investigation were (a) to develop an instrument and procedure for monitoring individualized education programs (IEPs), (b) to establish the instrument's validity and reliability, and (c) to field test the monitoring instrument. To accomplish these purposes the following steps were implemented:

1. Itemization of compliance requirements for IEPs based upon PL 94-142.
2. Development of monitoring questions and associated criteria for the IEP.
3. Development of a checklist and the instructions to be utilized for monitoring IEPs.
4. Establishment of validity and reliability of the checklist.
5. Field testing the checklist and its instructions.

Compliance Requirements and Monitoring Questions

To accomplish the first two steps listed above, the compliance requirements for the IEP which are contained in statute (PL 94-142) and its subsequent regulations (45 CFR 121a.) were listed. These requirements are the minimal requirements necessary for school districts and states to be in compliance with PL 94-142 (Holt, 1978a).
The development of the monitoring questions was based on the five major topic areas that are contained in PL 94-142 for the development, implementation, and evaluation of the IEP. These major topic areas are:

1. Evaluation of the student's present levels of performance.
2. Development of an IEP by a committee.
3. Documentation of the IEP components.
4. Implementation of the IEP.
5. Evaluation of instructional objectives.

The review of the literature indicates that there are concerns to be taken into account during the development of items to be included in questionnaires and checklists. These concerns are:

1. The questions need to be placed in a logical sequence so that there is a smooth transition made from one group of questions to the next (Van Dalen, 1973).

2. Critical attention needs to be focused on the framing of the questions so that they are not phrased in such a manner as to elicit replies from the respondents that would only support the investigator's beliefs (Van Dalen, 1973; Wiersma, 1975).

3. The questions should probe the crucial issues in enough depth so as to avoid overlooking important facts and should not be repetitive or redundant (Van Dalen, 1973).

4. The questions should be worded and ordered so as to allay fears, suspicions, embarrassment, or hostility on the part of the respondents (Van Dalen, 1973; Wiersma, 1975).
The concerns expressed by Van Dalen (1973) and Wiersma (1975) were taken into account in the development of the monitoring questions as follows:

1. The major topic areas required to be in the IEP were listed in chronological sequence for the development of the IEP, therefore, there was a smooth transition from one topic area to the next.

2. The questions were framed in such a manner that the respondents needed only to indicate "yes" or "no" to answer the questions, therefore, there was no prompting to secure a desired response other than to indicate that the IEPs were or were not in compliance.

3. The content of the questions was derived from the specifics contained in PL 94-142. This investigator's experience with PL 94-142 (Holt, 1978a, 1978b, Note 2) and with the development of IEPs facilitated the structuring of the monitoring questions.

4. The questions were worded and ordered in such a manner that the respondents would be free to express their judgements.

The monitoring questions are contained in Appendix A.

Considerations for the Development of the Checklist and Instructions

Wiersma (1975) indicated that checklists have been developed to assist investigators to focus their attention on specific phenomena, to make objective and accurate observations and to systematize the collection of data. The checklist for the monitoring of IEPs was designed to facilitate the collection of data regarding the compliance of IEPs with PL 94-142. The monitoring questions are those
questions that the respondents (monitors) will use when reviewing IEPs for compliance with PL 94-142.

Van Dalen (1973) indicated that there are three basic formats for questionnaires and checklists. The formats are: open, closed, and pictorial. The open format permits the respondents to answer freely and fully in their own words. The closed format restricts the respondents to options provided by the investigator. The pictorial format presents respondents with drawings or photographs and is useful with children and adults with limited reading abilities.

The pictorial format was rejected by this investigator for use as a monitoring checklist as the respondents were educators who it can be assumed have sufficient reading ability for the comprehension of the questions on the checklist. The open format was likewise rejected because Van Dalen (1973) reported that the open format complicates the task of categorizing, tabulating, and summarizing the wealth of information that it can generate. Mouly (1963) also indicated that establishing validity was more complicated with open formats than closed as the interpretations of the responses constitutes an added source of unreliability and invalidity.

The closed format was selected for the checklist as it was reported by Van Dalen (1973) to be easy to complete, helps keep the respondent's mind on the subject, and facilitates the process of tabulation and analysis of data. The closed format used in this study consisted of a prepared list of concrete questions and a choice of possible responses. Because of the specific requirements in the definition of monitoring, the respondents were provided with the
option of a "yes" or a "no" response or to not respond to the question. The yes or no responses to the questions indicated that the IEP was either in compliance or not in compliance. As indicated earlier, the closed format facilitated the establishment of validity and reliability.

A review of the literature dealing with the design and development of checklists produced a number of recommendations for implementing this investigation. These recommendations are as follows:

1. There needs to be concrete terms to increase the accuracy of the respondent's observations and to guard against errors in perceptions (Van Dalen, 1973).

2. The format should require a minimum amount of time from the respondents and yet provide the type and scope of information desired by the investigator (Van Dalen, 1973).

3. The respondent's responses should be structured in accordance with a specific scaling that is contained in the format of the checklist (Van Dalen, 1973).

4. The checklist, as a whole, should be attractive to the respondents (Van Dalen, 1973).

The recommendations listed above were taken into account during the development of the checklist as follows:

1. The criteria of compliance for the respondents to use in determining their responses to the monitoring questions were based upon statements made in the regulations issued for PL 94-142 (45 CFR 121a.). In addition, the criteria to be used in judging the monitoring questions were placed directly below the questions, themselves,
to facilitate the respondent's decisions. An attempt was made to insure that the questions and criteria were clear and concise, thereby reducing inferential decisions by the judges.

2. The format required a minimum amount of time from the respondents as they only had to check the appropriate response area or to make no response to a question. The length of the checklist was such that responding did not become tedious or burdensome. With the criteria directly below the questions, little time was needed for the respondents to judge if an item was in compliance or not. Space was allowed for questions regarding local requirements for IEPs even though such questions were not considered in the validity or reliability studies.

3. The format of this checklist was structured in such a manner that the respondents could only check "yes" or "no" or, if appropriate, make no response. The scaling of the responses (yes, no, or no response) was also consistent with the design for data analysis.

4. The physical layout of the instrument facilitated the respondents' use of the checklist. The monitoring questions were typed in elite type with the criteria for compliance typed in italics. Each topic area was begun on a separate page. The final topic area—evaluation—had a statement included that indicated whether or not it was to be completed. If the IEP had not been reviewed or revised and 1 year had not lapsed from its development the topic area would not be appropriate.
Validation Procedures

Wiersma (1975) indicated that validity is an essential requirement in a measuring device such as a checklist. The validity for the checklist used in this study was, then, the extent to which it measured the compliance of the IEPs with PL 94-142.

In the review of literature relating to validity, several authors were noted to have indicated factors that should be considered when validating a checklist. These are:

1. The actual validation of checklists utilizes the same principles and procedures as the validation of any instrument (Mouly, 1963).

2. At the most elementary level, it is necessary for a checklist to have face validity. Face validity indicates that there is adequate coverage of the overall topic and that the questions are clear and unambiguous. A more adequate validation, however, requires checking the content of the questions contained in a checklist against external criteria (Mouly, 1963).

3. Content validity is basically judgmental, which means that each question is to be judged for its presumed relevance to the property being measured (Kerlinger, 1973).

4. A usual procedure for establishing content validity is to have "competent" judges critically review the items. The judges indicate the extent to which the items sample the universe of the content that the checklist is designed to cover (Van Dalen, 1973).
5. There should be an accurate and complete record of all outgoing and incoming checklists (Wiersma, 1975).

The previous statements were taken into account for the procedures in the validation of the checklist. A panel of judges was formed to validate the checklist. The number of judges chosen to participate in the validation exceeded the number reported in other research, e.g., Hill (Note 3). It was this investigator's contention that the mandate for IEPs was so critical to special education that the panel of experts used to establish validity should reflect a larger membership than those found in other studies. Because PL 94-142 has an equal effect on the entire nation, there appeared to be a need to secure judges from various parts of the United States.

The judges were selected through the assistance of Dr. Robert E. Hall (Note 4). Hall, Secretary-Treasurer and member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) was requested to furnish a minimum of seven names of persons meeting the following criteria:

1. Individuals who were knowledgeable about PL 94-142 and IEPs.
2. Individuals who were involved in the development, implementation, evaluation, or monitoring of IEPs.
3. Individuals from various locations, e.g., more than one state.
4. Individuals who were not associated with the State of New Mexico education system as that state did not participate in PL 94-142.
Hall provided this investigator with a list of individuals who met the criteria and who were, or had been, elected to the Board of NASDSE. They were:

1. Dr. Robert Hall, Secretary-Treasurer, NASDSE, Albuquerque, New Mexico. (Hall is retired from his position with the U.S. Department of Interior and has had no direct contact with the New Mexico education system.)

2. Dr. Leonard Hall, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Missouri.

3. Dr. Judy Schrag, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Boise, Idaho.

4. Dr. Peter Fanning, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Denver, Colorado.


6. Mr. Sam Bonham, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Worthington, Ohio.

7. Mr. Don Weston, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education, Austin, Texas.

The checklist was mailed to the judges who were asked to serve on the panel. The directions to the judges indicated their role in validating the checklist and the procedures to be followed. (Appendix C contains the letter to the judges and the supplementary information questionnaire.) The supplementary questionnaire was provided to the validation judges for their indications of whether or not:
1. Additional questions should have been contained in the checklist.

2. The format of the checklist provided a satisfactory means to respond to the questions.

3. There was any ambiguity in the questions, criteria, or format.

4. There was any additional information that this investigator needed to be aware of regarding the validity of the checklist.

Specific questions and their criteria for response were considered to be valid by this investigator if the panel had 80% or better agreement on the validity of an item. The 80% was consistent with the information obtained from Hersen and Barlow (1976).

Reliability Procedures

Wiersma (1975) and Kerlinger (1973) state that reliability means there is consistency or accuracy of measurement. As applied to this investigation, reliability meant that the monitoring checklist consistently measured the compliance of the IEPs with PL 94-142. Mouly (1963) indicated that the reliability of checklists are often ignored, partly because such reliability is difficult to establish with any degree of confidence. The reason for this difficulty is that the usual procedures for determining the reliability of tests are difficult to apply to checklists (Mouly, 1963). Kerlinger (1973) stated that despite the difficulties, there is a growing understanding that all measuring instruments must be critically and empirically examined for their reliability as well as validity. Kerlinger's (1963) charge
for establishing reliability was one of the focal points for this investigation.

Ten Brink (1974) indicated that to obtain empirical evidence of reliability, the investigator needs to demonstrate the consistency of the instrument, which in this case was the checklist. Ten Brink's (1974) discussion of reliability indicated five different types of reliability:

1. Stability, which is consistency over time.
2. Equivalence, which is consistency across different forms.
3. Equivalence and stability, which is the use of alternate forms over time.
4. Internal consistency, which is consistency across different parts of the measurement instrument.
5. Scorer (interjudge) reliability, which is consistency across raters or respondents of the instruments.

Each of these types of reliability was explored for application to this investigation. Due to the fact that there is only one form of the checklist, the equivalence and equivalence and stability types of reliability were not required in this investigation. Internal consistency across parts of the checklist did not appear to be relevant to this investigation as each part of the checklist samples a different major component of the IEP, and must be reliable or consistent as a whole, not as a part.

The two types of reliability discussed by Ten Brink (1974) that were deemed to be relevant to this study were: (a) stability over time, and (b) scorer (interjudge) reliability. The monitoring
checklist needed to have stability over time as it should be applicable as long as PL 94-142 is in effect. This law is the first non-expiring piece of federal legislation for education and will remain in effect until it is repealed by the U.S. Congress (Weintraub, et al., 1976). Therefore, stability over time is a necessary element in the development of a checklist for monitoring IEPs. Interjudge reliability was critical to this investigation as more than one monitor used the checklist. The following procedures were used to establish reliability of the instrument.

**Stability Over Time**

The literature was reviewed for suggestions on establishing stability over time. Various authors provided suggestions to be considered. These are:

1. The test-retest method is the only one of four procedures currently discussed in the literature that provides information about measurement over time (Mouly, 1963; Tuckman, 1978).

2. The procedure for estimating stability over time is to give the instrument at two different times to the same individuals (Ten Brink, 1974).

3. The individuals who are to be respondents in a test-retest study need not be randomly selected from all prospective individuals, but they should be members of the group that would be involved in the study (Wiersma, 1975).

4. Memory, practice, and learning are not a major factor after 1 month interval between the test-retest (Ten Brink, 1974).
5. The results of the two test administrations are to be ana-
lyzed for stability over time. If the results are stable over time
then reliability has been demonstrated (Ten Brink, 1974).

6. A statistic for computing test-retest stability is the per-
centage of agreement (Anderson, Ball, Murphy, & Associates, 1975).

The test-retest instruments were four IEPs that were secured
from a school in North Carolina. The IEPs were randomly selected
from a total of 260. Twenty percent (52) of the total of 260 was
selected by random sample and from that group four IEPs were randomly
selected. The 20% represented a sample that would have been moni-
tored if the procedures (instructions) had been implemented. The
names and other personally identifiable information were covered on
the four IEPs prior to reproduction to maintain the confidentiality
of student information as required by the Family Education Rights and
Privacy Act of 1974. The four IEPs are contained in Appendix D.

