

Guide Steps for Programmatic Monitoring

Technical Assistance Manual

June 2025



Note:

It is important to note that state and federal laws change, and court opinions are issued regularly. All of these play a role in interpretation. It is important to ensure that the Public Education Agency (PEA) stays current on all requirements and changes made at all levels, assessing how these may impact the PEA's implementation of programming.

Contents

Note:	2
Guide Steps	5
Section I: Child Find	6
I.A.1 Child Find Requirements and PEA Policies and Procedures	6
I.A.2 Child Find Procedures	9
I.A.3 Early Childhood Transition (In by 3)	9
Section II: Evaluation/Reevaluation	11
II.A.1 Completion of Evaluation/Reevaluation	11
II.A.2 Review of Existing Data	12
II.A.3 Team Determination of Need for Additional Data	14
II.A.4 Eligibility Considerations	15
II.A.5 Initial Evaluations Completed within 60 Calendar Days of Receipt of Informed Written Consent of Parent	27
Section III: Individualized Education Program	29
III.A.1 Current IEP	29
III.A.2 IEP Review/Revision and Participants	29
III.A.3 General Required Components of the IEP Are Included	30
III.A.4 Special Education and Related Services	33
III.A.6 Postsecondary Transition Components	38
III.A.7 Additional Postsecondary Transition Components	41
III.A.8 Documentation That IEP Reflects Student Needs	43
Section IV: Procedural Safeguards/Parental Participation	44
IV.A.1 Notices Sent at Required Times and in a Language and Form That Is Understandable to Parents	44
IV.A.2 PWN Sent at Required Times and Contains Required Components	44
IV.A.3 Discipline Procedures and Requirements	46

AF Agency Form

CFW Child Find Worksheet

SPW Summary of Performance Worksheet

IB3W In-by-Three Worksheet
DRSF Data Review Student Form

SASF Self-Assessment Student Form

SF Student Form

TDAF Transportation District Agency Form

SCSAI Secure Care Site Administrator Interview

SCSEAI Secure Care Special Education Administrator Interview

SCSI Secure Care Student Interview

SCGETI Secure Care General Teacher Interview

SCSETI Secure Care Special Education Teacher Interview

SCPS Secure Care Parent Survey
SCSI Secure Care Student Interview

Guide Steps

The following instructions include all of the compliance items within the Arizona programmatic monitoring system. These guide steps contain the major elements that constitute the provision of a free appropriate public education (FAPE) It is incumbent upon the PEA to meet each of these requirements as well as all other requirements outlined in IDEA, state statute, Arizona Administrative Code (state board rule), and local board policy, whether or not they are included in the programmatic monitoring process.

Steps	General Instructions for Student Form Completion
Step 1	Record the demographic information requested. All demographic information must be entered on the student form. If a student does not have an SSID number, use the student's birth date and initials. Use the AzEDS category from the most recent AZEDS reporting submitted to the Arizona Department of Education (ADE). When reviewing the evaluation timeline for a student who was found to be ineligible for special education, record the SSID number and mark the eligibility category as "Not Special Education" (NSE).
Step 2	Determine the primary language spoken by the parent (to ensure that the PEA has met the parent notification requirements). Student File Review Method: Review the file for the language of the home, as indicated by the parent, and write the language in the space provided. Use any original parent source; home language survey (HLS), registration, developmental history, etc.
Step 3	Conduct the file review and record the information using the following codes: I = In compliance O = Out of compliance U = Unreported

Section I: Child Find

I.A.1 Child Find Requirements and PEA Policies and Procedures

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.111(a)(1)(i) AF, TDAF	Determine whether the PEA has board-approved comprehensive special education policies and procedures to ensure that all children with disabilities who need special education and related services are identified, located, evaluated, and afforded a free and appropriate public education (FAPE).
	PEA board-approved policies and procedures must include information related to equitable participation and accurate child count for parentally privately placed and home-school children.
	PEA board-approved policies and procedures should be unique and individualized to the PEA and should not be a replication of the applicable statutes. PEA board-approved policies and procedures should be comprehensive and include all requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA).
	Agency Review Method: Verify that the current PEA's board-approved policies and procedures reflect the requirements in IDEA, state statute, and state board rule.
	Policies are an outline of the local board-approved requirements that comply with federal and state requirements.
	Procedures explain how the PEA will carry out the policies and delineate who is responsible for each step in the processes.
	Note: Policies and procedures must be present and show evidence of board approval in order for this item to be considered compliant. Checklists to assist in ensuring a policy for all requirements can be found under Resources on the Program Support and Monitoring web page.
	Related Requirements: I11
R7-2-401.D.1 R7-2-401.B.3 AF, TDAF	Determine whether child find procedures have been made available electronically or in writing to parents within the PEA's boundaries of responsibility, including parents of children with disabilities who attend private schools and home schools. This is a requirement for all PEAs ,
,,	including secure care entities.
	Agency Review Method: Review available documentation such as a letter, flyer, web page, link, or other means of documentation. If parents have been made aware of procedures, including parentally placed private school and home-school children, via the available documentation, mark this item I .

