



Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
<p>1 Invitation to Conference Request to Excuse an IEP Team Member</p>	<p>Provide power point prior to be used for note taking slow pace How could LEA rep be excused and the reason in second table does not apply to LEA rep Clarification in training on lack of instruction Abuse of excusal form may be a problem On areas of suspected need will screening evaluations be drop down or check lists? Needs to be one or the other to stream line. Put more on a page if can because getting charged for paper at schools and charged for printing. In the other participant’s section, need to also include role (not just name). Need clarification on where to find/access the Consent to Invite Agency Representation form. Is the Consent to Invite Agency Representation Form created at the district level or state level? more time to review forms beforehand, excusal of LEA?, align with policy. Google doc or parking lot to ask questions, wordy and difficult for parents, title box next to name on agency and other form When should the request to excuse be signed? Available forms that are clean and copy for f ppt. Have access to google doc to record question by participants during session. More emphasis on purpose and policy, give the reminders throughout completion of the form, include the compliance components Should have a separate form and interpreter eval results why check it if they review it anyway Office use only should say "parent" Need to clarify what is "systematic observation" and what goes in the results/what if there is a parent referral and no observations were done? What is "documentation of adequate instruction" Presenter seemed confused and didn't clarify roles and who can complete the form. Please don't have the presenter to read the presentation. We can read and refer back. Clarify what role the Student Services Team play in the referral? How does the 90-day timeline start determined? More clarification needed on the evaluation plan.</p>	<p>Form Revisions/Responses <i>Invitation to Conference</i> - “Dear”, “Student Name”, “School Name” were added; business rules will pre-populate these items based on demographic information - Purpose of this meeting “check all that apply” has been changed to “check all that may apply” - IEP Team members- “Interpreter of Evaluation Results” has been changed to “Interpreter of Instructional Implications of Evaluation Results” to align with policy - DELETED “For Office Use Only” - ADDED School contact information - Invitation is now only one page. <i>Request to Excuse an IEP Team Member</i> - ADDED “Student” and “School” demographic information - ADDED “Interpreter of Instructional Implications of Evaluation Results”</p>



	<p>Content was clarifying raised a few questions that are stated in the general section more details about parent invitations with DSS is involved and/or surrogate parents and who to invite as the parent, need make it clear which forms are in CECAS are the ones in the new, need drop down box for evaluation plan on what assessments</p> <p>The student's name should be on the invitation. On the form, the wording on the alternative method of participation only lists the "phone". This you include the option of "video conference?" Module1 stated student participation should be 100% what if they don't want to come</p> <p>include transition needs in the reasons for the meeting LOTS of auditory info. Doesn't work for the visual learner. Would like more visuals!</p>	
--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
2	<p>Special Education Referral: Pre-School Special Education Referral</p>	<p>If parent revokes consent, do we redo the form. Where do we document? 90-day timeline ends also when parent revokes consent--that bullet is not there; invitation to agency representative only relevant for high school--doesn't work for preschool; add "transition" under purposes for invitation; "what's needed" section on evaluation plan should be categorical rather than specific--and there's only 3 lines there--does it expand? Summary on DEC 1 referral is repetitive Page 5 evaluation plan needs explanation of what it means. Does it mean that the IEP team listing the suspected area of disabilities</p> <p>Since consent for testing is not a separate form what is the process for getting consent for additional assessments after the referral process has begun? Do you have to addend the Referral and/or do a Prior Written Notice?</p>	<p>Form Revisions/Responses <i>Special Education Referral: Pre-School</i> - DELETE “Summary of Parts I-III”; duplicative - CORRECTION – name of Procedural Safeguards - The “Area(s) of Suspected Need” on the Evaluation Plan have been changed to “Area(s) of Suspected Disability”. The required screenings/evaluation will pre-populate based on the selection and include a description of the screening/evaluation. - In the Section V: IEP Team Participants, “Signatures” has been removed and replaced with “Name”.</p> <p><i>Special Education Referral</i> - Section II: “Must address all areas” was changed to “Must address all areas if data is available”</p>



	<p>Section 5 - prefer additional column rather than asterisk. Asterisk may be overlooked. With the DEC2 combined with the DEC1, if the parents are not present for the meeting, what happens to the process? Does the meeting end at that point/90-day timeline ends if parent is not present to give consent?</p> <p>more time for this module, define observational data, clarification of observational data, multiple places for observational data, if parent permission is needed for observations, it should be stated. Confusing evaluation plan and not explained. Take off evaluation plan. Chart of area of concerns as a possible guidance document (old form)</p> <p>If parents don't give consent shouldn't there be a place to indicate why?</p> <p>*Teams need to make sure to have the discussion around if the vision and hearing documentation is still relevant. *Systematic observation data - more clarification of this vs going into the classroom for the purpose of an observation. The word systematic, sounds like it's a purposeful observation. -What do Results mean here. *Section III - LEP: Need to have a partnership with ESL. Can there be some more explicit info here (I.e. Have a screening component in order to lead to in depth discussion). *Vision: if they fail can there be guidance of how to document that the failed vision does not effect the scores performance on the evaluation results. *Explicitly state that sections I-III is your summary discussion and problem solve of how you are going to proceed. *IV: If we choose to conduct an evaluation, then the evaluation plan needs to come right under that.</p> <p>Include what the monitors are looking for in compliance, strengths must be identified in each area--consider this wording</p>	<p>- "Systematic Observational Data Collected" has been amended to "Observational Data Collected." -Section III: Reason(s) for Referral/Areas of Suspected Need</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Documentation of the scientific research-based interventions implemented to address the targeted academic, behavioral, and/or functional areas of need" has been moved to Section II: Review of Existing Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ These data are most often existing data and should not create a barrier to a timely evaluation if there is a suspected disability. Intervention data is not required to determine if there is a suspected disability. It is required for eligibility purposes. • DELETE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ "Dates of implementation and numerical results" ○ "Does the student demonstrate limited English proficiency?" ○ "Documentation of adequate instruction in reading and math" <p>General Responses</p> <p>- If a parent revokes consent, this action is documented on the Prior Written Notice. Section V does not have to be completed again. -Invitation of Outside Agencies has been amended to include both the transition needs of students in pre-school or for post-secondary planning.</p>
--	---	---



		<p>The section on vision and hearing screening was a bit confusing. What many heard was that the IEP team had to get consent for hearing and vision then come back at a later date to complete the referral once the vision and hearing screening was complete. Getting consent for vision and hearing was mentioned in the script and as key points to remember. Needs to be clarified that the referral can be completed without the vision and hearing screening, but they will need to be done as part of the evaluation plan</p> <p>Part IV you actually are deciding eligibility and need more clarity and please define what it being asked in describing results of local screening data</p> <p>Documentation of adequate instruction in reading and math needs clarification Clarify whole sped process ends not just referral</p> <p>on the form where you identify the "area of need", can that be a drop-down menu like we have in CECAS?</p> <p>Page 4 - Documentation of adequate instruction - Is this section due to MTSS? How is this determined? Page 3 - more specifics needed on what information is needed for systematic observations data. More clarification on what documentation of adequate instruction in reading and math should be - page 4.</p> <p>On the preschool referral form, the English Language proficiency testing does not start till Kindergarten. The home language survey is not done</p> <p>Please consider this for training: when a child fails a speech screening and that triggers the referral process, what should we include as "interventions" that were conducted prior to referral if the child was never in a program to begin with?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no requirement that parents provide a reason for withholding consent for an initial evaluation. If a reason is provided, it may be documented on the Prior Written Notice. - The referral documents the data available at the time of the referral. If hearing or vision screening is not available, then consent is obtained to conduct those screenings on the Evaluation Plan. - There is a plan to upload evaluation data into the system to assist with students who transfer in the middle of special education processes. - A discussion of “formal” and “informal” evaluations will be incorporated into the revision of this module.
--	--	--	---