Seven monitors were selected based on the criteria previously
established for selection of the expert panel used to establish
validity. The seven monitors were:

1. Dr. Robert E. Hall, NASDSE, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

2. Dr. H. Wayne Johnson, Director of the Southwest Regional
   Resource Center, Salt Lake City, Utah.

3. Mrs. Carol Ann Hosmer, Special Education Teacher/Coordinator,
   Clewiston, Florida.

4. Mr. William Kennedy, Special Education Consultant, Niles,
   Michigan.

5. Mrs. Beth Ahman, Teacher's Aide, Hankinson, North Dakota.

7. Ms. Vicki Dekoekkoek, Executive Secretary to the State Director of Special Education, Carson City, Nevada.

This pool of monitors was used for two purposes: (a) to determine stability over time and (b) to establish interjudge reliability.

The four IEPs were mailed to the monitors. The instructions for the use of the checklist and the purpose of the study were enclosed in the mailing. (For copies of the letters see Appendix E, and for a copy of the instructions and the checklist see Appendix F.) It was decided that at least five of the reliability test monitors would be utilized for the retest procedure to determine stability over time.

The statistic to compute the test-retest stability over time was the percentage of stability. The data were analyzed by dividing the number of stable responses (those that did not change from test to retest) by the total number of stable and unstable responses. The monitoring checklist was considered reliable if the percentage of stability was equal to or greater than 90%.

**Interjudge Reliability**

Interjudge reliability needed to be established as several monitors may be using the checklist at the same time in the same local education agency. As discussed previously, perceptions are subject to distortions because of "emotions, motivations, prejudices, sense of values, physical condition, and errors of inferences" (Van Dalen, 1973, p. 14). Ten Brink (1974) indicated that this special problem
arises when two or more judges watch or rate the same product. Ten Brink's (1974) discussion included the following major points:

1. It was indicated that observation is the process of looking and noticing the important elements of a product. When observational techniques are used, a major source of error is the judge. The estimate of consistency of the results obtained from two or more observers gives a measure of that error.

2. The procedure for estimating interjudge reliability is, then, to have two or more observers obtain information about the same product at the same time.

3. The information obtained by one judge is then compared with the information obtained by other judges. It is the percentage of agreement that determines interjudge reliability.

The implementation of this procedure was accomplished by utilizing the first response to the test-retest procedure. The percentage of agreement for the four IEPs was computed. The method for computing the percentages was the sum of the number of agreements for each monitor over the total possible number of agreements. For this investigation the criterion for deciding that there was interjudge reliability was to have at least 90% agreement between the judges.

**Field Test**

The final stage in the development of the IEP monitoring checklist was to field test it in a school district. The test location was a school district that enrolls approximately the average number of students for all school districts in the United States. To...
determine the average number of students enrolled in a school dis-
trict, the total number of students reported in the United States who
were in public schools was divided by the number of school districts.
The number of students in the United States in 1978 was reported by
Debury (1979, p. 183) as 43,730,964. The number of public school
districts in the United States was reported to be 15,705 (Debury,
1979, p. 183). The mean, or average enrollment of the school dis-
tricts was computed to be 2,785 students. A district was located in
Colorado that was within 10% of that mean. The school district was
located outside the state of New Mexico since that state does not
participate in PL 94-142.

In asking the Colorado school district's cooperation for partici-
pation in this investigation, the district was assured that all rights
provided by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (1974) would
be strictly followed. The name of the school district was provided
to the committee, however, it will not be made public to protect the
school district's right to privacy. The regulations for the Privacy
Act state that prior written consent is not required for:

organizations conducting studies for, or on behalf of
educational agencies or institutions for the purpose of
developing, validating, or administering predictive tests,
administering student aid programs and improving instruc-
tion; Provided, that the studies are conducted in a manner
which will not permit the personal identification of stu-
dents and their parents by individuals other than the
representatives of the organization and the information
will be destroyed when no longer needed for purposes for
which the study was conducted; the term "organizations"
includes but is not limited to, Federal, State and local
agencies, and independent organizations. (45 CFR 99.31
(a)(7))
The school district was requested to complete a roster of all identified handicapped students who were receiving special education services. Twenty percent of the folders of such students were randomly selected for this investigation. This procedure was consistent with the procedures approved by BEH for monitoring (Nevada's State Plan, 1978). Selection of the 20% of the student folders was accomplished by randomly selecting a folder and using every fifth one after that. No coding system was used so that there would be no release of the names of the students or other personally identifiable information.

The checklist was completed on each IEP selected for this investigation in accordance with the instructions contained in Appendix D. The field monitor, who was the Director of Special Education in that administrative unit, reviewed the content of the IEPs and "other relevant information" for compliance with PL 94-142. The "other relevant information" was such items as certificates for instructors, class rosters, bus transportation lists, etc. as specified in the checklist.

The purpose of the field test was to identify any misunderstandings, ambiguities, or mechanical difficulties with the checklist and the instructions furnished for its use (Wiersma, 1975). Monitoring at a field location was used to uncover any difficulties that were not detected in the procedures used to establish validity or reliability.

A report was generated from the data provided by the checklist. The percentages of items found to be in compliance was computed for each item on the checklist. The computation was completed by dividing
the number of compliance items checked "yes" by the number of checks, both "yes" and "no" for each item. The percentages were reported to the cooperating school district in two forms. One form was the percentages for each item recorded on a copy of the checklist. The second form was a ranking of the items by the percentages of non-compliance for each item. The purpose of the ranking was to show items of greatest need for improvement, if any. This report process would permit the administrators of the cooperating district to select items, based on those items showing a large percentage of noncompliance, for corrective action.

Summary

Methods and procedures were designed to develop a monitoring procedure for determining whether the minimum components of IEPs are in compliance with PL 94-142. These methods and procedures were designed to assure potential users that the checklist and its instructions are valid, consistent over time, and reliable between judges or monitors. By demonstrating that the checklist is valid and reliable, the educational community would have access to an instrument that could be utilized with confidence in assessing compliance with the IEP mandate of PL 94-142.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The investigation involved the development of a monitoring procedure to be used in determining whether individualized education programs (IEPs) are in compliance with PL 94-142. The checklist, "Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs," was the product of this investigation along with the determination of the validity and reliability of the checklist. The results of the investigation are presented in the following manner:

1. Results of the validity study.
2. Results of the stability over time study.
3. Results of the interjudge reliability study.
4. Results of the field test.
5. Revision of the checklist.

Results of the Validity Study

The procedure to establish content validity was to have seven judges critically review the questions included in the monitoring checklist, and the criteria for each, to determine if they were representative of the requirements for IEPs in PL 94-142. The checklist (Appendix B), introductory letter, and supplemental questionnaire (Appendix C) were mailed to the judges after it had been confirmed by telephone that they would participate. The dates of the mailings are presented in Appendix G.
The percentage of agreement between judges was computed for each item of the checklist to determine if the items were sufficiently valid for inclusion in the checklist. The criterion for inclusion was 80% agreement. The data are shown in Table 1. The question relating to the qualifications of individuals to conduct assessments (Question 1.2) did not meet the criterion of 80% agreement and was, therefore, deleted from the checklist. Although Question 4.3 did reach 80% of agreement, the criterion for Question 4.3 did not meet the specified level and was, therefore, deleted. All other items met the criterion of at least 80% agreement and were, therefore, considered valid. There were no disagreements with the questions dealing with local requirements.

The results of the supplemental information questionnaire indicated that six of the seven judges stated that there were no additional questions or criteria that should have been included in the checklist. One judge indicated that further information on parent participation, and the necessity of parents being informed in the event of their nonattendance, should be included in the checklist. Because this was the only comment, it was not included in the checklist. Six of the seven judges indicated that the format of the checklist did provide a satisfactory means of responding to the questions. One judge suggested terminology and syntax changes to make the questions and criteria more self-explanatory. No changes were made as a result of these suggestions; however, the suggestions were noted in the event that there were similar comments from the reliability studies and/or the field test. Five of the seven judges indicated that there was no
Table 1

Validation Results in Percent Agreements Between Judges (n = 7) for Each Question of "Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>70% Agreement</th>
<th>85% Agreement</th>
<th>100% Agreement</th>
<th>Included in Checklist?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>x^b</td>
<td>x^b</td>
<td>x^b</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSee Appendix B for the questions.

^b"x" indicates agreement at the specified level.
ambiguity in the format which prevented the monitor from following each question and recording a decision. Because no two comments were the same, their suggestions were noted in the event similar comments were received from the reliability studies or the field test. Five of the seven judges made no comments regarding any additional information of which this investigator needed to be aware concerning the validity of the checklist.

As shown in Table 1, there was a very high percentage of agreement on the majority of the items. An overall 97.40% of agreement was obtained. After the deletion of Question 1.2 and the criterion for Question 4.3, all the remaining items were considered to be valid for inclusion in the checklist.

Results of the Stability Over Time Study

The procedure to establish stability over time was to select seven monitors who would evaluate four IEPs randomly selected from a school in North Carolina (Appendix D). The monitors were contacted by telephone to request their participation in this study. An introductory letter (Appendix E) and specific instructions (Appendix F) were provided to the monitors. They were then requested to evaluate the IEPs using the checklists that were provided. The second monitoring of the same IEPs was mailed to the first five monitors who responded to the original mailing. The second mailing was made after a 1-month interval so that memory, practice, and learning would not be factors for concern in the retest. The dates of the mailing are presented in Appendix G.
A 2 x 2 table was developed for tabulating the evaluation responses for the four IEPs by the monitors. Figure 1 indicates how responses were tabulated into cells.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliance</td>
<td>A. Changed from a non-compliant response on the test to a compliant response on the retest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>B. Stable compliant responses on the test and the retest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>C. Stable noncompliant responses on the test and the retest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliance</td>
<td>D. Changed from a compliant response on the test to a noncompliant response on the retest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. 2 x 2 table for tabulating responses to the test-retest procedure. A compliant response for each item was determined by the majority of responses made by the monitors.

The responses of the test-retest procedure for each IEP and for all IEPs combined are presented in Table 2 in the format described in Figure 1. Missing data were noted for each IEP.

To determine if the checklist has stability over time the "percentage of stability" was computed using the following formula:

\[
\frac{B + C}{A + B + C + D} = \text{percent stable over time},
\]

where \(A\) = the value of the cell \(A\); \(B\) = the value of cell \(B\); \(C\) = the value of cell \(C\); and \(D\) = the value of cell \(D\). A percentage of stability of 91.50% was obtained. It appears that the Holt's checklist has stability over time. If the missing data were deleted from the study, a 92.89% of stability would have been obtained.
Table 2
Stability of Responses to the Test-Retest Procedures (n = 800)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. IEP No.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noncompliance</th>
<th>B. IEP No.</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>No. of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noncompliance</th>
<th>D.</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a \] of the responses from IEP #1 which were due to missing data.
\[ b \] of the responses from IEP #2 which were due to missing data.
\[ c \] of the responses from IEP #3 which were due to missing data.
\[ d \] of the responses from IEP #4 which were due to missing data.
\[ e \] of the responses from all IEPs which were due to missing data.

Results of the Interjudge Reliability Study

The purpose of the interjudge reliability study was to determine if the checklist would be consistent across monitors. The results of the first response to the test-retest procedure were used to determine interjudge reliability. Of the pool of seven monitors six responded to the first mailing. The responses of the six monitors
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(Appendix G) were compared in order to compute the percentage of agreements to establish interjudge reliability. Inasmuch as Question 1.2 was not included in the final checklist, data on this question are not reported.

The percentage of agreement for all four IEPs was 90.42% which exceeded the criterion of 90%. If the missing data (23 responses) were removed from the study, the percentage of agreements would have been 92.64%.

Results of the Field Test

The review of the literature (Chapter II) indicated a void in instrumentation which is valid and reliable for use in monitoring procedures for determining whether or not IEPs comply with the mandate contained in PL 94-142. Based upon the results of the validation and reliability procedures, it appeared that Holt's checklist was sufficiently valid and reliable to be used in a field test. An administrative unit of schools in Colorado agreed to participate in the field test.

The Director of Special Education of the administrative unit agreed to complete the checklist in accordance with the instructions provided. (See Appendix F for a copy of the instructions that were provided to the Director.) A total of 54 IEPs was monitored. After this investigator tabulated the results, a report was sent to the Director of Special Education that contained a copy of the checklist containing the number and percentage of compliance and noncompliance responses to each item. In addition, the report contained the
ranking of percentages of noncompliance. (See Appendix H for a copy of the report.)

The field monitor (Director) indicated that the directions were clear and concise and that he had no problems in implementing the procedure for using the checklist. It was noted by the Director that the checklist did point out several IEPs that were not in compliance with the federal mandate. The total time involved in the monitoring procedure was less than 2 workdays. It appeared from the comments of the Director that the checklist has utility as a monitoring instrument for determining the compliance of the IEPs with PL 94-142.