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
R7-2-401.C.1	Determine whether the required child find procedures for birth to 2.9 years
R7-2-401.B.3	were followed. This is a requirement for all PEAs, including secure care
R7-2-401.D	entities, regardless of the student population served.
AF, TDAF	Required procedures include: A. Use of the mandatory AzEIP (child find) referral form and timelines (These can be found on the AZ Find web page). B. Documentation of appropriate follow-up on any referral to AzEIP or the school district. C. Alert forwarded to ADE/ESS Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) when no follow-up on a referral can be documented. Agency Review Method: If the system for referral to AzEIP is in place, and the timelines have been followed, mark this item I. If the system for referral is in place, but no child has accessed the system, mark this item I. If the system for referral to AzEIP is in place, but procedures or timelines have not been followed, mark this item O. If a system for referral to AzEIP is not in place, mark this item O.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
R7-2-401.C.1	Determine whether the required child find procedures for ages 2.9–5 years
R7-2-401.B.3	were followed. These procedures are required for all PEAs, including
R7-2-401 D.	secure care entities, regardless of the student population served. See
	below for more specific information.
AF, TDAF	'
,	Agency Review Method:
	For charter schools and union high school districts:
	If the system for referral to the responsible district is in place, and the timelines have been followed, mark this item I.
	 If the system for referral is in place, but no child has accessed the system, mark this item I.
	 If the system for referral to the responsible district is in place, but procedures or timelines have not been followed, mark this item O. If a system for referral to the responsible district is not in place, mark this item O.
	 For elementary and unified districts: If the district has a system for screening and referral with evidence that children are screened within 45 calendar days of initial expression of concern (from any interested party), mark this item I. If the system for screening and referral is in place, but no child has accessed the system, mark this item I. If the district does not have a system for conducting screenings, or fails to conduct screenings within the required timelines, mark this item O.
	Related Requirements: I11
300.134 300.135 R7-2-401.C.3 R7-2-401.L	Determine whether the PEA maintains an invitation list and agenda for consultation meeting(s) with private school(s) staff and families of homeschooled children. All references to private school students include home-schooled students.
AF, TDAF	 Agency Review Method: Locate the invitation list to the meeting between private schools and the district. Locate the agenda for this meeting. If private schools are listed as invited, and the meeting agenda covers private school and home-school involvement in consultation efforts, mark this item I. Note: Affirmations of Consultation (AOC) with private school personnel and/or home-schooled families affidavit would also meet this criterion. If there is no documentation of a meeting invitation list and/or agenda, mark this item O. If the agency is a school district, this item cannot be marked U. If the agency is a charter school, mark this item U.

I.A.2 Child Find Procedures

I.A.Z CIIII I III F	
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
R7-2-401.D.5	Determine whether the procedures for screening appropriate school-aged
R7-2-401.D.6	students (to include preschool) were completed within 45 calendar days of
	entry and that the seven required areas were addressed.
CFW	
	The required areas are vision, hearing, cognitive or academic,
	communication, motor, social or behavioral, and adaptive or self-help.
	Child Find Worksheet Method: Compare the date of enrollment and the
	date of screening or the date of the documented review of records.
	 If the student was screened in all seven areas within 45 calendar
	days, mark this item I .
	 If any area was not screened, mark this item O.
	 If the student was screened but not within the required 45 calendar
	days, mark this item O .
	 If the student was not screened, mark this item O.
	Related Requirements: I11
R7-2-401.D.8	Determine whether the students were referred for follow-up and/or
	evaluation when concerns were noted on the 45-day screening.
CFW	
	Child Find Worksheet Method: If concerns were noted about any of the
	students who were screened, the school must document follow-up actions.
	Follow-up may consist of a variety of actions, and the appropriateness of the
	follow-up is dependent upon the nature of the concern.
	If concerns were noted, look for documentation of follow-up that may
	include any attempts to collect additional records, collection of further
	records, implementation of classroom interventions, a referral to a
	child study team, or a referral for a special education evaluation. If
	this documentation is evident, mark this item I.
	 If concerns were noted and there is no documentation of follow-up,
	mark this item O .
	If no concerns are noted, mark this item U .
1	