		<p>Relative to a child who transfers during the referral, or eligibility determination process, would it be possible for any evaluations that were completed be scanned and uploaded into the system so that the receiving school could have all of the relevant information to move forward?</p> <p>What if parent doesn't attend the referral meeting, do you send original referral documents home for parent to sign consent for evaluation?</p> <p>seemed pushed, evaluation plan guidance for what to put for areas of concern, missing checklist for areas of need, would like more guidance...subheadings of what to consider, could team participants and parents' consent be reversed?</p> <p>Why are only formal evaluations allowed now? This seems an artificial and unhelpful construct to apply here. Sometimes informal evaluations are more relevant and some populations/ages do not have formal evaluations normed or validated. Eliminate formal evaluations or if you must keep it, at least clearly define what you are talking about!</p>	
--	--	--	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
3	<p>Eligibility Report ER Worksheet - Autism ER Worksheet – Deaf-Blindness ER Worksheet – Deafness ER Worksheet – Developmental Delay ER Worksheet – Hearing Impairment ER Worksheet – Intellectual Disability</p>	<p>SED worksheet not included in the workbook</p> <p>Indicate what documentation should be indicated beside procedural and safe guard provided to parent (i.e. Date, given a copy, already have a copy, etc.) Addition explanation of Pvt. School Placement option.</p>	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u> <i>Eligibility Report</i> - ADDED – “The disability has an adverse effect on educational performance. Yes/no” - Section IV: Eligibility Determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REVISED “The IEP Team should complete Section V and return the student to general education” has been changed to “The IEP Team should complete Section V and end the process.”



<p>ER Worksheet – Multiple Disabilities ER Worksheet – Orthopedic Impairment ER Worksheet – Other Health Impairment ER Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability ER Worksheet – Speech or Language Impairment ER Worksheet – Traumatic Brain Injury ER Worksheet – Visual Impairment ER Worksheet – Emotional Disability</p>	<p>The section on IEP Team reviewed all eval requirements and screening info (evaluation report language) confusing. Is evaluation report (term used on the first page) referring to the ELIGIBILITY REPORT (term used) as listed in the title? If the parent is not present for the meeting, how does the IEP Team proceed if the section on Parental Consent cannot be documented? Need to have the definition of Specially Designed Instruction listed in form.</p> <p>the addition of adult learning strategies, especially with worksheets, include monitoring data from the field, highlight connection with policy, how to address areas of need that arise but were not addressed with interventions. The directives in the forms could be seen as impersonal from a parent perspective.</p> <p>Does parent consent fall within 90-day timeline? Or wants to wait? Clarify use of reports from students coming in from out of state? Will parental consent come up for reevaluation? How can parent sign they received prior written notice?</p> <p>Procedural safeguards consider the second statement may needs to be at the end of the meeting or take out prior written notice statement since FAPE has not been fully discussed</p> <p>The slides are not consistent with best practices for presentations and adult learning (ex: slides too wordy, not consistently formatted, lack of graphics, etc.); address evaluations conducted out of state. The wording makes it seem like it has to be a NC evaluation; how can prior written notice be signed (on eligibility report) when it hasn't been completed; secondary category--can we have a box to indicate "none" or "n/a"? shouldn't be a limit on characters that can be entered on the form (concern about limited space in text boxes).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REVISED “IEP Team Member Signatures” has been changed to “Name”. <p>- Section V: Procedural Safeguards – updated title of parent handbook</p> <p>- AMENDED - Section VI: 3rd box under “I do not agree” to read “If, at any time after this decision, I suspect my child has a disability and is in need of special education and related services, a written request for formal evaluation must be made to the principal of my child’s school, <i>the child’s teacher or other school professional, or the Superintendent or other appointed official of the LEA.</i>”</p> <p><i>ER Worksheet – Deaf-Blindness</i></p> <p>- Audiological/Otological has been added to evaluation/screening section</p> <p><i>ER Worksheet – Intellectual Disability</i></p> <p>- ADDED “If no prior eligibility determination of ID” to (2) scientific research-based interventions to address deficiencies in academic and functional skills</p> <p>- DELETE “Parent Conference” (appears in evaluation/screening list twice)</p> <p><i>ER Worksheet – Other Health Impairment</i></p> <p>- DELETE “Review of Existing Data”; this information is captured in the reevaluation or Special Education Referral</p> <p><i>ER Worksheet – Traumatic Brain Injury</i></p> <p>- TYPO “medication” should be “medical” in the *Note</p>
--	--	---



	<p>If reeval is checked do they have to provide parental consent again? parents can decline or accept--if they change their minds do we have to start all over again is there a way to reopen from where we left off the first time</p> <p>Audiological report should be required for deaf blindness eligibility; throughout eligibility forms hearing should have left/right ear</p> <p>Consent to provide EC services needs to be a separate form. It is cumbersome to transfer students. Section 2 on form stated as a negative is confusing - "The IEP Team has also determined the student's current educational performance is not primarily caused by". Could this be added to the DEC 5? When exiting from ot speech where do you determine student is not eligible what are you using.</p> <p>Is power school going to be able to talk to ECATS? Some new vision screenings take pictures and do not give a 20/20 form. How to we put this on the forms?</p> <p>Include OSEP guidance in adverse effect.</p> <p>"Prior written notice" needs to be clarified to explain the meeting invitation, etc. it can be readily confused with Module 6 Prior Written Notice which is completed and signed after the eligibility form.</p> <p>Move audiological info onto same slide with otological slide; more information about observations across settings with guidelines</p> <p>Title of "Evaluation/Screening" in the grid- consider changing to "Required Components" because some of the items are not evaluations nor screening</p>	<p>General Responses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Timeline for initial referral – evaluations must be conducted, eligibility determined, and for an eligible child, the IEP development and placement completed with 90 days of receipt of a written referral. [NC 1503-2.2(c)] - The directions on the Eligibility Report under Section IV directs the IEP Team to develop and propose an IEP prior to completing Section VI (parent consent for the provision of special education and related services). - The Special Education Referral has a text box for comments if vision screenings take pictures rather than provide a numerical (20/20) result.
--	---	---



		<p>The order in which the "evaluation/screening" components are listed does not make sense. Rx. listing the evaluations/screening unique to each disability category first (e.g., hearing impaired = audiological) and then list the other required components next with parent interviews and observations last.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
4a	<p>IEP – PLAAFP Communication Plan Worksheet</p>	<p>Can you get the PLAFP to self-populate using information from evaluation worksheet? That would eliminate having to re-type or cut and paste from worksheet to IEP</p> <p>Need to work on samples for areas assessed--spell out acronyms, information isn't specific or measurable in some cases, etc.</p> <p>But needed more examples of how to write the data in the boxes Don't limit number of characters per cell/box</p> <p>Would like to see examples of a typical IEP that is not in the initial or reeval year. How do you fill out the data boxes with curriculum based measures, formative assessments, etc...</p> <p>In examples, be sure to include more information on strengths--seemed to be mostly about challenges and deficits.</p> <p>Please address if all data boxes need a comment (even if you don't have relevant information)</p> <p>Top of page 2: present level directions are repetitive "descriptive information"</p> <p>When you check "yes" for hearing loss, can the communication plan worksheet automatically pop up so people know they need to fill it out? Otherwise, people may not know to fill out form. Or, can there be a prompt on where to go to access and fill out the communication plan worksheet?</p> <p>Consideration of special factors: does this need to be different for limited language proficiency? You would need to describe rather than saying where things are on IEP related to this.</p> <p>Give an example of what you put in the data section when "no SDI is needed"</p>	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DELETED: "Does the student require a FBA? and "Does the student require an Assistive Technology Evaluation?" - The amount of directions pre-printed on all forms is being reconsidered in light of the capability of the new vendor to provide prompts and compliance alerts. The new forms were first finalized in 2015 prior to the passing of the UERS (Uniform Education Reporting System) requirement passed by the legislature. Therefore, directions were printed on the forms in the event third-party vendors were still permissible. - REVISED: Within the section of SUPPORTS FOR ACADEMIC, FUNCTIONAL, PERSONAL CHANGES OR CIRCUMSTANCES (IF APPLICABLE), there is concern about the statement, "What information is known about the student that will assist in developing a comprehensive plan of support?" The statement now reads "What information is known about the student that will assist in developing an <i>individualized education program</i>?" <p><u>General Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples of a completed IEP will be provided at a later date. - We are working with the new vendor to determine how user decision can pre-populate required forms, etc.