In tabulating the results of the field test it became apparent that two questions were in need of revision. From the responses obtained from the field test, it was difficult to determine if Question 5.1 was providing the information requested. A "no" response did not indicate if the item was not in compliance or if the IEP had not been reviewed. Similarly, Question 5.3.3 indicated that the parents did not attend the review meeting but did not document the efforts of the school to attempt to convince the parents to attend.

Revision of the Checklist

Comments made by the judges and monitors for reliability indicated that several questions and criteria needed minor revision in terminology and syntax. Similarly, the results of the field review indicated that two questions would need to be revised. The changes in the checklist and the rationale for those changes are presented below. (Appendix I contains the revised checklist.)
1. **Delete** Question 1.2 and renumber Questions 1.3 to 1.2; 1.4 to 1.3; 1.5 to 1.4; and 1.6 to 1.5.

**Rationale:** Question 1.2 did not meet the criterion for validation. The renumbering of the questions was for consistency of numbering within the topic area.

2. **Delete** the word "all" from Question renumbered 1.2.

**Rationale:** One validation judge and three monitors indicated that the word was difficult to evaluate.

3. **Add** quotation marks before "Content" and after "Notice" in renumbered Question 1.4.

**Rationale:** Several monitors and a validation judge indicated that the question would be clearer if the quotation marks were added.

4. **Delete** the "e" from "one" in the first line of the criterion for renumbered Question 1.4.

**Rationale:** Typographical error, the word should have been "on" not "one."

5. **Change** from "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate" to "Copyrighted 1980, George T.L. Holt."

**Rationale:** The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

---

1. **Change** from "supervise or provide" to "provide or supervise the provision of" in the criterion for Question 2.1.1.
Rationale: One validation judge and a monitor suggested the change to reflect the regulations for PL 94-142 (§121a.344(a)(1)).

2. Add "2.1.4:" in front of the statement beginning with "If there is, is a . . . ."

Rationale: This was added for consistency of the numbering of questions.

3. Change from "If this is, is" to "If this is the first IEP, was" in Question 2.1.4.

Rationale: One monitor and one validation judge suggested the change to clarify the question and its relationship to question 2.1.3.

4. Add a dotted line (---) between Questions 2.4 and 2.4.1.

Rationale: The line was needed for consistency of format.

5. Delete the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."

Rationale: The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.
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1. Delete the statement "or use other than verbalizations to communicate" from Question 2.5.

Rationale: Two monitors and a validation judge questioned the inclusion of the criterion inasmuch as the next question clarified a "no" response.

2. Delete the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."

Rationale: The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.
1. **Change** the period, "." to a question mark, "?" at the end of the criteria for Question 3.5.

   **Rationale:** Typographical error.

2. **Delete** the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."

   **Rationale:** The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

---

1. **Delete** the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."

   **Rationale:** The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

---

1. **Change** Question 4.1 from "Have or are the special education service as specified in the IEP been or being provided?" to "Have the special education service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?"

   **Rationale:** At the suggestion of a validation judge and a monitor the change was made to clarify the statement.

2. **Change** Question 4.2 from "Have or are the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been or being provided?" to "Have the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?"

   **Rationale:** A validation judge and a monitor indicated the change to clarify the statement.
3. **Delete** the criterion statement for Question 4.3.2.
   **Rationale:** The criterion did not meet the validation criterion which was at least 80% agreement.

4. **Delete** the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."
   **Rationale:** The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

---
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1. **Change** the criteria for Question 4.4 from "Date(s) of initiation should" to "Date(s) for the initiation of services should."
   **Rationale:** An error was made in syntax and also to clarify the criteria.

2. **Delete** the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."
   **Rationale:** The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

---

Page 8

1. **Change** the last line of the criterion for Question 5.1 from "not complete the remaining questions" to "not complete this page."
   **Rationale:** The monitors and field test monitor responded "no" to those IEPs which were developed within the last calendar year. This "no" response could be interpreted as an item in noncompliance when in fact the IEP is in compliance. The change was necessary to clarify that issue.

2. **Add** a criterion statement to Question 5.3.1 that will read "Responsible to provide or supervise the provision of special education services."
Rationale: This addition was necessary for consistency in format. The statement for criterion was the same as for Question 2.1.1.

3. Add a criterion statement to Question 5.3.2 that will read "A teacher who has or is working with the student."

Rationale: This addition was necessary for consistency in format. The statement for criterion was the same as for Question 2.1.2.

4. Revise Question 5.3.3 from "Parent/guardian (see 2.2 - 2.4)" to "Parent/guardian did attend OR is there documentation that the school attempted to convince them to attend? Signature on the IEP OR copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visits."

Rationale: In the field test there were 20 "no" responses which could be interpreted that the administrative unit was not in compliance, when in fact the parents were notified and encouraged to participate but chose not to attend. The rewording of the question and criteria will clarify that problem.

5. Delete the statement "Experimental - Do Not Duplicate."

Rationale: The checklist was copyrighted with the dissertation.

Summary

The results of the validation and reliability studies (i.e., stability over time and interjudge reliability) procedures and a field test were presented. The validity, stability over time, and interjudge reliability data were presented for "Holt's Monitoring Checklist..."
for Individualized Education Programs."

The checklist was used to monitor 54 IEPs of an administrative unit in Colorado. The results of the field test to assess the utility of the checklist were presented.

Using the comments and statements from the validation judges, monitors, and field test monitor, the checklist was revised. The revisions, as well as the rationale for those revisions, were presented.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

PL 94-142 mandates that each handicapped child have an individualized education program (IEP) which must be based upon his/her unique needs. Federal legislation requires that IEPs be developed and implemented if state and local education agencies are to receive federal funds. A review of the literature indicated that the procedures currently being used to monitor the IEP requirements do not have documented validity or reliability. The lack of validity and reliability of the monitoring procedures may be due to the difficulties in establishing the validity and reliability of questionnaires and checklists as described in the literature.

The study reported here has described the procedures used to develop the monitoring questions and criteria for compliance as well as the format of a checklist designed for use in monitoring IEPs. The "Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs" was constructed in a format suitable for use by prospective monitors utilizing recommendations found in the literature. The checklist was systematically reviewed and utilized in order to determine content validity, to establish reliability, and to determine utility.

Content validity was determined by a panel of judges who were knowledgeable about the requirements for IEPs found in PL 94-142. The percentage of agreement was 97.40% for content validity of the
items in the checklist.

The reliability was established by using two methods, namely, stability over time and interjudge reliability. The stability of the checklist over time was established by a panel of monitors evaluating four IEPs. The panel monitored the same IEPs in a test-retest procedure to determine reliability. The "percentage of stability" was 91.50% on the test-retest.

The interjudge reliability was established by using the first response to the test-retest procedure. The percentage of agreement was 90.42% for all four IEPs.

A field test was conducted to determine the utility of the checklist for monitoring IEPs. A Director of Special Education of an administrative unit in Colorado participated in the field test by monitoring 54 randomly selected IEPs. The results of the field test indicated that the checklist has utility as a monitoring instrument.

The comments and suggestions from the validation judges, reliability monitors, and field test monitor were used to revise the checklist. Utility and validity of the checklist and the need for concise clear statements were the basis for the revisions.

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions and limitations are applied to this investigation:

1. PL 94-142 has impact on all the states, except for New Mexico. The mandate for IEPs contained in the statute are the minimum requirements for IEPs for children in all school districts.
State and local education agencies may require schools to have additional components for IEPs. The components listed in the checklist developed for this study are the minimum for compliance with PL 94-142. It will be necessary for the monitors to determine if additional requirements need to be included in the checklist to meet state or local IEP requirements.

2. The classification of specialized services, either as special education or as related services, will depend upon state and local definitions. Speech therapy and counseling, for example, may, in some cases, be special education services and, in other cases, related services. State or local guidelines will determine the classification of the services.

3. The "Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs," as the title implies, does not include all the mandates contained in PL 94-142. Only those requirements relating to the IEP are contained in the checklist. Other requirements, such as, due process procedures, protection of personally identifiable information, and nondiscriminatory evaluations, were purposely omitted. Furthermore, the requirements that precede the IEP, e.g., determination of eligibility for special education, were not included in the checklist. It was not feasible to expand the checklist to include all requirements and yet maintain the focus of this investigation. To have added the other requirements would have lengthened the checklist and broadened the scope to a point where it would have resulted in a greatly modified checklist with a different purpose.
4. Basic understandings of special education and PL 94-142 are required to use the checklist. These prerequisite skills are necessary because of the terminology and concepts used in the checklist. Parents and other lay persons may be able to use the checklist, but the reliability of the instrument, if used by them, has not been demonstrated or established. However, the positions of secretary, teacher's aide, teacher, coordinator, and administrator were involved in the reliability study for this checklist.

Conclusions

The objectives stated in Chapter I are restated below with the conclusions of this investigation.

Objective 1. To itemize compliance requirements for the IEP based upon PL 94-142. The compliance requirements for the IEP were discussed in Chapter II (Context of the Need for a Monitoring Checklist).

Objective 2. To develop monitoring questions and associated criteria. The recommendations from a literature review were used to develop and structure the monitoring questions and associated criteria into a logical sequence.

Objective 3. To develop a checklist and the instructions for monitoring IEPs. Suggestions from the literature were utilized to develop the format of the checklist and the scale used to tabulate the responses of the monitors.

Objective 4. To establish the validity and reliability of the checklist. Seven judges reviewed the questions and criteria for
compliance included in the monitoring checklist to determine if they were representative of the requirements for IEPs found in PL 94-142. The percentage of agreement on the validation of the checklist was 97.40%. Based upon the results, it was concluded that the checklist measures what it was designed to measure; therefore, it is valid.

The test-retest procedure was used to determine the stability over time of the checklist. The "percentage of stability" of 91.50% was obtained which indicated that the checklist is stable over time. To establish interjudge reliability, six monitors evaluated four IEPs at the same time. The interjudge (monitor) agreement was 90.42%; therefore, there is consistency between monitors.

Objective 5. To field test the checklist and its instructions.

The checklist was able to discriminate between the IEPs that were in compliance and those that contained items that were not in compliance. The field monitor indicated that the checklist and its instructions were useful in monitoring IEPs for their compliance with PL 94-142; therefore, the checklist has utility.

Implications and Recommendations

The results of the investigation indicated that the "Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs" is a sufficiently valid and reliable instrument for use in monitoring IEPs. Until now, no valid or reliable instrument has been available for monitoring the compliance of IEPs with the requirements of PL 94-142. It is concluded, based on the field test, that the checklist will have utility in state and local education agencies. Finally, by
demonstrating that the checklist is valid and reliable, potential users of the checklist can monitor IEPs for compliance with the mandates of PL 94-142 with confidence.

Suggested additional uses of the checklist are:

1. During the development and implementation of the IEP, the chairperson of the IEP committee could use the checklist to insure that all of its components are in compliance with PL 94-142.

2. The results of a monitoring study at a local education agency could be useful for determining the in-service training needs of the special and regular education staffs. Those items that were consistently determined to be in noncompliance could be the focus for future in-service training sessions. The priority for the training sessions might well be based upon the ranking of items found to be in non-compliance.

3. The checklist could be a means of outlining the IEP requirements and procedures to parents of identified handicapped children. If the parents were provided a copy of the checklist it could facilitate their understanding of the school's activities in developing an IEP.

4. The checklist could be used by the individual who maintains special education records to insure that all documentation required by PL 94-142 for IEPs is contained in each student's file as that file is developed.

The following recommendations are offered as considerations for future investigations in the area of monitoring checklists:
1. There is a need to develop valid and reliable checklists to monitor the other requirements contained in PL 94-142 and the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974.

2. Although there is some literature relating to the development of valid and reliable checklists, additional research needs to be conducted that relates specifically to the development of checklists, as they are a common instrument used in the education community.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Monitoring Questions
Monitoring Questions

**Topic Area One:** Evaluation of student’s present levels of performance.

1.1: Is documentation available that indicates that informed parent/guardian consent for the evaluation was secured prior to the evaluation?

1.2: Is documentation available that indicates the formal and informal assessments were conducted by individuals who are qualified by state licensing or certifying agencies?

1.3: Is documentation available that all existing information regarding the student was made available to the IEP committee?

1.4: Is documentation available that indicates that the information came from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical conditions, cultural or social background, and adaptive behavior, where appropriate?

1.5: Is documentation available to indicate that the parent/guardian was provided a "Content of Notice?"

1.6: Is documentation available that indicates that state education agency and/or local education agency requirements that are in addition to federal requirements are being met?

**Topic Area Two:** Development of the IEP by committee.

2.1: Is documentation available that indicates a minimum of an administrator and the child’s teacher was designated to participate on the IEP committee?
2.2: Is documentation available that a mutually agreed upon
time and place of the meeting was established?

2.3: Is documentation available that indicates the parent/
guardian was notified as to the purpose of the meeting and who
would be in attendance?