I.A.3 Early Childhood Transition (In by 3)

This does not apply to Public Charter Schools, Union High School Districts, or Secure Care Entities.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.111.(a)	Determine whether students previously served by AZEIP were evaluated by the student's 3 rd birthday.
IB3W	There must be evidence that an evaluation was completed and that eligibility was determined by the student's 3 rd birthday.
	 In-by-3 Worksheet Method: Compare the student's date of birth to the date that eligibility was determined. If the date of eligibility was determined on or before the student's 3rd birthday, mark this item I. If the date of eligibility was determined is after the student's 3rd birthday, mark this item O. Note: If the parent makes the child unavailable, the parent is nonresponsive, or the parent made a referral to AzEIP after the child turned 2.9, these will be considered deductible, and findings will not be issued for this item. If the family moves out of the PEA boundaries after the referral is made, the initial PEA is still responsible for completing the evaluation process while collaborating with the new PEA.
300.111.(a) IB3W	For students previously served by AZEIP who were evaluated and found to be eligible, an IEP was developed, implemented, and FAPE was offered by the student's 3 rd birthday. For students served by AzEIP who were found not eligible, mark this item U.
	There must be evidence that the IEP was developed, implemented, and that FAPE was offered by the student's 3 rd birthday.
	 In-by-3 Worksheet Method: Compare the student's date of birth to the date that the IEP was developed and implemented, and that FAPE was offered. If the development/implementation of the IEP was done on or before the student's 3rd birthday, mark this item I. If the date the IEP was developed/implemented is after the student's 3rd birthday, mark this item O. Note: In the event the parent makes the child unavailable, the parent is nonresponsive, or the parent made a referral to AzEIP after the child turned 2.9, these referrals will be considered deductible, and findings will not be issued for this item. If the family moves out of the PEA boundaries after the referral is made, the initial PEA is still responsible for completing the evaluation process while collaborating with the new PEA.
	Related Requirements: I12

Section II: Evaluation/Reevaluation

For the initial evaluation of a student who did not qualify, only make a compliance call on II.A.5.

II.A.1 Completion of Evaluation/Reevaluation

	of Evaluation/Reevaluation
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.301(a)	An evaluation, beginning with the review of existing data and including
300.303(b)	an eligibility determination, has been completed (including phased-out
300.305(e)(1)	students).
300.306	
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Review the file for the current (dated within 3 years of the file review date) evaluation and the eligibility documentation.
60-Day Correction	 If a current evaluation and eligibility determination that contain evidence of team participation are present, mark this item I. If there is an evaluation that includes evidence of team participation, but components are missing or do not meet compliance, mark this item I, and mark the components in the line items that follow, as appropriate.
	For Reevaluations Only: If no current reevaluation documentation is found, look for evidence of the agreement between the parent and PEA that the reevaluation was unnecessary. This agreement must be based upon a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of conducting a reevaluation as well as the effect a reevaluation might have on a child's educational program. • If neither a reevaluation nor an agreement, as described above, is found, mark this item O and enter U on the remainder of the evaluation items.
	 If evidence of the agreement that a reevaluation was unnecessary, as described above, is present, mark this and all remaining items in the evaluation as U.
	If a student has been phased out of special education, the team must have conducted a reevaluation before the decision to dismiss the student from special education. The team team's decision may be based on existing information or newly administered tests or assessments. There is no requirement that new data be gathered to phase out a student, but all components pertinent to the student's eligibility category must be addressed and documented.
	 If no evaluation is found for a phased-out student, mark this item O and enter U on the remainder of the evaluation items.
	Note: A prior written notice (PWN) for initial referral is needed before the review of existing data. (Refer to line item IV.A.2)