		<p>There is a question under consideration of special considerations: "Does the student require a FBA?" That doesn't need to be there. Need some clarity on connectivity--what pops up or will be automatically included when you indicate there is an FBA?</p> <p>Put a drop down on where this is addressed on IEP or other places Drop down menu for question about Braille that would include reasonable justification for not using Braille</p> <p>Where in the IEP would you address LEP? This is new. Previously it was noted, but did not require additional notation regarding how addressed in the IEP.</p> <p>Consideration of Special Factors--Is there a reason why you have to list all those bullets? -- because that is addressed on the communication plan worksheet. Need to pre-populate that section from the worksheet or take it off.</p> <p>Parent input seems to come up as you share present level information, can there be a space there for parent input? It is awkward to click back and forth to get to the section for parent input. By the way, change language from "parent concerns" to "parent input"</p> <p>The wording if several items on special factors is confusing. Used to ask about behaviors, but not FBA. Is it asking whether they have one or need a new one? Also for assistive technology, it is now asking if the student needs an assistive technology evaluation...? Change wording from parent concerns to parent input need more guidance on how to collect information from parents throughout process</p> <p>Case study should provide further info regarding student's literacy strengths/gaps and math. Ex) Dibels/McClass data</p> <p>Once we put a NFL on the Dec 3 will it populate on the PLAAFP.?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are two places that prompt concerns from parents. The first is at the beginning of the IEP and the second is after the present levels of academic and functional performance/consideration of special factors are shared. This provides an opportunity for the IEP Team to consider any new concerns the parent may have as a result of hearing the PLAAFP. -Additionally the IEP Team is required to consider all of the unique needs associated with the student's disability – this may include a need to discuss the student's medical information. - Identifying the location of where the special factors are addressed in the IEP ensure that the IEP <i>did</i> address the special factors rather than simply acknowledging them without action. - The comments regarding the case study will be used in the revision to the IEP Process training for this module.
--	--	---	--



		<p>Going to be some very explicit training that's attached to follow the mindset that is behind how the paperwork is being created. We have a lot of lateral entry teachers or other inexperienced teachers. Give some examples of when you would choose no for SDI.</p> <p>The form of collecting feedback is chaotic, feels like finished product with courtesy chat, don't want more than what is in policy,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How do we know what areas to assess that are not requiring SDI? 2. Do we have to put Assessment data in PLAAFP if it doesn't need SDI? 3. Why would a consideration of an assessment or evaluation be within the IEP? Can easily lead to errors. 4. Consideration of special factors, assistive technology- checking yes begins the re-evaluation. This is problematic. The wording and presentation is confusing. <p>Make sure the training matches compliance and what the monitors are looking for, area of concern is the column for areas assessed. What does that mean if not in a re-eval, is it for gen ed assessments, redundant if an initial or re-eval, is this section intended to establish progress monitoring plans? The last column, is SDI needed? Does everything have to be checked yes, it is implied if it is a need? Where is the plan for a "no" documented. Will the clarifying information be presented when answered "Yes" especially for the Braille question? Will reminder populate?</p> <p>Where did "describe relevant medical information" come from? Do we want to have the medication noted in IEP.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>remove acronyms from examples...it is unclear.</p> <p>clarification of special factors asking where located on the IEP.</p> <p>where on the IEP are we supposed to address LEP as it is being addressed in the EL plan.</p> <p>Can PLAAFPs be in bucket format like the examples shown?</p> <p>define what area the SDI is needed?</p> <p>Confused about the inclusion of assistive tech eval and FBA in the IEP. It appears those two questions should be a part of the reeval plan and not included in the IEP.</p> <p>Form needs to either be all Portrait format or Landscape format to maintain consistency in the student's folder. Question about relevance of SDI (yes/no) column. If No is selected, why would it need to be documented as an area of concern? Additional Parents Concerns section - suggestion to just have after Consideration of Special Factors, rather than in both sections (beginning of DEC4 and after Consideration of Special Factors). Suggestion for Consideration of Special Factors section as drop down menu format. Need to reword questions under Consideration of Special Factors so it doesn't seem like there will be need for reeval (require vs. Have. For example - "Does the student require an assistive technology evaluation?). Concern about overall length of CPW. It seems as if the CPW has doubled in size.</p> <p>Add a line under special factors that states "Does the student have a significant visual impairment?"</p> <p>What is the difference between the information asked for on the DEC 3 and the area(s) to be assessed for the DEC 4 on the PLAAFP?</p> <p>I would suggest that all the evaluation data provided on the case study be dated keeping in mind current & relevant info.</p> <p>Considerations of Special Factors: For question about braille instruction, there should be a box asking if the student is VI, then another box if braille is needed.</p>	
--	--	--



		<p>The format was confusing.</p> <p>take the directions off of the form, this adds to length of the number of pages that need to be run off. Directions can be put in a separate book. After sitting through several IEP meetings, neither the parent or the team need this information.</p> <p>Does the student require an assistive technology evaluations and the questions that follow this question...? can the wording be change to does the student currently have instead of require? Requires implies that a reevaluation is triggered.</p> <p>Why do we have to put where the special factors are located in the IEP? This is repetitive.</p> <p>Within the section of SUPPORTS FOR ACADEMIC, FUNCTIONAL, PERSONAL CHANGES OR CIRCUMSTANCES (IF APPLICABLE), there is concern about the statement, "What information is known about the student that will assist in developing a comprehensive plan of support?" What is a "comprehensive plan of support?" This implies that the school will be responsible for developing and implementing a plan based on information shared. Will you be able to bullet in the PLAAFP box</p> <p>Andy scenario is too much information. Need to shorten or give graphs.</p> <p>Page 3- "Considerations for Special Factors" what happens if an FBA is already in place? Yes/No</p> <p>Send case study as homework with guiding questions. Example of an annual review and varied grade level. Area assessed should d area of need. Question about if SDI is needed or not is required and will lead to confusion. Since the form is so different there needs to be a crosswalk from the old form to new one showing where information is documented in new form. This needs to be a half day training. Pace is too fast.</p> <p>I think it was a mistake putting 'Fine Motor' as area assessed in the example where ABAS-III data was discussed on the slide. I think it should be adaptive as the area.</p>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>PLAFFP in this example, says scores should be self-explanatory, scores are not explained in parent-friendly terms. The Reading Comp box is explained from Sources of Relevant info box.</p>	
--	--	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
4b	<p>Secondary Transition Consent to Invite an Outside Agency Summary of Performance</p>	<p>Special factors extended content standards... need a statement informing parents that if yes then their child is on a pathway leading certificate of attendance not a diploma. Big issue if not communicated in elementary and middle school</p> <p>I am concerned about does the student require AT eval, APE, FBA-all of which requires a reevaluation</p> <p>If child is 14, can the secondary transition page automatically pop up or populate? ; For course of study box, can we have a pop up or box for number of work hours with a N/A option for 8th graders who don't have work hours?--or you could put 0.</p> <p>Slides are too wordy to be used for training/presentation-- suggest reformatting slides to be consistent with best practices for using slides for training/presentation.</p> <p>Transfer of rights--can the system generate the letter explaining transfer of rights when this is applicable?</p> <p>Can we move the invitation/request to include other agencies from section 4 to section 1 since you must obtain this permission prior to sending the invitation</p> <p>You have to invite outside agencies to transition from Part C to Part B so all of this information related to post-secondary goals is not relevant. Need more clarification on using this form when transitioning from or to any other agency.</p>	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DELETED: “Does the student require a FBA? and “Does the student require an Assistive Technology Evaluation?” - There are options/pages that will pre-populate based on the child’s age during the timespan of the IEP being proposed. - The system does not currently have a plan in place to generate a letter explaining the transfer of rights. This activity can be discussed and documented in the prior written notice. -REVISED: The “Consent to Invite an Outside Agency” has been revised in order to be able to be used with transition for either Part C to Part B or post-secondary. -DELETED: The “Summary of Performance Checklist” has been deleted from the form – it was duplicative and was intended to ensure the required components were included. -TECHNICAL CORRECTION – Post School and Post-Secondary will be reconsidered and clarified through-out the Summary of Performance at the next opportunity for technical corrections. -ADDED: Two distinctive questions/statements were added regarding the transfer of rights. One question/statement addresses notification prior to the age of 18 and the other documents that the rights have been transferred at the age of 18.