2.4: Is documentation available that indicates that the parent/
guardian did attend the meeting, if not, is there evidence that the
school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend?

2.5: Is documentation available that the parents do speak
English or use other than verbalizations to communicate, if not, was
an interpreter available for the parents who are deaf or whose native
language is other than English?

2.6: Is documentation available that indicates the additional
state and/or local education agency requirements have been met?

**Topic Area Three.** Documentation of the IEP components.

3.1: Is documentation available that the IEP contains a state-
ment of the student's present levels of educational performance?

3.2: Is documentation available that the IEP contains a state-
ment of annual goals?

3.3: Is documentation available that the IEP contains short
term instructional objectives?

3.4: Is documentation available that the IEP contains a state-
ment of specific special education and related services to be pro-
vided?
3.5: Is documentation available that the IEP contains a statement that specifies the extent to which a student will participate in the regular program?

3.6: Is documentation available that the IEP contains projected dates for initiation of services and the anticipated duration of those services?

3.7: Is documentation available that the IEP contains appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?

**Topic Area Four: Implementation of the IEP.**

4.1: Is documentation available that the specific special education services as outlined in the IEP have been or are currently being provided?

4.2: Is documentation available that the related services as specified in the IEP have been or are currently being provided?

4.3: Is documentation available that the extent to which the student is/was to participate in the regular program has been or is being met?

4.4: Is documentation available that the initiation dates and duration of services is being or has been determined to be in compliance?
**Topic Area Five:** Evaluation of the instructional objectives.

5.1: Is documentation available that the IEP has been reviewed and revised, if appropriate?

5.2: Is documentation available that the short term instructional objectives have objective criteria and schedules for evaluation?

5.3: Is documentation available that the short term objectives have been evaluated during the 1 calendar year from date of development?

5.4: Is documentation available that the next (or current) IEP was reviewed and, if appropriate, revised within 1 calendar year and that compliance area two was determined to be in compliance?
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Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for
Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Evaluation of student's educational performance.</td>
<td>Question 1.1: Was parent/guardian consent for the evaluation secured prior to the evaluation? The signature is required, date should be prior to the evaluation.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.2: Were the assessments conducted by individuals who are qualified by state licensing or certifying agencies? License or certificate is on file at school or agency.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.3: Was all existing information regarding the student made available to the IEP committee? The assessment results and records appear documented on the IEP.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.4: Was information considered from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, cultural or social background and adaptive behavior, where appropriate? More than one single procedure must be used except in cases involving speech therapy.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.5: Was a Content of Notice provided to the parent or guardian? A copy of the notice is one file with due process procedures, descriptions of actions proposed, description of evaluation procedures, tests or reports used, and a description of any other factors used to propose the evaluation procedure.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.6: List additional state or local education agency requirements:</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Development of IEP by a committee.</td>
<td>Question 2.1: Was a minimum of an administrator and the child's teacher designated to participate on the IEP committee? NOTE: Others may be present at the discretion of the school or parents.</td>
<td>2.1.1: Administrator? Responsible to supervise or provide special education services.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2: Child's teacher? A teacher who has or is working with the student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3: Is this the first IEP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.2: Was a mutually agreed upon time and place established for the IEP committee? Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls or parent visits.</td>
<td>If this is, is a psychologist, diagnostician or other specialists on the IEP committee? Someone with knowledge of the evaluation procedures used and able to interpret the results of the evaluation procedure must be on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.3: Was the parent/guardian notified as to the purpose of the IEP meeting and who would be in attendance? Copy of the notice that was provided to the parent or guardian.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.4: Did the parent/guardian attend the IEP meeting, if not is there evidence that the school attempted to convince them to attend? 2.4.1 Parent/guardian did attend? Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting.</td>
<td>If parent did not attend, is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend? Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE
### Compliance Topic Area

**Question**

**Suggested Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2.5: Do the parents speak English or use other than verbalizations to communicate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If not, was an interpreter available for the parents who are deaf or whose native language is other than English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation of native language or mode of communication, and interpreter provided.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Documentation is Available?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.
### Compliance Topic Area
**III. Documentation of the IEP components.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.1: Does the IEP contain a statement of the student's present levels of educational performance?</td>
<td>The student's present levels of educational performance should include a variety of information from the assessment/evaluation that was completed on the student and other information such as medical, behavior, speech, etc., if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.2: Does the IEP contain a statement of annual goal(s)?</td>
<td>The annual goal is a projection of achievement for one year; there could be one goal for each service and/or academic area which is specified in the IEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.3: Does the IEP contain short term instructional objectives?</td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives are meant to be benchmarks that indicate steps to be reached in achieving the annual goal. There are usually more than one objective for each annual goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.4: Does the IEP contain a statement of specific special education and related services to be provided?</td>
<td>The types of special education services and related services should be fully specified in the IEP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.5: Does the IEP contain a statement that specifies the extent to which the student will participate in the regular program?</td>
<td>The amount of time (hours, periods, or percentages) should be specified that the student shall participate in the regular program. If a student does not participate in the regular program, is there documentation to support that decision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.6:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain projected dates for the initiation of services and the duration of those services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The actual dates should be contained in the IEP and the duration of services should not be for more than one calendar year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.7:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives should have an evaluation component contained with them to assist in determining if the student is attaining the objectives and therefore the annual goal. The method for the evaluation of the short term goals should also be specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.8:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain components that are required by the state or local education agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List the requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE
### Compliance Topic Area

**Question**

**Suggested Criteria**

**IV. Implementation of the IEP.**

**Question 4.1:** Have or are the special education services as specified in the IEP been or being provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.1: Service (List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.4: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student's name is on teacher's role and show scheduling of the student for that specified time period.*

**NOTE:** Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all services specified in the IEP.

**Question 4.2:** Have or are the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been or being provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2.1: Service (List)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.4: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student's name is on bus list for transportation, designation by administration to employee to provide service, contract for service issued, student's name on specialist's or teacher's class roll or register, etc.*

**NOTE:** Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all the related services specified in the IEP.

**Question 4.3:** Does the student participate in the regular program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3.1: Yes? Specify amount (percentage/hours) or is to participate:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3.2: If no, is there rationale for non-participation available?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Student's name is on teacher's roles of the regular program.*

---

**EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE**
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for
Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. (continued)</td>
<td>Question 4.4: Have the initiation dates and duration of the service(s) been specified?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.1: Date (Specify) Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.2: Date (Specify) Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.3: Date (Specify) Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4.4: Date (Specify) Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date(s) of initiation should be the same as the date(s) entered on the class roll or the contract. The duration of services should not be more than one year as the IEP is only valid for one calendar year.

NOTE: Only the number of blanks required need to be completed.

EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V. Evaluation of the instructional objectives. | Question 5.1: Has the IEP been reviewed or revised, if appropriate?  
*If no, and it is not more than one calendar year since the IEP was written--STOP--do not complete the remaining questions.* | YES | NO |
|                       | Question 5.2: Do the short term instructional objectives have objective criteria and schedules for evaluation?  
5.2.1: Criteria?  
Criteria could be stated in behavioral terms, test gain, or other conditions that will demonstrate the achievement of the objectives.  
5.2.2: Schedules?  
A schedule is contained in the IEP that will state when the IEP is to be reviewed and revised if necessary. | YES | NO |
|                       | Question 5.3: Did a committee as stated in Topic Area II, Question 2.1 and 2.4 review and revise the IEP?  
5.3.1: Administrator?  
5.3.2: Child's teacher?  
5.3.3: Parent/guardian (see 2.2 - 2.4)  
The minimum committee should review and revise, if appropriate, the IEP. | YES | NO |
|                       | Question 5.4: Has the IEP been evaluated during the calendar year from the date of development?  
5.4.1: Date developed:  
5.4.2: Date reviewed:  
The IEP is not valid for more than one calendar year after its development. | YES | NO |
Appendix C

Sample Letter and Questionnaire—
Expert Panel for Establishing
Validity
Dear

Thank you for your cooperation to participate with the other panel members to determine the validity of a checklist for monitoring IEPs. You will find enclosed a checklist that contains monitoring questions and criteria that are believed to be representative of the requirements of Public Law 94-142. Based on your experience and knowledge of PL 94-142 it is requested that you review each question and criterion for the question to determine its appropriateness for monitoring the requirements of PL 94-142 for IEPs.

Specifically you are requested to:

1. Judge each monitoring question and criterion to determine their appropriateness to monitor the requirements of PL 94-142.
2. Indicate your decision on the appropriateness of each item by checking (✓) the "yes" or "no" column in the "Compliance is documented" section of the checklist.
3. a. If "no" is checked and if a minor change in the question or criterion could make the item appropriate in your judgement, please mark the change or changes and place a (X) in the "yes" column.
   b. If no modification can correct the item in your judgement please underline the portion or portions which you judged as inappropriate.
4. Continue through the checklist judging each item.
5. When completed, please respond to the questionnaire that is attached to this letter.
6. Mail the questionnaire and checklist in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which is enclosed.

Thank you for your cooperation in this investigation. When the results are tabulated, you will receive a copy of those results.

Sincerely,

George T.L. Holt
Doctoral Student

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Supplementary Information

Judge #

1. In your opinion, is/are there monitoring question(s) and criterion that should have been included in the checklist that were not? Yes ___; No ___; If yes, please specify the question(s) and criteria.

2. In your opinion, does the format of the checklist provide the monitor a satisfactory means to respond to the questions? Yes ___; No ___; If no, please specify any improvements.

3. In your opinion, is there any ambiguity in the format which prevents the monitor from following each question and marking a decision on that question? Yes ___; No ___; If yes, please specify what prevents the monitor from following each question.

4. In your opinion, are there any comments that this investigator needs to be aware of regarding the validity of this checklist?

THANK YOU
Appendix D

Copies of the IEPs Used for the Reliability Studies
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

NAME: Lopal D.

DATE: 6-15-78

AGE: 7.8

DOB: 

LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING: ATTACHED

HANDICAPPING CONDITION: Speech Impaired

APPROVED: 

SCHOOL

PLACEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Superintendent: 6-25-79

Teacher: 6-25-79

Parent: 6-28-79

Pathologist: 6-28-79

INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING IEP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM GOALS</th>
<th>CC/DATE</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathologist</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I, II, III</td>
<td>L, a, b, c, II, III, a, b</td>
<td>7-12-79</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>% of Time</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Annual Goals</td>
<td>Short Term Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>96.65%</td>
<td>08/19</td>
<td>06/20</td>
<td>(a) D will improve on auditory attention.</td>
<td>(a) D will improve on auditory attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) D will improve on auditory figure-ground skills</td>
<td>(b) D will improve on auditory figure-ground skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) D will improve on speech sound discrimination and auditory sequence.</td>
<td>(c) D will improve on speech sound discrimination and auditory sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Art/Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(II) Improve speech production</td>
<td>(II) D will improve production and use of these sounds in words th (m); (w) med; (f) forth (l, L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>X OF TIME</td>
<td>START DATE</td>
<td>END DATE</td>
<td>ANNUAL GOALS</td>
<td>SHORT TERM GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Regular class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Art/Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Shuffled Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>% OF TIME</td>
<td>START DATE</td>
<td>END DATE</td>
<td>ANNUAL GOALS</td>
<td>SHORT TERM GOALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Regular class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive Art/ Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sheltered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME: Daniel

IPI # 1
Page 4 of 10
# Level of Functioning

**Speech and Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>SES No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/31/1971</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testing Instruments</th>
<th>Date Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Picture Arrangement Test</td>
<td>5/31/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Picture Vocabulary Test</td>
<td>5/31/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pure Tone Screaming Hearing Test</td>
<td>6/13/79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results**

- **P.A.T.**:
  - Retardation: Read 6th grade level; should read 2nd grade level.
  - Verbal: 6th grade level; should read 5th grade level.
  - Mental age: 6.6 years; percentile score: 40.

- **W.P.T.**:
  - Verbal: Read 6th grade level; percentile score: 40.

**Hearing**

- Good for speech range

**Strengths**

1. Worked hard
2. Very attentive
3. Is making progress in articulation skills

**Weaknesses**

1. Poor writing (wrote auxiliary verbs)
2. Front teeth not aligned
3. Delayed language

(signed)

**Speech Pathologist**
MULTDISCIPLINARY PLACEMENT TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS

Statement of Eligibility:
The results of the speech and hearing evaluation conducted 8-30-79, seem to indicate the presence of a communication disorder as defined in §§310.3(h)(10) which may adversely affect Daniel's educational performance. Specific needs were noted in the area(s) of speech, language, and hearing skills.

Therefore, it is recommended that Daniel receive speech therapy for 30 minutes 2 times per week.

Comments:

Signature: [Signature]
Date: 6-25-79
Position: Speech Therapist
Name: [Name]
Title: Speech Therapist

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
**IEP #1**

**Page 7 of 10**

**FAMM - WEST**

**Dates of Initial Assessment**

**Educational Appraisal and Action Committee:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>6-25-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>Parent</td>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>6-25-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu Hart</td>
<td>Special Advocate</td>
<td>Stu Hart</td>
<td>6-25-79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Committee Comments and Recommendations:**

The members of the Committee recommend that Daniel be placed in the regular school and receive speech therapy 30 minutes 2 times per week.