II.A.2 Review of Existing Data

le , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
Explanation and Review Method
A review of existing data occurred within 15 school days of a parent's written request for evaluation.
 Student File Review Method: Determine whether there is evidence of a written parent request for evaluation (evidence includes reference to such request in a PWN). If so, ensure that the PEA documented a review of existing data or issued a PWN, refusing to evaluate, within 15 school days. If there is evidence of a written parent request for evaluation, and the timeline is met, mark this item I. If there is evidence of a written parent request for evaluation, and the timeline is not met, mark this item O. If there is no evidence of a written parent request for evaluation, mark this item U. If there is evidence of a written parent request for evaluation, but the evaluation being reviewed is a transfer from another district, mark this item U. Note: PEAs are encouraged to have a system in place for how parent written requests for evaluation are maintained as part of the student record/file.
The parent provided current information during the review of existing data timeframe and before the decision of the need for additional data. Student File Review Method: Determine whether there is evidence that the parent provided information to the team or that the PEA made several varied efforts to request information from the parent. This documentation may be a review of information provided through a meeting, questionnaire, phone interview, or email to document developmental, medical, functional, and other pertinent information before the decision that additional data was needed. For students 18 years or older whose rights have transferred, look for evidence of current information provided by the adult student and/or the parent. • If it is evident that a parent was not a member of the review-of-data team or it is evident that input is only from prior evaluations, mark this item O . Related Requirements: I8, I11
Current classroom-based assessments were reviewed before the decision
of the need for additional data. Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team considered specific, classroom-based information (quantitative data) shared by the child's teacher and related to classroom assessments, such as quarterly grades, portfolio information, and/or anecdotal records such as behavior

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	tracking records.
	For a student being evaluated for a possible learning disability based on an MTSS process, comparative reports of progress monitoring from each tier of instruction/intervention were reviewed.
	For children aged birth to 3 referred from AzEIP, assessment and performance information were reviewed. For reevaluations of preschool students, the team may include specific assessment information, such as data collected from Teaching Strategies GOLD/My Teaching Strategies, Child Outcomes Survey (COS), etc.
	 If it is clear that the child's teacher was not included in the review of existing data process, mark this item O. If the student has not attended school or an early intervention program, mark this item U.
	Related Requirements: I8, I11
300.305(a)(1)(iii)	Teacher and related service provider input/observations were reviewed
SF, SASF, SCSF	before the decision of the need for additional data.
	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team considered current information (qualitative data) that was shared by any teacher and/or related service provider, community-based personnel, service provider for children aged birth to 3, or other provider, as appropriate. Examples of information could include pertinent data related to peer relationships, work habits, organizational skills, motivation, behavior and/or self-esteem, and any pre-referral intervention efforts for initial evaluations.
	For a student being evaluated for a possible learning disability based on an MTSS process, descriptions of research-based instruction and tiered interventions and documentation that the interventions were implemented with fidelity and were reviewed for sufficient periods of time.
	If the student has not attended school, mark this item U .
	Related Requirements: I8, I11
300.305(a)(1)(ii)	Formal assessments were reviewed prior to the decision of the need for additional data.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team considered the most current performance on state-required assessments (includes language proficiency assessments and Move On When Reading), as well as any PEA-administered benchmark assessments. • The team reviewed state assessment data, to include PEA benchmark assessment data, mark this item I.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	 If the student is a recent transfer student, the PEA documented that they were unable to obtain any state required assessment data, and the PEA does not conduct any benchmark assessments, mark this item U. If the student is in preschool, mark this item U
	Related Requirements: 18, 111