	<p>Summary of performance could have more guidance around recommendations for compensatory strategies and resources. Transition assessments and data should prepopulate. Recommendations section assumes the recommendations would be the in school as well as leaving school but advocates might have different recommendations for post school and these should be separated out more clearly.</p> <p>Under Assistive Technology what is the difference between Postsecondary Setting and Post School. Can this wording be clarified? Under recommendations add Community Agencies or is that captured under Assistive Services. Can you be clearer about what these areas cover.</p> <p>The flow is unclear. Where does the transition plan fall in the process?</p> <p>Is the Summary of Performance section required or does it serve as a guide? Prefer to document transition assessment info with the transition plan. If transition assessment info is to be documented in PLAAFP section, is it to be integrated with SDI? Concern about documentation of Assistive Technology section documented in two different places. Would be helpful if the postsecondary goals prepopulate in the SOP section.</p> <p>Will assessment data and post secondary goals repopulate?</p> <p>It would be good to have guiding questions document for transition.</p> <p>NOt sure teachers understand the depth of requirements of transfe of rights. I'm also not sure just the one question addresses it. MAYbe a comment/text box to include the date/method parents and students were informed.</p> <p>IF our district has been writing post secondary goals since the students transitions to 9th grade, will that have to stop and wait until the student turns 16?</p>	<p><u>General Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The question in Special Factors for whether or not the student is following the extended content standards is a prompt to discuss what that decision means. A statement regarding the certificate of attendance may be included on the prior written notice rather than generated in the IEP. - The request to include the “Consent to Invite an Outside Agency” with the invitation module will be considered as the training modules are reviewed and revised. - The Summary of Performance is a required component and is provided to the student as a resource to assist in transitioning to employment or further education/training after high school. -The comments regarding training clarification of requirements will be used in the revision to the IEP Process training for this module.
--	--	---



	<p>Is there a "transfer of rights" form to use at age 18 (statewide) or just use LEA-created form. Have not felt safe in the past without using the form.</p> <p>May need more clarification around the age of majority process and how best to document in IEP and Prior Written Notice.</p> <p>Under the transition plan, under the statement regarding whether the student has been informed of his rights, add a second box that is completed at 18 to document how the team has provided the information.</p> <p>age 17 question is not clear- it needs more explanation for not not teachers, it parents need more info to refer back to.</p> <p>Make it clear if the area assessed for post secondary is only post secondary and only one line or is it a separate line for education, employment, living-- so this means 3 lines total for post secondary areas assessed? How should you connect post secondary areas assessed to the effect of disability section? Is the transition activities going to be a drop down or narrative? Do the goals have to have the components-in example given there was no condition statement? Will method of measuring progress & service provider responsible be drop downs? The consent for outside agencies--does it get signed every year or before every meeting? Need a direct answer as one wasn't given-just discussed what OSEP said.</p>	
--	---	--



		<p>Remove dream sheet and add survey, transition assessments. Districts have been encouraged not to use dream sheet anymore. Need form to prepopulate if student is turning 14 as a reminder to complete transition. Assistive technology is unclear and misleading. Clarity on outside agency purpose beyond transition on the invitation.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
4c	Measurable Annual Goals	<p>Examples of transitions other than post secondary Criteria for mastery is not consistent in the module. Question re: benchmarks or objectives? Are we going to require benchmarks along with annual goals? Will there be drop down boxes?</p>	<p><u>General Responses</u> - For students who take alternative assessments aligned to alternative achievement standards, a description of benchmarks or objectives should be included on the IEP. - If Areas Assessed are identified “yes” for SDI, the requirement to develop a measurable goal will populate. - Reporting assessment data, regardless of whether SDI is required, is important when sharing the results of an evaluation or</p>



	<p>Would be nice to have a different format to document to write measurable goal. Make sure areas of assessment prefills from area of need. Will the area of need prefill from the area identified as needing SDI on the present level? Characteristics of Measurability slide - "stands on it's own without additional info." - remove the apostrophe. Measurable Annual Goals - will this section prefill from PLAAFP? Benchmark/objectives needs to be a required box for compliance. If part of annual goal there will be no way for compliance check. Annual goals - is there a way to denote "functional, academic or both? Is that necessary. Question on pg 3 - Is the student following the Extend I Content Standards - will this trigger a reminder to include benchmarks or STO in annual goal section? Policy does not require the IEP goal to list a correlation with relationship to transition goals, this overreaches if LEAs need to do a better job at transition, state guidance in transition document to guide IEP teams to review IEP to assure goals. Policy does not require IEP teams to ask in goal section if AT is required or not for every goal. This prioritizes AT over any other accommodation or modification need. If policy doesn't prioritize why does DPI?</p> <p>CWPM used on slides but not written out. Everyone does not know this.</p> <p>Examples of observable behavior: I would remove or change the one about "appropriate language". Add more good examples.</p> <p>If SDI is not required, why report data (this could be huge)</p> <p>We need examples, please</p> <p>If there has not been a recent evaluation (fine motor), should every area be addressed? The PLAAFP looks like the DEC 3- is it necessary to be so specific (example-fine motor slide).</p> <p>Can we cut and paste? Could be really redundant at a real/IEP Meeting?</p> <p>Method of measuring progress-what? Need more guidance on last five parts of goals</p>	<p>reevaluation. It provides a comprehensive view of the student's abilities and areas in need of SDI.</p> <p>-The recommendations offered for improving training and clarifying language will be considered during the revision to this module.</p>
--	--	--



		<p>Annual goals Too fast, no time to process or ask questions. Need more time to clarify and ask questions since this is a major change in how we write goals.</p> <p>Information about benchmarks/objectives was confusing/needs clarifying since there doesn't seem to be a place for them to go on the measurable annual goals page. Will we address reporting out of goal progress & see how that form should look? Would be good. Form should make you give data or feedback & not just a click box.</p> <p>On the IEP, "method" of measuring progress needs examples for level of detail expected please.</p> <p>The word appropriate has been used in goal examples. Training has usually addressed not using this type of word, seems too ambiguous.</p> <p>Some areas of need taken from the SFA (strengths) are gross motor not fine motor--maybe the area is actually campus access or motor skills?</p>	
--	--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
4d	Least Restrictive Environment ESY Eligibility	<p>The benchmark slide too busy, needs to be broken into several slides. Some of the slides have information that goes off the slide. All slides in all modules should look the same, same design to look professional</p> <p>understanding of the preschool settings- the training content should explain that the continuum is: 1) regular early childhood setting (10 hours a week or more or 10 hours a week or less) with the majority of services provided in that setting, and 2) Separate class, school or residential program. The remaining settings just not where the services are provided.</p>	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DELETED- "LRE Justification" beside each specially designed instruction and related service. - ADDED- One cumulative "LRE Justification" after the "Alternate Assessment Justification". - REVISION- Will work with vendor to establish a business rule to generate the ESY Worksheet and remove the direction to go to the EC website for the form.