**Parental Consent:**

This is to certify that George Smith, Parent or Guardian, hereby request that David, Child/ward, be placed in Special Speech-Threading Service Program/Serviced

Operated by: Elementary School

For a period not to exceed three years from the date of execution of this consent, I understand that at the end of that period my child/ward will be reevaluated and that I will be given the recommendations for placement and further consent.

**Signature:**

Parent/Guardian  6-25-79

**Witnessed:**

Interpretation was not provided.

**Interpretor:**

Signed by

Superintendent or Designated Representative  6-25-79

cc: Parent/Guardian

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
IEP #1

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Dear Mr. and Mrs. George,

The assessment(s), examination(s), or evaluation(s) for which you gave your consent have been completed. The results indicate that:

a. ( ) No placement in special education programs or services is recommended at this time.

b. ( ) A planning meeting for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and/or revising an IEP (Individualized Education Program) for your child is necessary.

It is important that you participate in this meeting. You have been contacted orally and given an opportunity to have input in the scheduling of the planning meeting. The meeting has been scheduled at the following mutually agreed upon time and place:

Date: 6-25-79
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Place: 
Purpose: IEP
Participants in Meeting:
1. A representative of the school
2. The child's teacher
3. One or both parents
4. The child, where appropriate
5. Evaluation personnel representative
6. Other individuals at the discretion of the parents of the school

Interpretation: 
1. Was
2. Was not provided.

Witnessed: 
Interpreter: 

Page 1 of 2

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
PLEAEl DETACH AND RETURN TO THE SCHOOL IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.

1. (✓) I will attend the scheduled IEP Meeting.
2. ( ) I cannot attend. Please contact me to arrange alternate solutions.
3. ( ) I choose not to participate in developing the IEP for my child and I authorize school personnel to develop the IEP. I understand that I will then be contacted by the school to obtain my written permission for student placement and for implementation of the service.

Signature: ________________

Parent or Guardian

Date: 6-7-79

INSTRUCTIONS:

Original mailed to parent or guardian 10 days prior to scheduled meeting date.

One copy to be filed in 94-147 Central File (High School Vault)
One copy to be filed in DPU File (Student Folder)
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM GOALS</th>
<th>CC/DATE</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Pteil 1</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II, III</td>
<td>9/27/71</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>Pteil 2</td>
<td>I, II</td>
<td>II, III, IV, V</td>
<td>8/32/71</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PlACEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIG</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td>6/17/79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>6/17/79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr.</td>
<td>4/17/79</td>
<td></td>
<td>School Psychologist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING IEP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/4/79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE</td>
<td>5 OF TIME</td>
<td>START DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Regular class</td>
<td>Approx 30%</td>
<td>06/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Adaptive Art/ Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Resource Sp.Ed.</td>
<td>Approx 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **11a** C will improve her Math Skills
- **11b** C will be able to solve basic addition facts with 90% accuracy
- **11c** C will be able to solve basic subtraction facts with 90% accuracy
- **12a** C will be able to spell 10 out of 10 basic sight words on a test
- **12b** C will be able to write 10 sentences correctly (capitalization, punctuation, word usage) with 80% accuracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>% OF TIME</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT TERM GOALS</th>
<th>MATERIALS OR TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>EVALUATION METHOD</th>
<th>EVALUATION RESULTS AND DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. C will be able to write a letter that is legible and makes sense</td>
<td>Handwriting Program</td>
<td>Pen Pal</td>
<td>C will show 5 months growth in spelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Art/Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Present Level of Functioning**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WIDEBANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST (WAT)</td>
<td>2/1/78</td>
<td>VIQ 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEATHER INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST (FIAT)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRY TEST OF VISUAL-MOTOR INTEGRATION (VMI)</td>
<td>2/14/78</td>
<td>(VMI A.E. 63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER TESTS: RUCOE 4/74</td>
<td>4/71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEYSTONE WSC SCREENSENG</td>
<td>2-5-78</td>
<td>NEEDS HELP IN SAIPIN HOPPING AND WALKING THE BALANCE BEAM. APPEARS TO EYE CLUE 2-6-78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

- SMILES A LOT - GOOD NATURED - SEEMS HAPPY
- A WILLING WORKER

**Weaknesses:**

- Immature - in comparison with peers
- Easily distracted
- Gross and fine motor problems
- Visual perception and visual motor problems
**Student** Callie  
**Date** 6-21-79  
**Age** 9.4  
**Grade** 2

### Present Level of Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests Administered</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wechsler Scale (WPPSI, WISC-R, or WAIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>PSIQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Expectancy Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade Equivalents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Arithmetic</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Tests:**

- **California Achievement Test**
  - Reading: 89
  - Math: 88
  - Language: N

### Strengths:

- [Blank]

### Weaknesses:

- [Blank]
EDUCATIONAL APPRAISAL AND REVIEW COMMITTEE:

Name: 
Position: 
Signature: 
Date: 4-17-79

COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The recommendation for special education services under the special education education program is based on the needs of the student as determined by the educational materials and techniques and evaluation methods. The appropriate educational program is

PARENTAL CONSENT:

This is to certify that I, (Typed), Parent or Guardian, hereby request that my Child/Ward, (Typed), be placed in (Typed) Spec. Educat. Class. (Typed), Operated by (Typed) Agency/Practitioner, for a period not to exceed three years from the date of execution of this consent. I understand that at the end of that period my child/ward will be reevaluated and that I will be given the recommendations for placement and further consent.

Signature: (Typed) 
Date: 4-17-79

WITNESSES:

Interpretation was not provided.

I, the undersigned, have read and fully explained the recommended placement of the above-named child and the parent or guardian as witnessed above requests the placement of the child in the program/service stated.

Signature: (Typed) 
Date: 4-17-79

The Individual Education Plan (IEP) dated 4-17-79 and will be continued through the end of the school year 5-24-79. The revised IEP dated 4-17-79 will be issued at the beginning of the next school year 9-3-79.
STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

Based on the results of the total assessment which indicate subaverage general intellectual functioning (IQ ≤ 70) and deficits in adaptive behavior as indicated by the mental retardation for learning, the assessment seems to indicate that these factors may adversely affect his educational performance unless he receives special education and/or related services. It is recommended that (NAME) receive special education and/or related services in a mainstream setting for (TYPE) minutes or class periods (FREQUENCY) times per week.

Comments: Due to his slow academic skills and poor social skills, (NAME) needs to be in a small class environment where teachers can spend more time with him leading and push skills also need to be practiced.

[Signature]  4-21-76
Psychologist  Date
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Class</th>
<th>Separate Class</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular Class with Subject Services</td>
<td>Regular Class with Subject Services</td>
<td>Total, Direct/Other Time in Regular Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only</td>
<td>Only</td>
<td>Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3 Total 17 17 01</td>
<td>3 Total 17 17 01</td>
<td>3 Total 17 17 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>3 Total 17 21</td>
<td>3 Total 17 21</td>
<td>3 Total 17 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
<td>6 Total 17 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
<td>10 Total 01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**
Dear [Name],

The assessment(s), examination(s), or evaluation(s) for which you gave your consent have been completed. The results indicate that:

a. ( ) No placement in special education programs or services is recommended at this time.

b. ( ) A planning meeting for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and/or revising an IEP (Individualized Education Program) for your child is necessary.

It is important that you participate in this meeting. You have been contacted orally and given an opportunity to have input in the scheduling of the planning meeting. The meeting has been scheduled at the following mutually agreed upon time and place.

Date: 4-17-79
Time: 2:30 p.m.
Place: [Location]
Purpose: [Purpose]

Participants in Meeting:
1. A representative of the school
2. The child's teacher
3. One or both parents
4. The child, where appropriate
5. Evaluation personnel representative
6. Other individuals at the discretion of the parents or the school

Interpretation ( ) was provided.
( ) was not provided.

Witnessed: [Signature]
Interpreter: [Signature]

Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN TO THE SCHOOL IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.

1. ( ) I will attend the scheduled IEP Meeting.
2. ( ) I cannot attend. Please contact me to arrange alternate solutions.
3. ( ) I choose not to participate in developing the IEP for my child and I authorize school personnel to develop the IEP. I understand that I will then be contacted by the school to obtain my written permission for student placement and for implementation of the service.

Signature__________________________
Parent or Guardian

Date__________________________

INSTRUCTIONS:

Original mailed to parent or guardian 10 days prior to scheduled meeting date.

One copy to be filed in 94-143 Central File (High School Vault).
One copy to be filed in DPW File (Student Folder).
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Eastern Area

Documentation of Parental Contact

Student ______________________
Parent(s) or Guardian ______________________
Address ______________________
Telephone Number ______________________
Person placing call (Signature) ______________________
Date of Call ________________ Time of Call ________________
Talked with ______________________
Purpose of call ______________________
Result of call ______________________

Interpretation [ ] was provided [ ] was not provided

Person(s) making home visit (Signatures) ______________________
Date of Home Visit ______/____/____ Time of Home Visit ______:____:____
Talked with ______________________
Purpose of Home Visit ______________________
Result of Home Visit ______________________

Interpretation [ ] was provided [ ] was not provided

Witnessed ______________________ Date ______________________
 Interpreter ______________________

(To be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault))

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

NAME: Joseph

SES: 

DATE: 02-22-79

LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING: ATTACHED

HANDICAPPING CONDITION: 

APPROVED: Parent Signature

SCHOOL

PLACEMENT COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Supervisor: 

Teacher: 

P.T. Teacher: 

School Psychologist:

Mother: 

INDIVIDUALS RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTING IEP:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>SERVICE PROVIDER</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT-TERM GOALS</th>
<th>CC/DATE</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Glands</td>
<td>I C</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-29-79</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>Bragg</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-20-79</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parent Signature: 

Date: 

Signature: 

Position: 

Date: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>% OF TIME</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT TERM GOALS</th>
<th>MATERIALS OR TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>EVALUATION METHODS</th>
<th>EVALUATION RESULTS AND DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Regular class</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>08/79</td>
<td>06/80</td>
<td>1) J will improve his reading skills</td>
<td>a) Given 10 multi-syllable words J will indicate the accented syllable to 90% accuracy</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Given 10 words J will be able to alphabetize than to 100% accuracy</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Given 10 questions on material read, J will be able to provide the correct answer to 90% accuracy</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) Given 10 comparisons J will be able to identify simile and/or metaphor and give the meaning to 90% accuracy</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Art/ Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Given a list of 10 teacher selected paired words J will be able to identify antonym, synonym, or homonym to 90% accuracy</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II) J will receive supportive counseling</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II) J will meet the school psychologist once every two weeks for a 30 min. session Topics of discussion will include:</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Completing homework</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) Peer Relationships</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Personal Hygiene</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II) Bi-weekly meetings with school psychologist</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II) Observation by Administrator, teachers and school psychologist</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II) Observation by Administrator, teachers and school psychologist</td>
<td>Programmed materials</td>
<td>1) 90% accuracy on teacher made or program tests J will gain at least 1 year in reading vocabulary, reading comprehension and total reading on the CAT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

The results of the most recent psychoeducational assessment indicate that [pupil name] has a specific learning disability in the area(s) of [specify area(s)]. This determination is based on the severe discrepancy between [pupil name]'s average or above average ability (M.A.P.) and [pupil name]'s past and present educational achievement in the area(s) of [specify area(s)].

Observation of [pupil name] in the regular classroom setting as noted on the Peterson Screening Scale by [teacher's name] (regular classroom teacher) and the observations noted on the psychological report indicate that these observed behaviors relate to [pupil name]'s academic functioning by the [specific statement].

Since the assessment seems to indicate that the observed behaviors and the identified discrepancy may adversely affect [pupil name]'s academic achievement unless [pupil name] receives special education services and/or related services, it is recommended that [pupil name] receive special education services and/or related services in a 1:1 setting for [number of class periods] times per week.

No adverse effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted in the screening or assessment data.

The following adverse effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted on the screening instrument and assessment data:

No medical information which is relevant to [pupil name]'s education is noted.

The following medical information which is relevant to [pupil name]'s education is noted:

[Medical information]

Comments: [Teacher's comments]

[Psychologist's comments]

[Signature] [Date]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Eastern Area

PARENT CONSENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT AND SERVICES

EDUCATIONAL APPRAISAL AND REVIEW COMMITTEE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUPERVISOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dav.</td>
<td>TAMPERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>RE: TAMPERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louie</td>
<td>MURRAY</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE CONSENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The undersigned recommend that John receive special services through the regular classroom program for the 1979-80 school year. It is recommended that he receive supporting counseling at least once a month from the school psychologist.

PARENTAL CONSENT:

This is to certify that I, Parent or Guardian, (Typed)

Hereby Request that my Child/Ward, (Typed)

Be Placed in (Typed)

Program/Service (Typed)

Operated by (Agency/Practitioner)

For a period not to exceed three years from the date of execution of this consent, I understand at the end of that period my child/ward will be reevaluated and that I will be given the recommendations for placement and further consent.