II.A.3 Team Determination of Need for Additional Data

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.305(a)(2)	A team determined that existing data was sufficient or that additional data
	was needed.
SF, SASF, SCSF,	Otandont File Decises Methods Detamains whether a transfer and
SCSETI	Student File Review Method: Determine whether a team discussed and made a determination about the need for additional data following the
	review of existing data (before/simultaneous to parent consent obtention,
	before the collection of additional data, and/or before eligibility was
	determined).
	Examples:
	 Based on the review of existing data, the team determined that additional data were not needed = I
	The team determined that concerns about the student could not be addressed without collecting additional data = I
	There is no documentation that the team made the determination
	regarding the need for additional data = O
	Note: If the evaluation being reviewed originated from another district and
	there is no evidence of a team making this decision, mark this item U.
	Related Requirements: 18, 111
300.305(d)	For reevaluations only: when the team decided not to collect additional
	data, the parents were informed of the reasons for that decision and of their
SF, SASF, SCSF	right to request additional data.
	Student File Review Method: For reevaluations only, look for evidence
	that the parents were informed of the reason that the school did not plan to
	gather further information and of the parents' right to request additional
	data. Verify through documentation of a conversation, letter, or in the body
	of the evaluation report. It does not have to be (but may be) in the form of a
	prior written notice.
	Mark this item U for initial evaluations and reevaluations that required
	additional data.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Related Requirements: I8, I11
300.9 300.300(a)(1) 300.300(c)(1)(i) 300.300(c)(2)	If the team determined that additional data was needed, informed parental consent was obtained following the review of existing data (or for reevaluations, efforts were made to obtain consent, and no additional data could be collected) and before the collection of additional data.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Consent means: (a) The parent has been fully informed of all information relevant to the activity for which consent is sought, in his or her native language, or through another mode of communication. (b) The parent understands and agrees in writing to the carrying out of the activity for which his or her consent is sought, and the consent describes that activity.
	Student File Review Method: Determine whether informed, written parental consent, as described above, is documented. Written parental consent has to be in the native language or include evidence of an interpreter and has to include information relevant to the activity. For students 18 years or older whose rights have been transferred, look for written consent from the student. • If additional assessments are needed, and informed consent is obtained (see above), mark this item I. • If there is no documentation of informed parental consent, mark this item O. • If a parent did not provide informed written consent for all activities, and there is documentation in the evaluation of an additional assessment(s), mark this item O. • If no additional data is needed, mark this item U. • If the student transferred in with a current evaluation, and parent consent was not included in the records received, mark this item U. Note: Prior written notice (PWN) is needed as part of informed consent before gathering additional data (refer to line item IV.A.2). For information related to acceptable electronic signatures, see the Hot Topic regarding electronic signatures, dated July 2020. Related Requirements: I8, I11

II.A.4 Eligibility Considerations

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.304(c)4)	The student was assessed in all areas related to the suspected disability.
ARS 15-761(24) and	
(34)	Student File Review Method: Look for documentation of any of the
	following:

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
SF, SASF, SCSF	concerns brought forward in the pre-referral process, including
	preschool screenings/roundups
60-Day Correction	concerns brought forward through developmental and/or medical
	history
	review of existing data
	parent/teacher input
	any area where informed parental consent was obtained
	any area related to the student's suspected disability
	 inclusion of, but not limited to, any academic, social, behavioral, vision
	and hearing, or assistive technology needs
	For a preschool child with the eligibility of SLI, DD, or PSD, all developmental domains (cognition, language, motor, personal/social, and adaptive) were addressed in the evaluation. A CDA (comprehensive developmental assessment in all five domains) may be accomplished through a review of existing data, criterion-referenced assessments, norm-referenced assessments, observation, and parent input to determine eligibility. At least one norm-referenced assessment to obtain standard deviation information
	must be used to determine whether eligibility criteria are met. Note: If there were problems identified through the vision or hearing
	screening, the problems must be resolved prior to continuing with the evaluation unless the nature of the problem is part of the evaluation process and the strategies/instruments used during the evaluation take into account the vision or hearing issues. Vision and hearing screenings are required under the Arizona Department of Health Services , which is separate from IDEA and evaluation requirements. Under IDEA, vision and hearing would only be expected when a concern arises as part of the child's evaluation and/or related to the child's eligibility.
	 When testing a 2nd grader who failed hearing screenings, and parents have indicated a concern with the student's hearing, the evaluation team documented a hearing report provided by the parents from the pediatrician that indicated typical hearing impacted by seasonal allergies and ear infections. = I The student was failing to make progress in math, and statewide test scores were significantly below expectations. However, the evaluation did not address math as an area of concern. = O
	Related Requirements: 18, 19, 110, 111
300.304(b)(1)(ii)	Upon review of all data, the team documented issues related to the
SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSEAI	student's performance in the educational setting, to such a degree that specially designed instruction (SDI) is required, and how progress in the general curriculum is affected by the student's disability.
	Student File Review Method: Locate documentation of the overall impact