		<p>Need a place to show more than one continuum in the life of the IEP- in HS it can change every semester. It may also change from grade level to grade level transition based on need.</p> <p>Slide on the preschool continuum is incorrect. Needs to be fixed. Will utilizing the drop down box for providers as a position limit us to run a provider report?</p> <p>Need more time Allow enough time for module</p> <p>Could we please have ECATS program automatically change 6 year olds from RECP to school-age continuum? The IEP team can choose what continuum would be when 6.</p> <p>someone else navigating the slides is resulting in much forward and backward and not time to review the slide and handout.</p> <p>Need more clarification in what services would constitute a short duration without having a meeting to change.</p> <p>Provide guidance on how to add frequency to high school block schedules (I realize that it has to be based on need.)</p> <p>The school age slide for continuum did not list resource or separate classroom, only reg 80%reg 79-40% and RG <40%</p> <p>Will continuum be a pull down? Or will calculations be provided for reference?</p> <p>Placement on the continuum is confusing. As of from data. Should there be a service provider column in related service LRE section and jn specially designed instruction section? Service Delivery - what if a service delivery line is not for the entire span of the school year, will the total time of removal "per week" take that into consideration? That there's a line of service that is not every week of the IEP...does it average the time? Will the software calculate total school week and total removal based on service delivery lines? Is there a way to document service provider for each line of SDI service & related service? We use this info to calculate service band hours per provider. Helps with allotment. LRE Justification Statement - remove "if applicable" and replace with something like "for SDI away from nondisabled peers". If applicable may lead some to believe that it can be left blank. "Why SDI cannot be achieved in the regular education</p>	<p><u>General Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The preschool content will be reviewed and revised (if appropriate) based on the comments provided for this module. - Recommendations for formatting will be considered during the review and revision. - There are calculations that the ECATS will perform for the user based on the service times outlined on the services page. The continuum will be reflected inside of the system for specified time periods within the life of the IEP. - We will discuss the possibility of a business rule with the vendor to address the school-age continuum once a child turns six.
--	--	--	--



	<p>environment"- some requested to add anticipated frequency. If we add "anticipated frequency", that is a concern. We used to say "write what you do, do what you write." Anticipated means we will try, but may be less, may be more. Continuum - Total time - does this calculate lunch, etc.? Does time have to be in a specific form (e.g., minutes/hours) to calculate & prefill? Each bell time is different per school. Supplemental aids & services needs to be discussed earlier. Are dates for ESY necessary? Sometimes these dates change within districts due to planning process & then it makes them to correct, requiring an addendum. Can the amount/frequency of services & type of service suffice? Non-Academic Services & Activities says to record, but not necessarily SDI! So, where does it go? Related Service - if service type is supplemental, will time/freq/location be required? If so, how?</p> <p>Will EZIEP automatically calculate the continuum/placement on continuum? It currently does.</p> <p>If the IEP team is considering ESY, please allow the form to pre-populate and filled out by IEP team, the draft form says ESY must be completed...go to....nc public schools....</p> <p>Will frequencies in services be a drop down menu? Will the duration time automatically generate or will it need to be entered manually? (High School) This is for LRE section service time.</p> <p>If ESY must be complete, why not just part of IEP form?</p> <p>When the total minutes in school week and then(?) removal per week is entered, will it calculate the % for the placement?</p> <p>SDI Duration: For high school students on a semester system, will duration only include 1 semester if area of disability is addressed only in 1 semester?</p> <p>Will transition goals be addressed with service delivery time under SDI? Based on "Ethan" example, will specific area of need be 'writing' or 'transition'?</p> <p>Not NEARLY enough time for the content in this time frame! Also, presenter did not seem to have the background/expertise for this content (Light Blue).</p>	
--	---	--



	This is important but was rushed and barely covered.	
--	--	--

Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
5	<p>Reevaluation</p> <p>Systematic observational data collected: Is this a formal observation similar to what is used in initial? So we need a formal observation written up and stated prior to the reevaluation meeting?</p> <p>Reevaluation report - Additional observation data --> should not require at least one response. If it is required, then can previous observation data be used?</p> <p>We need more time to look more closely at this in order to give feedback. Would have been great to be able to view these modules in advance of the conference and use time at conference to give feedback and discuss. That would have freed up time to have other sessions that are more engaging and suitable for a face to face presentation.</p> <p>Having a purpose and category in the reveal report titled "eligibility" is confusing, makes it sound like an initial. May want to call it "to determine continued eligibility" or something similar.</p> <p>What is going to be the requirement for systematic observation data collected? Is this formal and requires parent permission? What do you mean by systematic?</p> <p>There is no place to justify why no testing is needed or document information.</p> <p>Reevaluation report: additional observation data should not require at least one response. If it is required, then can previous observation data be used?</p> <p>More info needed in observational data.</p> <p>Can the systematic observation data collected section be removed and let it be captured under additional observation data,</p>	<p>Form Revisions/Responses</p> <p>-DELETED- "Report" in title "Reevaluation Report"</p> <p>-DELETED- "Check Purpose – Eligibility – Programming – Parent Request"</p> <p>-REVISED- Section I: Review of Existing Data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes areas on the old forms for "Record Review" • DELETED – "Systematic" from Observational Data Collected <p>-REVISED- Section II: Reevaluation Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DELETED - instructions (system is now able to provide prompts) • REVISED - Eligibility and Programming questions to yes/no and in alignment with old forms • REVISED - Parent Request section to provide one statement and signature indicating that parent disagrees with the decision to not conduct a formal evaluation. • ADDED - Text box to provide explanation of why no additional formal evaluations are needed • REVISED/ADDED - Business rules to select individual assessments or required assessments if a new disability area is suspected or changed with a description of each assessment populated <p>-REVISED- Section III: Formal Evaluations</p>



	<p>1) Examples needed for what is considered to be informal evaluation?</p> <p>2) Need to clarify/answer - what is the difference between re-evaluation for "programming" and an annual review to review & revise the IEP?</p> <p>3) Need to clarify/answer - if team decides no additional evaluations are needed but a parent requests an evaluation or a comprehensive evaluation must the LEA conduct the evaluation?</p> <p>4) Need to clarify/answer - Is there any instance when a student can be determined no longer eligible for special education and related services without any formal evaluations?</p> <p>Define programming.</p> <p>We have to justify everything except why we don't need additional info. I would suggest justifying.</p> <p>Parent request for evaluation....add section for number of attempts to get parent signature.</p> <p>request use "continued eligibility " not eligibility as it confuses it with initials.</p> <p>At end of reevaluation report under IV Procedural Safeguards box 2: it includes eligibility report. This would not be given if the team checked "yes" under Section II. Eligibility. Should it have, "if applicable" after this or have a separate box specific to the eligibility area?</p> <p>Will revised state forms be posted online (similar to now) as Word documents? There are times or specific circumstances (home IEP meeting) where state forms are needed/used at IEP meeting.</p> <p>Using the term "eligibility" and " programming" may confuse teachers during the reevaluation. Do they check eligibility and reveal on the prior notice? If they are considering eligibility and programming as part of the reevaluation process.</p> <p>Previously a DEC 2 and 6 were the only forms you could send home to sign. What, if any, form can be sent home to sign with consent now being attached to reevaluation and eligibility.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REVISED – Signature only required for parent consent; the “name” of IEP Team participants is all that is required <p>-REVISED- Section IV: Procedural Safeguards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AMENDED – A copy of the Reevaluation, Eligibility Report, and Prior Written Notice “<i>will be</i>” provided to the parent/guardian. <p>General Responses</p> <p>-Forms will be posted to the website.</p> <p>- The new ECATS has the ability to group the forms by the process needed, thereby making some combinations of the forms unnecessary. It is possible to have the consent for evaluation and consent for services as separate documents – this discussion will continue during the development process with the vendor.</p> <p>-As the training is reviewed and revised, the requests for clarification will be incorporated as appropriate. (moving away from naming the forms by number, etc.) Forms will be referred to by process/title on the form.</p> <p>-The triennial date or three-year cycle is re-started when the IEP Team conducts a reevaluation to determine whether or not the child continues to be eligible for special education and related services. Reevaluations for the purposes of gaining specific evaluation data for the purposes of “programming” or reviewing and revising the IEP does not reset the triennial date; however, the team could decide to include eligibility in the purpose of the re-evaluation and this would reset the triennial date.</p> <p>-Q&A: “If a reeval does not reset the 3 year reevaluation date (e.g., for an FBA) will the team still be required to complete the disability worksheet?” No – based on this question, the issue</p>
--	--	--