Signature: Parent/Guardian: 5/23/79

Interpretation was not provided.

WITNESSED:

Interpreter: Date:

I, the undersigned have defined and fully explained the recommended placement of the above-named child and the parent or guardian as witnessed above requests the placement of the child in the program as stated.

Signature: Superintendent or Designated Representative: 5/23/79

[Note: Parent/Guardian]
### Present Level of Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests Administered</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.I.S. scale (WPPSI, WISC-R, or WAIS)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VIQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronological Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Expectancy Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rey Test of Visual-Motor Integration (VMI)</td>
<td></td>
<td>VMI A.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Tests: CRT 4/79</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Reading 2.5 4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Language 6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Math 5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strengths:**

**Weakness:**

[UPDATE]
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Eastern Area

PARENT CONSENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT AND SERVICES

EDUCATIONAL APPRAISAL AND REVIEW COMMITTEE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-17-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-17-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>05-17-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE CONSENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

We, the undersigned, do hereby consent to the Special Educational Program for the [Child/ward] described above.

PARENTAL CONSENT:

This is to certify that I, [Parent/Guardian], hereby request that my child/ward, [Name], be placed in [Program/Service] for a period not to exceed [three years] from the date of execution of this consent. I understand at the end of that period my child/ward will be reevaluated and that I will be given the recommendations for placement and further consent.


INTERPRETATION:

Interpretation was [II] not [II] provided.

WITNESS:

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the recommended placement of the above-named child and the parent or guardian as witnessed above requests the placement of the child in the program/service stated.

Signature: [Superintendent or Designated Representative] Date: [11-2-79]

CC: Parent/Guardian
Joseph

FD: 25
AGE: 16
GRADE: 10

PRESENT LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TESTS ADMINISTERED</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>RESULTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| WECHSLER SCALE (APPSI, VISC.-R, or WAIS) | 10/9/99 | VQ: 85  
IQ: 101  
PIP: 91 |
| CHRONOLOGICAL AGE | 16.9 | |
| MENTAL AGE | 9.3 | |
| GRADE EQUIVALENTS | Grade 3.5 Upper |
| WIDE RANGE ACHIEVEMENT TEST (WRAI) | 10/9/99 | READING: 7.8  
ARITHMETIC: 6.5 |
| OR | | |
| PEABODY INDIVIDUAL ACHIEVEMENT TEST (PIAT) | | |
| BEERY TEST OF VISUAL-MOTOR INTEGRATION (VMI) | 10/9/99 | VR: 8.7  
I.Q.: 86 |
| OTHER TESTS: Peabody picture Vocabulary | 10/9/99 | |

STRENGTHS:


RE-EVALUATION
The results of the most recent psychological assessment indicates that [Name] has a specific learning disability in the area(s) of [Specific Area].

This determination is based on severe discrepancy between [Name]'s average or above average ability (WPPSI) and [Name]'s past and present educational achievement in the area(s) of [Specific Area].

Observation of [Name] in the regular classroom setting as noted on the Peterson Screening Scale by [Teacher] (regular classroom teacher) and the observations noted on the psychological report indicate that these observed behaviors relate to [Name]'s academic functioning by including a special education plan for [Name].

Since the assessment seems to indicate that the observed behaviors and the identified discrepancy may adversely affect [Name]'s academic achievement unless [Name] receives special education services and/or related services, it is recommended that [Name] receive special education services and/or related services in a [Specific Setting], setting for [Number of hours per week] minutes per week.

No adverse effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted in the screening or assessment data.

The following adverse effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted on the screening instrument and assessment data:

... (Text continues)

No medical information which is relevant to his/her education is noted.

The following medical information which is relevant to his/her education is noted:

... (Text continues)

Comments:

Signature: [Signature]
Position: [Position]
Date: [Date]

---

[Name]
Teacher
01/01/23

[Name]
Teacher
01/01/23

[Name]
Teacher
01/01/23

---

RE-EVALUATION

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Class</th>
<th>Separate Class</th>
<th>TABLE 4: LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with regular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with receipt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL:
The assessment(s), examination(s), or evaluation(s) for which you gave your consent have been completed. The results indicate that:

a. ( ) No placement in special education programs or services is recommended at this time.

b. ( ) A planning meeting for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and/or revising an IEP (Individualized Education Program) for your child is necessary.

It is important that you participate in this meeting. You have been contacted orally and given an opportunity to have input in the scheduling of the planning meeting. The meeting has been scheduled at the following mutually agreed upon time and place.

Date
1

Time
2

Place
3

Purpose
4

Participants in Meeting:
5. A representative of the school.
6. The child's teacher.
7. One or both parents.
8. The child, where appropriate.
10. Other individuals at the discretion of the parents or the school.

Interpretation { } was provided.

Witnessed

Interpreter

Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
Eastern Area

IEP #3

Page 11 of 14

Documentation of Parental Contact

Student

Parent(s) or Guardian

Address

Telephone Number

Person placing call (Signature)

Date of Call

Time of Call

Talked with

Purpose of call

Record of call

Interpretation { } was not provided

Person(s) making home visit (Signatures)

Date of Home Visit

Time of Home Visit

Talked with

Purpose of home visit

Result of Home Visit

Interpretation { } was not provided

Witnessed

Interpreter

(To be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
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Dear [Name],

The assessment(s), examination(s), or evaluation(s) for which you gave your consent have been completed. The results indicate that:

a. ( ) No placement in special education programs or services is recommended at this time.

b. [x] A planning meeting for the purposes of developing, reviewing, and/or revising an IEP (Individualized Education Program) for your child is necessary.

It is important that you participate in this meeting. You have been contacted orally and given an opportunity to have input in the scheduling of the planning meeting. The meeting has been scheduled at the following mutually agreed upon time and place:

Date: 5/27/79
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: [Location]

Purpose: IEP

Participants in Meeting:
1. A representative of the school
2. The child's teacher
3. One or both parents
4. The child, where appropriate
5. Evaluation personnel representatives
6. Other individuals at the discretion of the parents or the school

Interpretation { } was
{ } was not provided.

Witnessed Interpreter

Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN TO THE SCHOOL IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE.

1. ( ) I will attend the scheduled IEP Meeting.
2. ( ) I cannot attend. Please contact me to arrange alternate solutions.
3. ( ) I choose not to participate in developing the IEP for my child and I authorize school personnel to develop the IEP. I understand that I will then be contacted by the school to obtain my written permission for student placement and for implementation of the service.

Signature ____________________________
Parent or Guardian

Date ____________________________

INSTRUCTIONS:

Original to parent or guardian 30 days prior to scheduled meeting date.

One copy to be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
One copy to be filed in DPU File (Student Folder)
Documentation of Parental Contact

Student: (Name)
Parent(s) or Guardian: (Name)

Address:

Telephone Number:

Person placing call (Signature):

Date of Call: ___________ Time of Call: ___________

Talked with:

Purpose of call:

Result of call:

Interpretation: { } was not provided

Person(s) making home visit (Signature): ___________

Date of Home Visit: ___________ Time of Home Visit: ___________

Talked with: (Name)

Purpose of Home Visit: (Reason for visit)

Result of Home Visit: (Outcome of visit)

Interpretation: { } was not provided

Witnessed: ___________ Date: ___________

Interpreter: ___________

(To be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>OF TIME</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>END DATE</th>
<th>ANNUAL GOALS</th>
<th>SHORT TERM GOALS</th>
<th>MATERIALS OR TECHNIQUES</th>
<th>EVALUATION METHOD</th>
<th>EVALUATION RESULTS AND DATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Regular class</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td>08/79</td>
<td>06/80</td>
<td>1) R will improve in reading skills</td>
<td>1) R will review Distor lessons one day in advance to increase his confidence in class. As a result he will participate in the regular classroom and do the Distor lessons to at least 75% accuracy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Typing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Adaptive Art/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Resource L.D.</td>
<td>Approx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Audiology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Speech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Psychological</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Sheltered Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAME: Richard
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS  
Eastern Area  
PARENT CONSENT - SPECIAL EDUCATION PLACEMENT AND SERVICES  
EDUCATIONAL APPRAISAL AND REVIEW COMMITTEE:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-27-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-27-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-27-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>TEACHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-27-79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>SUPERVISOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-27-79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMITTEE CONSENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:  
It is recommended that Richard be served in an inclusion classroom on a resource basis for the '79-'80 school year.  

PARENTAL CONSENT:  
This is to certify that I, [Name/Parent or Guardian - (Typed)], hereby request that my child/ward, [Name - (Typed)], be placed in [Learning Disability Classroom] (Program/Service) operated by [Agency/Practitioner].  
For a period not to exceed three years from the date of execution of this consent. I understand that at the end of that period my child/ward will be reevaluated and that I will be given the recommendations for placement and further consent.  

Signature  
Date  
Interpretation was not provided.  
WITNESSED:  
Interpreters  
Date  
I, the undersigned have signed and fully explained the recommended placement of the above named child and the parent or guardian as witnessed above requests the placement of the child in the program/service stated.  
Signature  
Date  
cc: Parent/Guardian  
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STATEMENT OF ELIGIBILITY

The results of the most recent psychoeducational assessment indicates that [Student] has a specific learning disability in the area(s) of [describe areas]. This determination is based on the severe discrepancy between [Student]'s average or above average ability (IQ, etc.) and [her] past and present educational achievement in the area(s) of [describe areas].

Observation of [Student] in the regular classroom setting as noted on the Petersen Screening Scale and by [Teacher] (regular classroom teacher) and the observations noted on the psychological report indicate that these observed behaviors relate to [describe areas].

Since the assessment seems to indicate that the observed behaviors and the identified discrepancy may adversely affect [her] academic achievement unless [Student] receives special education services and/or related services, it is recommended that [Student] receive special education services and/or related services in a [describe setting] setting for [describe number] times per week.

✓ No adverse affects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted in the screening or assessment data.

The following adverse affects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage were noted on the screening instrument and assessment data:

No medical information which is relevant to [Student]'s education is noted.

✓ The following medical information which is relevant to [Student]'s education is noted:

[Student] was referred to [Healthcare Provider] for further evaluation on [date].

Comments:

[Signature] [Name]
Psychologist
Date
NAME: Richard

SEX: M

GRADE: 1

DATE: 4/26/79

ACADEMIC LEVEL: 7.6

LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING:

TESTS ADMINISTERED

- WISC-R or WISC-V
- VMI

RESULTS

- VIQ 99
- PIQ 82
- FSIQ 89

GRADE EQUIVALENTS

- READING: 1.3
- SPELLING: 1.4
- ARITHMETIC: 1.2

STRENGTHS:

- Good attention in one to one situation

WEAKNESSES:

- Ability to perceive detail and to distinguish essential from nonessential detail
- Ability to learn new material rapidly under time limits
- Perceptual motor speed
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Dear [Name],

The assessment(s), examination(s), or evaluation(s) for which you gave your consent have been completed. The results indicate that:

a. ( ) No placement in special education program or services is recommended at this time.

b. (✓) A planning meeting for the purpose of developing, reviewing, and/or revising an IEP (Individualized Education Program) for your child is necessary.

It is important that you participate in this meeting. You have been contacted orally and given an opportunity to have input in the scheduling of the planning meeting. The meeting has been scheduled at the following mutually agreed upon time and place.

Date ___6-7-74___
Time __4:00p.___
Place _______________________
Purpose _______________________

Participants in Meeting:
1. A representative of the school [Name] ________
2. The child's teacher [Name] ________
3. One or both parents [Name] ________
4. The child, where appropriate [Name] ________
5. Evaluation personnel representative [Name] ________
6. Other individuals at the discretion of the parent or the school [Name] ________

Interpretation (✓) was provided.
( ) was not provided.

Witnessed________________________
Interpreter_____________________

[Signature]

Page 1 of 2
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN TO THE SCHOOL IN THE ENCLOSED SELF-ADRESSED STATED ENVELOPE.

1. [ ] I will attend the scheduled IEP Meeting.
2. [ ] I cannot attend. Please contact me to arrange alternate solutions.
3. [ ] I choose not to participate in developing the IEP for my child and I authorize school personnel to develop the IEP. I understand that I will then be contacted by the school to obtain my written permission for student placement and for implementation of the services.

Signature ____________________________ 
Date 8-21-71

INSTRUCTIONS:
Original mailed to parent or guardian 70 days prior to scheduled meeting date.