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	that the disability has on the student's education, including progress in the general curriculum. For a preschool child, progress means the general developmental progress of the child.
	This information must be student-specific and must not contain boilerplate statements, and it should address how the disability is manifesting in the classroom for that child.
	 Guiding questions that teams could use: What are the general characteristics of the disability? How is the student's access to the general curriculum impacted (all facets: social/emotional, grades, attendance, organization, etc.)? How is the student progressing in the general education curriculum (all facets: social/emotional, grades, attendance, organization, etc.)? What supports are already in place for the child that are assisting in the classroom? How is the student's progress affected by their disability or would be affected without the supports being provided? How is the disability manifesting in the classroom?
	A tool to assist the team in discussing the impact of the student's disability on progress in the general curriculum can be found on the PSM website
300.304(b)(1) 300.304(c)(6)	Upon review of all data , the student's educational needs to access the general curriculum are identified.
SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSEAI	Student File Review Method: Locate documentation that the team considered information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input, and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the student's physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior, in order to determine and document the educational needs of the child.
	 Examples: Because of the student's auditory processing disability, all instructional material should be presented in print media. = I Student is weak in auditory memory. = O Although student achievement in math does not evidence a significant discrepancy, given state assessment scores and teacher input, the team has determined that using manipulative aids will help the student improve math calculation skills. = I Student needs help in math. = O Student needs assistance in using positive behaviors as an alternative to reacting in an aggressive physical or verbal manner. = I Student needs behavioral support. = O Student needs generalization and practice in daily living skills. = I Because of the student's reading comprehension disability, the student should be provided with assistive technology (e.g., Kurzweil)

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	to access grade-level text. = I • Because of the student's reading disability, the student needs specialized instruction. = O
300.305(a)(2) (B)(iv) SF, SASF, SCSF	 Upon review of all data, for reevaluations only, the team considered and documented any additions or modifications to the special education or related services needed for the student to progress in the general curriculum. Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team considered the needs of the student in making progress toward annual goals and in the general curriculum. If progress was deemed insufficient, determine whether the team recommended additions, deletions, or revisions to the services. If no additions or modifications were needed, a statement to that effect must be included. Examples: Student is not making progress with math facts. Flashcard drills and weekly testing have not improved accuracy when completing math problems. It is recommended that manipulatives be incorporated into math instruction. = I Based on student progress, no additions or modifications are needed. = I Student's state assessment scores in math show improvement from "minimally proficient" to "partially proficient" on the grade-level standard. The current level of special education support received is meeting the student's needs. = I Student has continued to make adequate progress on all annual goals and is becoming more social in classes through active participation, so there are no changes needed at this time. = I Student is not making progress and the IEP team should determine what additions and modifications are needed. = O Student is still eligible for special education and in need of specially designed instruction in the areas of reading and math. = O N/A or not addressed = O Related Requirements: I8, I11
300.306(b) (1)(i)	A student must not be determined to be a student with a disability if the
300.306(b) (1)(ii) ARS 15- 761(2)(b)(i) ARS 15- 761(2)(b)(ii)	determinant factor is lack of appropriate instruction in reading and/or math. Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team considered the
SF, SASF, SCSF	lack of learning opportunities. There should be a clear statement of consideration within the evaluation documentation. A rule-out statement is sufficient only if there is no evidence of a lack of learning opportunities.
	For preschool students, lack of formal schooling/childcare is not considered a lack of appropriate instruction in reading and/or math.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	The lack of learning opportunities may include:
	Frequent school changes
	Poor attendance
	Multiple teachers in the same year
	Questionable home-school curriculum
300.306(b)(iii) ARS15- 761(2)(b)(iii)	If the student is not a native English speaker, the impact of limited English proficiency on progress in the general curriculum must be addressed.
SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSEAI	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the team documented their consideration of language proficiency (AZELLA or other formal/informal assessments). There should be a clear statement within the team documentation. A rule-out statement is sufficient only if there is no evidence of limited English proficiency (refer to Home Language Survey [HLS] and additional narrative throughout the student's documentation). If there is no data showing English language (EL) proficiency, there must be an explanation of the impact of English language acquisition as it relates to the student's progress in the general curriculum.
	Note: Students being previously withdrawn from EL (parent withdrawal or due to SPED) does not equate to EL proficiency and still requires documentation of the impact of English language acquisition.
	Guiding questions teams can use when discussing language proficiency data:
	What is the student's language proficiency?
	 Is language acquisition impacting the student's progress in the general curriculum?
	Does the student have language acquisition needs?
	How is language acquisition manifesting in the classroom?
	A tool to assist the team in discussing the impact of limited English
	proficiency on progress in the general curriculum can be found on the PSM
	website
300.306(a)(1)	Upon review of all data, a team determined that the student has a specific
	category of disability.
SF, SASF, SCSF	
00.5	Student File Review Method: Locate documentation of the team's decision
60-Day Correction	regarding the specific disability category. All criteria for classifying any given disability should be reported and clearly demonstrated with supporting data.
	Evamples
	 Examples: The evaluation documents that multiple people had a role in making the classification decision and that the decision was made using data from a variety of sources. = I There is no eligibility determination. = O
	Decision was made by one person, not a team. = O