	<p>Parent request-team must meet and discuss not required to evaluate. Wording in parent request section: Predetermining purpose of meeting: consent form being combined with other forms and being sent home, what does the parent send back? This doesn't align with policies about reevaluation.</p> <p>The Programming selection is confusing. The Parent Request option may be misleading to the parent.</p> <p>*What is the psych viewpoint of just meeting about programming. Is their input/viewpoint taken into consideration? Is the skill being drilled down enough.</p> <p>*Systematic observational data: Define this in more detail.</p> <p>*Section III: what type of evaluations are you requesting?</p> <p>Our presenter explained that DEC 1, 2, 3, etc forms will no longer be referred to as such. We think you need to be explicit about this in the training somewhere so people will understand that has been discontinued.</p> <p>Move the parent request section to earlier in the form to improve the flow. Not sure programming is the most appropriate word for describing this need. Need clarification on the differences between the two. Look closely at wording in the parent request. States that IEP team must ensure that the formal evaluations are completed. Are we saying this is a done deal? Under programming, there is a statement that the IEP team has determined that formal evaluations are needed...should this be a question? Is formal evaluation needed to determine.....If it is a parent request, should we not follow the same procedures as on the previous page for eligibility and Programming.</p> <p>For programming..If you ask for testing and don't complete an eligibility report, where do you put the results?</p> <p>Training needed on examples of systematic observational data feel like that can be confused w/observations across setting which you need permission to obtain</p>	<p>of continued eligibility is not in question. The 3-year date WOULD NOT be re-set nor would a worksheet be completed.</p> <p>-Q&A: “Say it is a speech only child and we are going to exit without testing (do we have to test?)” – A reevaluation must be conducted to determine whether the child continues to be eligible for special education and related service because SPEECH is an eligibility category. The IEP Team can determine whether or not further evaluations are required to exit.</p>
--	---	---



		<p>It nice that the DEC numbers are not on the form. The participants understand that using the titles of the forms (i.e.: Prior Written Notice) is helpful, especially for new teachers. However, if the numbers are no longer going to be used, how are they to ensure appropriate sequence of the forms?</p> <p>Would be helpful to have a slide in the Presentation PPT that outlines the major changes before going into the content. This will be helpful for local level training. Terribly devisive to say "parent request" for meeting. Policy doesn't deliniate, why is DPI? We need to be sure more than one purpose for reeval report can be selected. Why is it called Reeval Report instead of just Reevaluation? The referral isn't a "referral report". If the intent is to not have to go through the entire process for changes to transportation or an FBA, give us guidance that we can document that in a PWN. Suggest Parent Request being drop down to fill out their reason of concern, etc. Doesn't make sense to have it toward the end of section II. If eligibilty not checked for purpose, could you exit student if evals resulted in no longer meeting criteria? Parent Request section - form says we must complete formal evaluations as team decision, not according to parent decision. Form should be consistent: Eligibility & Programming. With eligibility report, does section 6 drop off for a reeval or does parent sign that section every time? Are we requiring an evaluation when a parent requests a reeval for testing? The way the form reads indicates this. Where is the section that you would explain why you are not evaluating (parent request, etc.)? Parent Request Section - sounds like we have to evaluate... Programming & Parent Request - if the team answers "yes" to either programming question, is parental consent required with Eval Plan? #1 doesn't say this explicitly like it does in the Eligibility section. Parent request also does not say this explicitly. Reeval - "sysrematic observational data"- does that mean formal observation? If so, you can't do that without a DEC2, which hasn't happened yet in the process.</p> <p>This question is related to modules 7 and 5. If a reeval does not reset the 3 year reevaluation date (e.g., for an FBA) will the team still be required to complete the disability worksheet?</p> <p>Reevaluation Determination: Say it is a speech only child and we are going to exit without testing (do we have to test?) One the old DEC</p>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>Reevaluation Programming Consideration - need for a related service, in the past this resets the 3 year. Now, you are saying it will not. So, the team will need to meet again within the same time period? What about Blind children who will not regain sight but programmatically may need new information. So, the reason for the reeval is not to determine what additional supports are needed to support this student? Do we then have to meet again within the same three year time period to determine continued eligibility? Why is this now an "and" when in the past eligibility and programming have been an "or"? Policy 1503-2.6 Review of existing data that satisfies the triennial includes what this form reflects as eligibility, programming and parent request.</p> <p>I. Review of existing data: systematic observation data: We are required to get Consent to Test for all observations so we cannot complete this form as it is written with DPI asking for an observation here. This cannot be done in this order without consent to test so we will have to stop here and get consent. You could have extensive teacher input here with a set # (e.g. 3) of required teacher observations.</p> <p>The systematic observation data on Re-eval report: does it require a report? does it require parent permission? Delete "Complete Elib. Report" on pg 2 - Re-Evaluation II. Eligibility - 2. (Incorrect!!) Re-eval pg 4: A copy of re-eval report, etc has been provided. CAN NOT give Eligibility Report if testing not completed: re-word? a 3rd choice?</p> <p>Using the term "eligibility" and " programming" may confuse teachers during the reevaluation. Do they check eligibility and reveal on the prior notice? If they are considering eligibility and programming as part of the reevaluation process. Clarify Scenario #1 slide #36 - Special Transportation - What is the definition of formal evaluation/reevaluation when used on the slide - "It is highly likely that this situation will not require formal evaluation, therefore, formal evaluation/reevaluation is not needed." Does this mean you don't have to go through the re-evaluation process and you can just revise IEP or does it mean you don't have to conduct evaluations but still need to complete the re-evaluation process?</p>	
--	--	---	--



	<p>7 there was a section that said if no testing needed, why? This is where a SLP can indicate the informal data collection that substantiates the rationale for exit from services. This is in regards to students that are SI with articulation only.</p>	
--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
6	Prior Written Notice	<p>Can you please add "Initial Referral" and "Re-evaluation Determination" to purposes at the top of the prior written notice?</p> <p>Can we say rejected instead of refused?</p> <p>Action proposed-Why? Accepted/rejected-Why? ...or something similar. Some of the ?'s seem redundant.</p> <p>Why & Data...seems the data would be part of why.</p> <p>Parts 1, 3, and 6---All listing actions proposed? Parts 2, 4, and 5---All asking for justification for decision.</p> <p>How does it show alignment for actions proposed with refused, and Why, etc...</p> <p>Seems like those should be going across in columns beside each other</p> <p>Prior Written Notice is required at all meetings. Under purpose, Initial Referral needs to have its own box. We have learned this week that it is extremely important, it shouldn't go under other.</p> <p>Examples need work, description should include staff information parent information, or other:</p> <p>Do we need to have person who interprets eval results or can an individual serve dual roles? #6 - not clear enough to explain to schools when to use that (as "toss away").</p> <p>We need clarification on the difference between #3 and #6. They seem the same.</p>	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u></p> <p>-The request to include "Initial Referral" in the purposes will be considered during the next window for technical revisions. Currently, "Eligibility", "Educational Placement/Change in Placement" and "Other" are all options to reflect the possible outcomes associated with an initial referral.</p> <p>-The statement regarding due process rights comes between Item #5 and Item #6 because Items #1-5 reflect the final decisions of the IEP Team. Item #6 document options considered and Item #7 documents other relevant information.</p> <p><u>General Responses</u></p> <p>-There are business rules embedded in the different processes that will allow decisions and null decisions to be reflected in the appropriate spaces on the PWN.</p> <p>- Actions proposed and refused are a requirement in the federal regulations. They were separated to provide clear documentation of the final decisions.</p> <p>.</p>