One copy to be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
One copy to be filed in DPU File (Student Folder)

Page 2 of 2
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Documentation of Parental Contact

Student ____________
Parent(s) or Guardian ____________

Address

Telephone Number

Person placing call (Signature)

Date of Call ____________ Time of Call ____________

Talked with ____________

Purpose of call

Result of call

Interpretation { } was not provided

Person(s) making home visit (Signature) ____________

Date of Home Visit 2-5-79 Time of Home Visit ____________

Talked with ____________

Purpose of Home Visit ____________

Result of Home Visit ____________

Interpretation { } was not provided

Witnesed ____________ Date ____________

Interpreter

(To be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation of Parental Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s) or Guardian: Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person placing call (Signature):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Call:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Call:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of call:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of call:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ } was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ } was not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person(s) making home visit (Signatures):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Home Visit: 26/6/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Home Visit: 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with: Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of Home Visit: To set up IEP Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result of Home Visit: Further plans to attend meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ } was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{ } was not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(To be filed in 94-142 Central File (High School Vault)
Appendix E

Sample Letters to the Monitors of IEPs for Pretest and Posttest Reliability
Dear

Thank you for your cooperation to participate in this investigation to determine the reliability of the enclosed checklist. Four checklists and four sample IEPs are enclosed. The checklists and IEPs are numbered. Please complete each checklist on each IEP. Please be sure that the code numbers are the same for the IEPs and the checklists.

You are to presume the following items:
1. You are monitoring the IEPs on December 4, 1979, as that is the date that they were selected.
2. You are to presume that all personnel have valid teaching or other certificates.
3. Names have been removed to protect the identity of the students and their parents. Where there is an obvious blank space for signatures or names, you are to presume that the names and signatures are in those spaces.
4. Class lists, bus rosters are to be presumed available to document the services, and that the services were being provided on December 4, 1979.
5. You are to presume nothing else. If the documentation is not present in the IEP, it is not in compliance.
6. You are to follow the directions from #4 through #8 listed on the instructions which are enclosed. Do NOT complete steps 9 and 10.

The criterion stated with each monitoring question will be the minimally acceptable standard. It is to be the basis of your decision regarding compliance.

The checklists and IEPs are to be returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please make no marks on the IEPs. It would be appreciated if the checklists be completed in five days and returned by mail.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

George T.L. Holt
Doctoral Student
Dear

This is the post-test reliability on the checklist. The IEPs are the same ones that were completed one month ago. Again, the checklist and the IEPs are numbered. Please complete each checklist on each IEP. Please be sure that the code numbers are the same for the IEPs and checklists.

It is again important to presume the following items:
1. You are monitoring the IEPs on December 4, 1979, as that is the date that they were selected.
2. You are to presume that all personnel have valid teaching or other certificates.
3. Names have been removed to protect the identity of the students and their parents. Where there is an obvious blank space for signatures or names, you are to presume that the names and signatures are in those spaces.
4. Class lists, bus rosters are to be presumed available to document the services, and that the services were being provided on December 4, 1979.
5. You are to presume nothing else. If the documentation is not present in the IEP, it is not in compliance.
6. You are to follow the directions from #4 through #8 listed on the instructions which are enclosed. Do NOT complete steps 9 and 10.

The criteria stated with each monitoring questions will be the minimally acceptable standard. It is to be the basis of your decision regarding compliance.

The checklists and IEPs are to be returned in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please make no marks on the IEPs. It would be appreciated if the checklists be completed in five days and returned by mail.

Thanks again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

George T.L. Holt
Doctoral Student
Appendix F

Instructions for
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for
Individualized Education Programs
Instructions for Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

This checklist has been designed to monitor IEPs for compliance with Public Law 94-142. The checklist contains five major topic areas that are to be reviewed. The major topic areas are: (1) evaluation of student to determine present levels of functioning, (2) committee to develop IEP, (3) written document (IEP) that has the required components, (4) implementation of the IEP, and (5) evaluation of short term instructional objectives. Each topic area has a series of monitoring questions and criteria that relate to that topic. The criteria have been stated in terms that are minimally acceptable for compliance with Public Law 94-142.

The directions for utilizing the checklist are as follows:
1. Develop a roster of all students who are currently receiving special education services.
2. a. Use a table of random numbers to select 20% (.20) of the number of students on the roster. If there is a fraction remaining, round up to the next whole number.
   (or)
   b. If a table of random numbers is not available, randomly select any number between one and the last number on the roster of students. (The number should be selected by a disinterested party.) At the point on the roster where the random number is located, select that student and every fifth student to participate in the study. Do not forget to return to the beginning and continue to count up by five to the point where the selection began. The number selected should equal 20% (.20) of the total number of students on the roster (plus or minus one).
3. The students' IEPs that have been selected should have a checklist completed for compliance with PL 94-142.
4. Documentation must be observed prior to marking the question "yes" or "no." Teaching certificates, class rosters, transportation lists, etc., should not be presumed, they should be verified.
5. Complete each item on the checklist. The information may not be located in the sequence of the checklist but should be available as a part of the educational records.
6. Certain portions of the checklist have dotted lines (----) as dividers to monitoring questions. This indicates that there could be more than one criterion statement to the monitoring question. Unless otherwise indicated, each
portion of the monitoring question should receive a response from the monitor.

7. Only one check mark is required on each line. The response could be an (X) or (✓). No duplicate responses should be on the same line (example: both "yes" and "no" columns marked. If there are two criteria in a statement, both criteria must be in compliance for a "yes" response.

8. In the event that the monitor is not sure if the question is in compliance, this would indicate that the monitor does not have sufficient documentation available. The "no" column should then be checked.

9. To analyze the data contained in the checklist, the percentages of compliance need to be computed. The percentages of compliance can be computed by dividing the number of "yes" checks for each item by the total number of checks for that line (number of "yes" checks plus the number of "no" checks in each line equals the total).

   Example:

   "Yes" "No"
   2.2 Child's Teacher  28   2

   \[ \frac{28}{28+2} = \frac{30}{28} = .933 \text{ or } 93.3\% \]

10. The monitoring questions can then be ranked by the percentage of compliance. The ranking can be from the highest to the lowest percentage of compliance. Those that are ranked lowest could be the area(s) that the administration of a school district would address as the highest priority to insure compliance with PL 94-142.
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Evaluation of student's educational performance.</td>
<td>Question 1.1: Was parent/guardian consent for the evaluation secured prior to the evaluation?</td>
<td>The signature is required, date should be prior to the evaluation.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.2: Were the assessments conducted by individuals who are qualified by state licensing or certifying agencies?</td>
<td>License or certificate is on file at school or agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.3: Was all existing information regarding the student made available to the IEP committee?</td>
<td>The assessment results and records appear documented on the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.4: Was information considered from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, cultural or social background and adaptive behavior, where appropriate?</td>
<td>More than one single procedure must be used except in cases involving speech therapy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.5: Was a Content of Notice provided to the parent or guardian?</td>
<td>A copy of the notice is on file with due process procedures, descriptions of actions proposed, description of evaluation procedures, tests or reports used, and a description of any other factors used to propose the evaluation procedure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.6: List additional state or local education agency requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE*
## Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

### Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| II. Development of IEP by a committee. | **Question 2.1:** Was a minimum of an administrator and the child's teacher designated to participate on the IEP committee? **NOTE:** Others may be present at the discretion of the school or parents. | 2.1.1: Administrator?  
Responsible to supervise or provide special education services.  
2.1.2: Child's teacher?  
A teacher who has or is working with the student.  
2.1.3: Is this the first IEP?  
If this is, is a psychologist, diagnostician or other specialists on the IEP committee?  
Someone with knowledge of the evaluation procedures used and able to interpret the results of the evaluation procedure must be on the committee. | YES | NO |
|                                         | **Question 2.2:** Was a mutually agreed upon time and place established for the IEP committee?  
Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls or parent visits. | **Question 2.3:** Was the parent/guardian notified as to the purpose of the IEP meeting and who would be in attendance?  
Copy of the notice that was provided to the parent or guardian. | YES | NO |
|                                         | **Question 2.4:** Did the parent/guardian attend the IEP meeting, if not is there evidence that the school attempted to convince them to attend?  
2.4.1 Parent/guardian did attend?  
Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting.  
2.4.2 If parent did not attend, is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend?  
Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records. | | YES | NO |
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for
Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. (continued)</td>
<td>Question 2.5: Do the parents speak English or use other than verbalizations to communicate?</td>
<td>If not, was an interpreter available for the parents who are deaf or whose native language is other than English? Documentation of native language or mode of communication, and interpreter provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Documentation of the IEP components.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.1:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of the student's present levels of educational performance?</td>
<td>The student's present levels of educational performance should include a variety of information from the assessment/evaluation that was completed on the student and other information such as medical, behavior, speech, etc., if appropriate.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.2:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of annual goal(s)?</td>
<td>The annual goal is a projection of achievement for one year; there could be one goal for each service and/or academic area which is specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.3:</strong> Does the IEP contain short term instructional objectives?</td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives are meant to be benchmarks that indicate steps to be reached in achieving the annual goal. There are usually more than one objective for each annual goal.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.4:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of specific special education and related services to be provided?</td>
<td>The types of special education services and related services should be fully specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question 3.5:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement that specifies the extent to which the student will participate in the regular program?</td>
<td>The amount of time (hours, periods, or percentages) should be specified that the student shall participate in the regular program. If a student does not participate in the regular program, is there documentation to support that decision.</td>
<td>YES NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE**
## Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>III. (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.6:</strong> Does the IEP contain projected dates for the initiation of services and the duration of those services?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The actual dates should be contained in the IEP and the duration of services should not be for more than one calendar year.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.7:</strong> Does the IEP contain appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The short term instructional objectives should have an evaluation component contained with them to assist in determining if the student is attaining the objectives and therefore the annual goal. The method for the evaluation of the short term goals should also be specified.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.8:</strong> Does the IEP contain components that are required by the state or local education agency?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>List the requirements:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Compliance Topic Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Implementation of the IEP.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.1: Have or are the special education services as specified in the IEP been or being provided?</td>
<td>4.1.1: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student's name is on teacher's role and show scheduling of the student for that specified time period.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.2: Have or are the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been or being provided?</td>
<td>4.2.1: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4: Service (List)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student's name is on the bus list for transportation, designation by administra-</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>tion to employee to provide service, contract for service issued, student's name on specialist's or teacher's class roll or register, etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all the related services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4.3: Does the student participate in the regular program?</td>
<td>4.3.1: Yes? Specify amount (percentage/hours) or is to participate:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2: If no, is there rationale for non-participation available?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Student's name is on teacher's roles of the regular program.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENTAL - DO NOT DUPLICATE**
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **IV. (continued)**   | Question 4.4: Have the initiation dates and duration of the service(s) been specified? | - 4.4.1: Date (Specify) Duration
- 4.4.2: Date (Specify) Duration
- 4.4.3: Date (Specify) Duration
- 4.4.4: Date (Specify) Duration | YES | NO |

- **Date(s) of initiation should be the same as the date(s) entered on the class roll or the contract. The duration of services should not be more than one year as the IEP is only valid for one calendar year.**

NOTE: Only the number of blanks required need to be completed.

*EXPERIMENTAL – DO NOT DUPLICATE*
# Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **V. Evaluation of the instructional objectives.** | **Question 5.1:** Has the IEP been reviewed or revised, if appropriate?  
  *If no, and it is not more than one calendar year since the IEP was written--STOP--do not complete the remaining questions.* | | |
|                       | **Question 5.2:** Do the short term instructional objectives have objective criteria and schedules for evaluation? | **5.2.1:** Criteria?  
  *Criteria could be stated in behavioral terms, test gain, or other conditions that will demonstrate the achievement of the objectives.* | |
|                       |                                                                         | **5.2.2:** Schedules?  
  *A schedule is contained in the IEP that will state when the IEP is to be reviewed and revised if necessary.* | |
|                       | **Question 5.3:** Did a committee as stated in Topic Area II, Question 2.1 and 2.4 review and revise the IEP? | **5.3.1:** Administrator?  
  **5.3.2:** Child's teacher?  
  **5.3.3:** Parent/guardian (see 2.2 - 2.4)  
  *The minimum committee should review and revise, if appropriate, the IEP.* | |
|                       | **Question 5.4:** Has the IEP been evaluated during the calendar year from the date of development?  
  **5.4.1:** Date developed:  
  **5.4.2:** Date reviewed: | | |

*The IEP is not valid for more than one calendar year after its development.*
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### Mail Responses of the Validation Judges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Date Sent</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hall, R.</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>May 28, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, L.</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>May 17, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schrag</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>May 19, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanning</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>June 7, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersen</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>May 27, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonham</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>May 16, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>May 5, 1980</td>
<td>June 2, 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mailing Responses of Monitors for Stability Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Test (1st Monitoring)</th>
<th>Retest (2nd Monitoring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>May 9, 1980</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>May 9, 1980</td>
<td>June 16, 1980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H

Report to Special Education Director on Results of the Field Test
A total of 54 IEPs was monitored in your administrative unit, representing 20% of all the IEPs on file in your offices. The enclosed checklist contains the results of your monitoring effort. The results are reported in the numbers and the percentages of the responses to each item. No datum was missing on any of the checklists as each checklist was correctly completed.

The ranking by percentage for noncompliance is presented below; all other questions were 100% in compliance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percent in Noncompliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Did the parent/guardian attend the meeting to review the IEP?</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Has the IEP been reviewed or revised, if appropriate?</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain short term instructional objectives?</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Question 5.3.3 was revised to indicate that the parents may not have attended the review meeting, but there is documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents to attend. With this revision the percentage of noncompliance could have been reduced, as the schools may have endeavored to convince the parents to attend, and they chose not to participate.