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Related Requirements: 18, 111
300.306 (a)(1) ARS 15-761 (30) & (32) SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	 Upon review of all data, a team determined that the student needs special education and related services. Student File Review Method: Locate documentation of the eligibility for special education that is based on the presence of a disability and the need for specialized instruction. Examples: The evaluation documents that multiple people had a role in making the determination that special education and related services are needed. = I There is no determination of the need for special education and related services. = O The decision was made by one person, not a team. = O
	Related Requirements: 18, 111
300.304 (c)(1) & (3)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were administered in a language and form most likely to yield accurate information.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Review assessments and other evaluation
60-Day Correction	materials to ensure that they were selected and administered in a nondiscriminatory racial or cultural manner and that they were administered in a form and language most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally unless it was not feasible to do so. A simple statement to this effect is insufficient if the evidence is contrary. Evidence can be found in the HLS, narrative within the evaluation, etc. If there is no evidence of language proficiency, there must be a data-based explanation of the assessments chosen and the validity of those assessment results.
	Note : Students who were previously withdrawn (WD) from EL (parent WD or due to SPED) still require consideration of language through data-based decisions. For additional information specific to students previously WD due to SPED, please refer to the English Learners Hot Topic , dated July 2019.
	 Examples: There is evidence that the child is not proficient in English (through the Home Language Survey or the narrative), and all tests were administered in English. = O Evidence shows that the child is not proficient in English, and tests were administered in the native language. = I The child is monolingual Urdu, and all tests were administered that are nonverbal or non-language-based. = I There is evidence that the child is not proficient in English (HLS, narrative, etc.), and the parent reports that the child speaks English.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	The parent reports that the child speaks English, and documentation indicates the child has been instructed in English for 5 years. All tests are administered in English. = O • The child's level of language proficiency was not determined and/or documented. = O • The child is monolingual Navajo, and the teacher aide (trained to assist in assessment) interprets for the child during testing. = I • The child has a hearing impairment, and tests were administered that are nonverbal or non-language-based or were developed/normed for children with a hearing impairment. = I • AZELLA scores indicate that the child is not proficient in English. The evaluation documents data from assessments (formal and informal) that compare the student's performance in English vs their native language. Additionally, the team synthesized data in the evaluation to explain that assessments in English would yield the most accurate assessment results. = I Related Requirements: 19, 110, 111
ARS 15-943(2)(b)	The student eligibility category reported in AZEDS matches the student's
ARS 15-1042	current evaluation.
	Student File Review Method: Compare the eligibility reported on the SPED 72 to ensure data matches the current eligibility documented in the most recent evaluation.
	Examples: • SPED 72 reports student as SLD and current evaluation determined
	eligibility as SLD. = I
	 SPED 72 reports federal primary as SLD and secondary as SLI, and it appears to be the opposite on the eligibility determination form from the evaluation team. = I (TA provided to ensure the most accurate reporting)
	 SPED 72 reports the student as DD, but the most recent evaluation changed eligibility from SLI to SLD. = 0
	 SPED 72 reports the student as SLD, but the current evaluation has the child eligible as SLD and SLI. = I (TA provided to ensure the most accurate reporting)
	 Initial evaluation determined that the student is eligible under SLI, but SPED 72 does not show the student being reported. = 0
	 Current evaluation shows that the student was phased out (no longer eligible) but is still reported as eligible on the SPED 72. = O
300.8(c)(1) ARS 15-761(1)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Autism (A): a developmental disability that significantly affects verbal and nonverbal communication and social interaction and adversely affects