		<p>*Explanation of Why Action Was Refused slide - this needs some editing. The slide notes outside the school. This could open a can of worms.</p> <p>*Example slide of Why Action Was Refused - the first sentence is a little antagonizing.</p> <p>*Example for #5 - Explain what eligibility documentation is.</p> <p>*More explanation of #6. See it still as a refusal - is this redundant?</p> <p>More clarification with the evaluation procedures. (Is it all evaluations or just those relative to options accepted or rejected.)</p> <p>For wording on form, consider, description of ALL actions, rather than actions, edit the examples, several suggestions given and noted, statement of procedural safeguards seems to be in an odd place in middle of form, move to end, include compliance components, include policy, audio in one clip, Is there a reason that meeting participant sections are not consistent? Some sections have roles, others do not, others are a mix</p> <p>Clarity regarding items 3 & 4, as compared to 6, duplication?</p> <p>On the PWN, we think 3 & 4 and 6 & 7 are the same. Don't need both, Both rejection/refusals and why.</p> <p>Will section 5 on the PWN be check boxes with a description of each? Currently in EasyIEP, we have check boxes for this area. Makes it easier for staff.</p> <p>Will due process information, parent rights and who to contact info populate on the document like it does in EasyIEP?</p> <p>Currently in EasyIEP if you click on a purpose on DEC5, you give an explanation of the purpose from the list. I don't see that on the form and is always so helpful to summarize what happened. EX: Purpose is placement - click on placement continues to be regular. It needs to be added back.</p> <p>Will there be a cap on text let mit for PWN fields?</p>	
--	--	--	--



		<p>Can you explain the difference between actions refused and rejected?</p> <p>Did you really need to add the additional place for rejections?</p> <p>Does the term "propose" mean proposed and accepted?</p> <p>On PWN will there still be a 4,000 character limit? Our teachers are required to write the evaluation and description of that evaluation.</p> <p>On PWN purposes does the eligibility purpose work for referrals (initials) and reevaluation? If not, then should "initial eligibility" be there as a purpose?</p>	
--	--	---	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
7	<p>Manifestation Determination Review</p> <p>Disciplinary Change in Placement</p>	<p>Under essential questions the first 2 questions sound exactly the same. Honestly, our teachers will not be able to recognize any difference.</p> <p>Bill Elvey and Melvin Diggs and Vivian James developed a case study for preschool that delineates what LEAs should do when a child is suspended from an LEA administered preschool class versus a private child care program where the LEA is providing special education and related service. You may want to consider using that information in future training.</p> <p>Clarification on when prior written notice required within manifestation of determination process- invitation or after team makes decision?</p> <p>On the invitation to conference when you check manifestation determination does it automatically populate onto the MD form?</p> <p>How can the prior written notice go out prior to the MDR meeting . Need more explanation in the presentation what the team that completes the prior written notice before it goes to the parent looks like. If it is an IEP team, they would need to invite the parent to the meeting to complete the prior written notice. It is confusing</p> <p>Clarification on slide 10 number 3 what is the states stance?</p> <p>Clarification on slide 10 #3. What is dpi interpretation?</p> <p>Slide 10 provide examples to share to illustrate this.</p> <p>Why did we get rid of 5a?? Policy didn't change.</p> <p>Too many policy slides..can't read them</p>	<p>Form Revisions/Responses</p> <p>-ADDED – The DEC5A has been brought back with revisions. It is titled “Disciplinary Change in Placement”. It has three parts: Disciplinary Change in Placement; Prior Written Notice and Invitation to Conference.</p> <p>-REVISIONS - MDR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COMBINED – “Describe the current disciplinary event” with “Summary of administrative authority’s findings” • DELETED – “Current Educational Setting-LRE” • DELETED – Section II: “History of Disciplinary Events” • REVISED – Section II: “Describe the <i>specific</i> information that is being considered <i>from the data sources above.</i>” • REVISED – Section II: “Describe the <i>specific</i> information that is being considered <i>from the parent, including any outside evaluations.</i>”



	<p>Need an example in the presentation about when in school suspension is not considered a removal regarding what access to general education would look like and participating with non disabled peers would look like, especially if there are no other students in the ISS</p> <p>If a child is removed/suspended, the parents have to be notified that placement has been changed with a prior written notice before the manifestation determination meeting is held. On the PWN what will go into the IEP TEAM PARTICIPANTS, it appears a meeting has not been held</p> <p>Sending the PWN indicates that a meeting was held. Can you hold an IEP meeting without inviting the parent?</p> <p>The MDR presentation needs an example of what the prior written notice should contain that we send home with the invitation. Also, who signs the prior written notice that goes home with the invitation.? Would it be the administrator making the suspension/removal?</p> <p>Please address students being placed on modified day who get EC services during the time there but get no EC services after they are sent home. Is this considered a suspension?</p> <p>Concern that admin making suspension decisions would have to notify EC teacher immediately for proper paperwork to be generated & sent home in a timely manner</p> <p>If you have to attach a FBA/BIP what is that going to look like electronically</p> <p>Manifestation of student disability slide- keeps noting to attach bip, fav, do we scan and put in?? What does this look like electronically? Where am I showing the data within this context? Am I just stating that I did it??</p> <p>Does the person providing homebound services to a student with disabilities have to be EC certified. Needs to be addressed in the presentation as questions may arise</p> <p>Prior written notice and manifestation meeting was not enough information and detail was given on how this will work and how this works with the prior written notice, do we complete all of the questions? Proposed? Rejected? Do we list team members?</p> <p>POSITIVE---Great slides explaining purpose of manifestation! This will be helpful to share with administrators!!!</p> <p>There needs to be a flow chart for making decisions regarding discipline and change in setting- more training in general for MDR & discipline decisions</p> <p>On first page of mdr form it lists Ire, what is thinking behind that?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REVISED – Section II: “Explain how and when the interventions and/or BIP were revised (<i>if any were completed</i>).” • REVISED – Section II: “Has this behavior or similar behaviors associated with the disability been exhibited <i>this school year?</i>” • REVISED – Section III: Essential questions separated to include a section for the Manifestation Determination decision. • DELETED – Directions for yes/no responses. <p><u>General Responses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A state form for FBA/BIPs is under consideration. - Many scenarios were provided in the General Comments – clarification of those issues will be incorporated in the revisions to this module. -The person that provides EC services in a homebound setting must be EC certified. If the student is receiving general education in the homebound setting, the appropriate licensure requirements apply. It is possible that both a special education teacher and general education teacher serve students on homebound. -We will work with the vendor to determine if compliance symbols are possible to flag homebound placements and the need to review in 30 days.
--	---	--