<sup>b</sup>Question 5.1 was changed to state that the monitor was not to complete the page if the IEP had not been reviewed and revised. The "no" response did not indicate if the item was not in compliance or if the IEP had not been reviewed.
Other information gained from the review of the checklist is:

1. All 54 students are receiving special education services.

2. Of the 54 students who are receiving special education services, 32 are receiving some form of related services and 2 are receiving more than one related services.

3. Of the 54 IEP meetings, 16 parents participated in the meetings; 38 chose not to participate.

4. Of the 54 IEPs, 51 had been reviewed and revised, if appropriate, and 3 had not.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this investigation. Your cooperation was greatly appreciated.

George T.L. Holt
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Evaluation of student’s educational performance.</strong></td>
<td>Question 1.1: Was parent/guardian consent for the evaluation secured prior to the evaluation?</td>
<td>The signature is required, date should be prior to the evaluation.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.2: Was existing information regarding the student made available to the IEP committee?</td>
<td>The assessment results and records appear documented in the IEP.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.3: Was information considered from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, cultural or social background and adaptive behavior, where appropriate?</td>
<td>More than one single procedure must be used except in cases involving speech therapy.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.4: Was a &quot;Content of Notice&quot; provided to the parent or guardian?</td>
<td>A copy of the notice is on file with due process procedures, descriptions of actions proposed, description of evaluation procedures, tests or reports used, and a description of any other factors used to propose the evaluation procedure.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.5: List additional state or local education agency requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Development of IEP by a committee.</td>
<td>Question 2.1: Was a minimum of an administrator and the child's teacher designated to participate on the IEP committee? NOTE: Others may be present at the discretion of the school or parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1: Administrator?</td>
<td>Responsible to provide or supervise the provision of special education services.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2: Child's teacher?</td>
<td>A teacher who has or is working with the student.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3: Is this the first IEP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4: If this is the first IEP, was a psychologist, diagnostician or other specialists on the IEP committee?</td>
<td>Someone with knowledge of the evaluation procedures used and able to interpret the results of the evaluation procedure must be on the committee.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.2: Was a mutually agreed upon time and place established for the IEP committee?</td>
<td>Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls or parent visits.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.3: Was the parent/guardian notified as to the purpose of the IEP meeting and who would be in attendance?</td>
<td>Copy of the notice that was provided to the parent or guardian.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 2.4: Did the parent/guardian attend the IEP meeting, if not is there evidence that the school attempted to convince them to attend?</td>
<td>Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting.</td>
<td>29.6% 70.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.1: Parent/guardian did attend?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.2: If parent did not attend, is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend?</td>
<td>Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records.</td>
<td>38% 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. (continued)</td>
<td>Question 2.5: Do the parents speak English?</td>
<td>If not, was an interpreter available for the parents who are deaf or whose native language is other than English? Documentation of native language or mode of communication, and interpreter provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. Documentation of the IEP components.</td>
<td>Question 3.1: Does the IEP contain a statement of the student's present levels of educational performance?</td>
<td>The student's present levels of educational performance should include a variety of information from the assessment/evaluation that was completed on the student and other information such as medical, behavior, speech, etc., if appropriate.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3.2: Does the IEP contain a statement of annual goal(s)?</td>
<td>The annual goal is a projection of achievement for one year; there could be one goal for each service and/or academic area which is specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3.3: Does the IEP contain short term instructional objectives?</td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives are meant to be benchmarks that indicate steps to be reached in achieving the annual goal. There are usually more than one objective for each annual goal.</td>
<td>96.3% 3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3.4: Does the IEP contain a statement of specific special education and related services to be provided?</td>
<td>The types of special education services and related services should be fully specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 3.5: Does the IEP contain a statement that specifies the extent to which the student will participate in the regular program?</td>
<td>The amount of time (hours, periods, or percentages) should be specified that the student shall participate in the regular program. If a student does not participate in the regular program, is there documentation to support that decision?</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Topic Area</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Documentation is Available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. (continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.6:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain projected dates for the initiation of services and the duration of those services?</td>
<td>100% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The actual dates should be contained in the IEP and the duration of services should not be for more than one calendar year.</td>
<td>54 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.7:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?</td>
<td>94.4% 5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives should have an evaluation component contained with them to assist in determining if the student is attaining the objectives and therefore the annual goal. The method for the evaluation of the short term goals should also be specified.</td>
<td>51 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3.8:</td>
<td>Does the IEP contain components that are required by the state or local education agency?</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>List the requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. Implementation of the IEP.</td>
<td>Question 4.1: Have the special education service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.1: Service (List)</td>
<td>54-100% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2: Service (List)</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3: Service (List)</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4: Service (List)</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student's name is on teacher's roll and show scheduling of the student for that specified time period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4.2: Have the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1: Service (List)</td>
<td>34-63% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2: Service (List)</td>
<td>2-3.7% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3: Service (List)</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4: Service (List)</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student's name is on bus list for transportation, designation by administra-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tion to employee to provide service, contract for service issued, student's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>name on specialist's or teacher's class roll or register, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTE:</td>
<td>Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all the related services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4.3: Does the student participate in the regular program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.1: Yes? Specify amount (percentage/hours)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or is to participate:</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2: If no, is there rationale for non-participation available?</td>
<td>0% 0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Compliance Topic Area

#### Question 4.4: Have the initiation dates and duration of the service(s) been specified?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (Specify)</td>
<td>54-100% 0-0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0-0% 0-0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Question 4.4.1: Date (Specify) Duration

- Date(s) for the initiation of services should be the same as the date(s) entered on the class roll or the contract. The duration of services should not be more than one year as the IEP is only valid for one calendar year.

#### NOTE: Only the number of blanks required need to be completed.
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Evaluation of the instructional objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.1: Has the IEP been reviewed or revised, if appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If no, and it is not more than one calendar year since the IEP was written--STOP--do not complete this page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.2: Do the short term instructional objectives have objective criteria and schedules for evaluation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1: Criteria?</td>
<td>Criteria could be stated in behavioral terms, test gain, or other conditions that will demonstrate the achievement of the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2: Schedules?</td>
<td>A schedule is contained in the IEP that will state when the IEP is to be reviewed and revised if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.3: Did a committee as stated in Topic Area II, Question 2.1 and 2.4 review and revise the IEP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.1: Administrator?</td>
<td>Responsible to supervise or provide special education services.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.2: Child's teacher?</td>
<td>A teacher who has or is working with the student.</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3.3: The parent/guardian did attend, OR is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting, OR copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5.4: Has the IEP been evaluated during the calendar year from the date of development?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1: Date developed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2: Date reviewed:</td>
<td>The IEP is not valid for more than one calendar year after its development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1See report.
2See report.
Appendix I

Final Version of
Holt's Monitoring Checklist for
Individualized Education Programs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Evaluation of student's educational performance.</td>
<td>Question 1.1: Was parent/guardian consent for the evaluation secured prior to the evaluation? The signature is required, date should be prior to the evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.2: Was existing information regarding the student made available to the IEP committee? The assessment results and records appear documented in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.3: Was information considered from a variety of sources including aptitude and achievement tests, teacher recommendations, physical condition, cultural or social background and adaptive behavior, where appropriate? More than one single procedure must be used except in cases involving speech therapy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.4: Was a &quot;Content of Notice&quot; provided to the parent or guardian? A copy of the notice is on file with due process procedures, descriptions of actions proposed, description of evaluation procedures, tests or reports used, and a description of any other factors used to propose the evaluation procedure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 1.5: List additional state or local education agency requirements:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Development of IEP by a committee.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.1:</td>
<td>Was a minimum of an administrator and the child's teacher designated to participate on the IEP committee? NOTE: Others may be present at the discretion of the school or parents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1: Administrator?</td>
<td>Responsible to provide or supervise the provision of special education services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2: Child's teacher?</td>
<td>A teacher who has or is working with the student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3: Is this the first IEP?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4:</td>
<td>If this is the first IEP, was a psychologist, diagnostician or other specialists on the IEP committee? Someone with knowledge of the evaluation procedures used and able to interpret the results of the evaluation procedure must be on the committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.2:</td>
<td>Was a mutually agreed upon time and place established for the IEP committee? Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls or parent visits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.3:</td>
<td>Was the parent/guardian notified as to the purpose of the IEP meeting and who would be in attendance? Copy of the notice that was provided to the parent or guardian.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2.4:</td>
<td>Did the parent/guardian attend the IEP meeting, if not is there evidence that the school attempted to convince them to attend? Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1: Parent/guardian did attend?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2:</td>
<td>If parent did not attend, is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend? Copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. (continued)</td>
<td>Question 2.5: Do the parents speak English?</td>
<td>If not, was an interpreter available for the parents who are deaf or whose native language is other than English?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation of native language or mode of communication, and interpreter provided.</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>III.</strong> Documentation of the IEP components.</td>
<td><strong>Question 3.1:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of the student's present levels of educational performance?</td>
<td>The student's present levels of educational performance should include a variety of information from the assessment/evaluation that was completed on the student and other information such as medical, behavior, speech, etc., if appropriate.</td>
<td>✔️  ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.2:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of annual goal(s)?</td>
<td>The annual goal is a projection of achievement for one year; there could be one goal for each service and/or academic area which is specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>✔️  ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.3:</strong> Does the IEP contain short term instructional objectives?</td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives are meant to be benchmarks that indicate steps to be reached in achieving the annual goal. There are usually more than one objective for each annual goal.</td>
<td>✔️  ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.4:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement of specific special education and related services to be provided?</td>
<td>The types of special education services and related services should be fully specified in the IEP.</td>
<td>✔️  ❌</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.5:</strong> Does the IEP contain a statement that specifies the extent to which the student will participate in the regular program?</td>
<td>The amount of time (hours, periods, or percentages) should be specified that the student shall participate in the regular program. If a student does not participate in the regular program, is there documentation to support that decision?</td>
<td>✔️  ❌</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III. (continued)</td>
<td><strong>Question 3.6:</strong> Does the IEP contain projected dates for the initiation of services and the duration of those services?</td>
<td>The actual dates should be contained in the IEP and the duration of services should not be for more than one calendar year.</td>
<td>YES  NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.7:</strong> Does the IEP contain appropriate objective criteria and schedules for determining, on at least an annual basis, whether the short term instructional objectives are being achieved?</td>
<td>The short term instructional objectives should have an evaluation component contained with them to assist in determining if the student is attaining the objectives and therefore the annual goal. The method for the evaluation of the short term goals should also be specified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Question 3.8:</strong> Does the IEP contain components that are required by the state or local education agency?</td>
<td>List the requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

**Note:** Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Implementation of the IEP.</strong></td>
<td>Question 4.1: Have the special education service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.1: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.2: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.3: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.4: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student's name is on teacher's roll and show scheduling of the student for that specified time period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4.2: Have the related service(s) as specified in the IEP been provided or are now being provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.1: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.4: Service (List)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student's name is on the bus list for transportation, designation by administration to employee to provide service, contract for service issued, student's name on specialist's or teacher's class roll or register, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NOTE:</strong> Not all blanks need to be completed, only the number required to list all the related services specified in the IEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 4.3: Does the student participate in the regular program?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.1: Yes? Specify amount (percentage/hours) or is to participate:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2: If no, is there rationale for non-participation available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Compliance Topic Area

**Question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV. (continued)

**Question 4.4:** Have the initiation dates and duration of the service(s) been specified?

| Date(s) for the initiation of services should be the same as the date(s) entered on the class roll or the contract. The duration of services should not be more than one year as the IEP is only valid for one calendar year. |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|

**NOTE:** Only the number of blanks required need to be completed.
## Holt's Monitoring Checklist for Individualized Education Programs

Note: Please read instructions before using this checklist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Topic Area</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Suggested Criteria</th>
<th>Documentation is Available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Evaluation of the instructional objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5.1: Has the IEP been reviewed or revised, if appropriate?</td>
<td>If no, and it is not more than one calendar year since the IEP was written--STOP--do not complete this page.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5.2: Do the short term instructional objectives have objective criteria and schedules for evaluation?</td>
<td>5.2.1: Criteria? Criteria could be stated in behavioral terms, test gain, or other conditions that will demonstrate the achievement of the objectives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2.2: Schedules? A schedule is contained in the IEP that will state when the IEP is to be reviewed and revised if necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5.3: Did a committee as stated in Topic Area II, Question 2.1 and 2.4 review and revise the IEP?</td>
<td>5.3.1: Administrator? Responsible to supervise or provide special education services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2: Child's teacher? A teacher who has or is working with the student.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.3: The parent/guardian did attend, OR is there documentation that the school attempted to convince the parents/guardians to attend? Signature(s) on IEP and notes of meeting, OR copies of correspondence, records of phone calls and home visit records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question 5.4: Has the IEP been evaluated during the calendar year from the date of development?</td>
<td>5.4.1: Date developed:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.2: Date reviewed: The IEP is not valid for more than one calendar year after its development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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