	<p>Clarify/ add to the presentation that the IEP TEAM should not be afraid to write in the prior written notice if the parent disagrees or argues about what the incident that the student was removed for. Explain that there should not be an argument but it is ok to put it in the prior written notice that the parent disagrees because everyone needs to be aware of what the prior written notice is form</p> <p>will lre on mdr auto populate? If use it should be changed from setting to placement.</p> <p>History of events (II) slide 24. Add current school year to this form</p> <p>On MDR form change wording from setting to placement...add current school year</p> <p>The 5a form previously documented the educational change in placement made by an administrator /teacher. This did not require an IEP meeting. We are now required to complete a PWN with the IEP team signature indicating the change in placement. Does the team make the decision?</p> <p>Item I. Slide 19, if any of these are yes will there be a section for team to discuss that. If you check yes, for example to a weapon, will something come up</p> <p>What is an appropriate qualified teacher to provide homebound instruction/ does that mean special ed and gen ed teacher?</p> <p>What is an appropriate person who can provide homebound? Can it be a gen ed teacher?</p> <p>The history of disciplinary events should not be on the form. It should be done prior to the meeting.</p> <p>If history of disciplinary events is on the form it should have a heading to clarify dates and summary of events.</p> <p>Can PowerSchool populate the dates and summary of the history of disciplinary events on the form?</p> <p>Policy does not require the mdr meeting to list out the intentions and/ or bip were revised if not effective.</p> <p>purpose of admin findings be reworded to be "description of incident" as most schools copy and paste from incident report which provides a description for IEP team to consider.</p> <p>Policy does not require IEP team to list separately current ed setting LRE.</p> <p>This won't make more compliant IEPs and runs risk of noncompliance with paperwork.</p> <p>It appears that DPI is moving toward the invite to conference for MDR MTSS. Great! Let's not mix-up the names any more.</p>	<p>-Q&A- "If another disability is considered in the MDR- do you conduct a reeval at that point in time?" – If another disability is suspected, then a reevaluation must be conducted. It does not have to be at the same time of the MDR – however, the reevaluation meeting should be scheduled in a timely fashion. The MDR process does not stop due to the need to complete the re-evaluation process. Manifestation must be determined on all available data – even if new data is presented that suspects a new disability during the MDR meeting.</p>
--	--	---



	<p>Section IV of MDR - Confusing to have all 4 questions together - somehow the 4th question needs to be separated from the first 3 since it is the final determination based on answers to the first 3 questions.</p> <p>Could PCG develop a compliance symbol that is triggered when homebound placement is selected on the IEP. THAT way districts can keep track of the 30 day reviews. Example Our LEA HAS A SYMBOL FOR BIP reviews so we can keep track of when they are due. The symbol changes color as the due dates approach</p> <p>There is way too much info on these slides, thinking about a new teacher. Fine to show policy briefly, but then show bulleted key points.</p> <p>Behavior page 2 of the MDR instead of summarizing the BIP can we attach it because it should be well defined</p> <p>History of disciplinary events need clarification is this all during school year of from the date of the last manifestation meeting ?</p> <p>Serving kids in ISS- it was stated that teacher can't serve kid in ISS. Student must go where normally receives the service. What if the child was removed and put in ISS due to an incident that occurred in that class? How can we send student to the class in which he was removed due to behavior?</p> <p>The parent is part of the IEP team how can the parent disagree with a team that they are a part of? If the parent disagrees then does the team disagree?</p> <p>Would like a separate training offered on FBA's BIP's and MDRs. Can we provide guidance as to who should serve on a Private Services Plan. In a home school situation, can the parent serve in a dual role (also as a teacher)?</p> <p>If there is NO change in policies - why is MDR so misunderstood? If this is a change in the forms only, why is there so much confusion?</p> <p>Why are we doing away with Dec 5a. Removing 1 form and replacing it with 2 is cumbersome and adds more work for teachers and admins.</p> <p>Could the summary of administrative findings populate from Powerschool to match the discipline summary there?</p> <p>How can you complete a PWN without first inviting parents to a meeting? PWW - invitation to conference)</p> <p>Will we (or when will we) be shared the business rules for the forms to review and provide feedback?</p> <p>Writing a summary of BIP seems redundant when there is a BIP that can be referred to</p>	
--	---	--



	<p>Are we going to have state created FBA and BIP forms?</p> <p>MDR - bottom 2 boxes: isn't this a repeat of what is on the front page where you check & describe each type of data?</p> <p>Special ed is not a place or specific time of day. If a student is to receive 1 hour per day of EC services, and is in ISS and the teacher goes into ISS, and provides that service, the student has received their EC services</p> <p>Reevaluation as part of a manifestation does not restart the timeline? Currently in CECAS there is no way to enter a re-evaluation without changing timeline. Will we be able to do this in ECATS?</p> <p>Consider the fact that if something is required for an evaluation, the state should provide a uniform way to capture the data (FBA and BIP)</p> <p>When administrators enter in ISS/OSS discipline incidents in PowerSchool, and they are approaching (or at) 10 days ISS/OSS for that student- will PowerSchool "populate" or "generate" a notice to administrators and/or case managers/EC teachers that a MDR must be conducted?</p> <p>If 5a is taken away, (a form that admins could complete without removing an EC teacher from providing services to others) This will cause other issues.. An EC teacher will now need to be removed from the class, others will have to cover or students won't receive their service delivery</p> <p>What do we do with information a parent brings in (like an outside evaluation)? Do we stop the MDR meeting and trigger a reevaluation? If we have to consider ALL information, then we may need more time to adequately do so.</p> <p>Behavior section (BIP) this seems to be additional work because policy states that if conducting MD then a BIP review, is the held. Why do it twice?</p> <p>If another disability is considered in the MDR- do you conduct a reeval at that point in time?</p> <p>Would failure to review the BIP consistently / have an FBA mean the IEP was not implemented?</p> <p>I would recommend a different presenter who isn't as rude and condescending as the one presenting the manifestation determination module.</p> <p>What is the time frame to provide school plan? Traditionally was to end of school year and renewed if Parent contacted following year</p> <p>What happens if the IEP team can't agree to the 3 essential questions on the manifestation paperwork?</p> <p>We need clarification on removals in general. Example, Removal elementary student receives EC services before they are sent home does this constitute a suspension</p>	
--	--	--



		<p>If in ISS, services must be given but EC teacher can not go there, how do services get provided? Especially when removal was from the EC class due to major disruptions? We can't pull during regular education classes - clarity please.</p> <p>Some of the forms were printed in landscape. Was this just for the training? Will/can they all be in portrait?</p> <p>On the MDR why do you summarize prior behavior /discipline incidents under I it says currently only, needs clarification</p>	
--	--	--	--

	Module	Feedback	EC Division Response
8	Private School Services Plan	<p>Wherever there is a drop down area can it be included in each powerpoint of each area Can we know what the drop down areas would be</p> <p>Clear instruction for offer of FAPE to parent so they could determine if they will leave private school and begin attending public school. Then if denied by parent, clear offer of private school services that have been determined by the LEA, but not confused with every area of need identified in the IEP offering FAPE. Seems confusing because seems like you would summarize each assessment area, say "yes" there's a need, but NOT have a goal or services, because they are not the services identified as being provided for the proportionate share funds.</p> <p>Can the information from the IEP roll over to Private School Plan to prevent double entry.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clarify slide #10 Measurable Annual Goals with regard to the description about alternate assessments to alternative achievement standards, is an LEA supposed to be testing students placed in private schools as part of this process? Recommend revising this slide as it relates to private schools. 2) Clarify why transition from Part C to Part B is included as a meeting purpose? 3) In past we've been told the end date should be the last day of school, since the grant could change for the next year. In the training you indicated the plan cannot exceed 365 days. Does the plan now need to extend beyond the last day of the school year? 4) Clarify how the progress report requirements would work for an LEA, particularly if the parent is homeschooling the student? 	<p><u>Form Revisions/Responses</u> -DELETED – “Area in need of SDI” – services on a PSSP are already determined by need and by proportionate share plan.</p> <p><u>General Responses</u> -We will consider the request to highlight drop-downs during the revisions to the process training. -We will review the business rules to determine if IEP information can roll over to the PSSP.</p>



		<p>PSSP should be done but school year rather than calendar year to align with the grant.</p> <p>May want to consider adding language to form that explains proportionate share policies that the district determined to offer that school year. Include language about proportionate share funding if used up - services could end before the end of the school year.</p> <p>Under Purpose may want to consider - revise wording - from "Transition Part C to B" to "Transition from Early Childhood to School Age". Parents don't always understand Part B and Part C.</p>	
--	--	--	--