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	educational performance.
300.8(b) ARS 15-761(3)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF	Developmental Delay (DD): performance by a child who is at least three years of age, but under ten years of age on a norm-referenced test that measures at least one and one-half, but not more than three, standard deviations below the mean for children of the same chronological age in two or more of the following areas: (a) Cognitive development (b) Physical development (c) Communication development (d) Social or emotional development (e) Adaptive development
	For preschool only: The results of the norm-referenced measure must be corroborated by information from a comprehensive developmental assessment and from parental input, if available, as measured by a judgment-based assessment or survey. A CDA (comprehensive developmental assessment in all five domains) may be accomplished through a review of existing data, criterion-referenced assessments, norm-referenced assessments, observation, and parent input. For the purpose of determining eligibility, at least one norm-referenced assessment to obtain standard deviation information must be used to determine whether eligibility criteria are met. If there is a discrepancy between the measures, the evaluation team shall determine eligibility based on a preponderance of the information presented. Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary, specifically to explain which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.
300.8(c)(4) ARS 15-761(7)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
R7-2-401.E.7.a	Emotional Disability (ED) : verification by a qualified professional of one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a
SF, SASF, SCSF	marked degree that adversely affects educational performance: inability to learn, inability to build or maintain relationships, inappropriate
60-Day Correction	behavior/feelings, unhappiness or depression, physical symptoms/fears, or schizophrenia, any of which adversely affects education performance.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c)(5) ARS 15-761(8)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
R7-2-401.E.7.b	Hearing Impairment (HI): verification by a qualified professional of a hearing impairment that interferes with the student's performance in the educational
SF, SASF, SCSF	environment and requires the provision of special education and related services. If there is evidence that a student's condition has changed, look for

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
60-Day Correction	documentation that the team discussed the need for an updated medical
	verification.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
R7-2-401.E.7.b	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Hearing Impairment (HI) : evaluation of the language proficiency of the student, including documentation of the student's mode of communication and its effectiveness for the student in accessing the general curriculum.
ARS 15-761(14)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Mild Intellectual Disability (MIID): performance on standard measures of intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior is between two and three standard deviations (SD) below the mean for students of the same age.
	Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
ARS 15-761(15)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Moderate Intellectual Disability (MOID): performance on standard measures of intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior is between three and four standard deviations (SD) below the mean for students of the same age.
	Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c)(7) ARS15-761(17)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	Multiple Disabilities (MD): multiple disabilities include two or more of the following: HI, OI, MOID, and/or VI or a student with one of the disabilities already listed in this section existing concurrently with MIID, ED, or SLD.
JO-Day Gorrection	Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
ARS 15-761(18)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	Multiple Disabilities with Severe Sensory Impairment (MD-SSI): multiple disabilities include (1) severe visual impairment or hearing impairment with another severe disability or (2) severe visual impairment and severe hearing impairment.
	Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c)(9) ARS 15-761(20) R7-2-401.E.7.c SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for: Other Health Impaired (OHI): verification by a qualified professional of limited strength, vitality, or alertness, including heightened alertness to environmental stimuli (such as ADD or AD/HD) that is due to chronic or acute health problems and adversely affects student performance. If there is evidence that a student's condition has changed, look for documentation that the team discussed the need for an updated medical verification.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c)(8) ARS 15-761(19) R7-2-401.E.7.e SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for: Orthopedic Impairment (OI): verification by a qualified professional of one or more severe orthopedic impairments, including those caused by congenital anomaly, disease, and other causes, such as amputation or cerebral palsy, and that adversely affect educational performance. If there is evidence that a student's condition has changed, look for documentation that the team discussed the need for updated medical verification.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
ARS 15-761(24)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF	Preschool Severe Delay (PSD): more than three standard deviations below the mean in one or more of the following areas: cognitive, motor, communication, social/emotional, or adaptive development. A CDA (comprehensive developmental assessment in all five domains) may be accomplished through a review of existing data, criterion-referenced assessments, norm-referenced assessments, observation, and parent input.

	Explanation and Review Method
	For the purpose of determining eligibility, at least one norm-referenced assessment to obtain standard deviation information must be used to determine whether eligibility criteria are met.
	The results of the norm-referenced measure must be corroborated by information from a comprehensive developmental assessment and parental input, if available, as measured by a judgment-based assessment or survey. If there is a discrepancy between the measures, the evaluation team shall determine eligibility based on a preponderance of the information presented.
	Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.
300.8(c)(11)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
ARS 15-761(34)(a) SF, SASF, SCSF	Speech or Language Impairment (SLI): a communication disorder such as stuttering; impaired articulation; severe disorders of syntax, semantics, or vocabulary or functional language skills; or a voice impairment to the extent that it calls attention to itself, interferes with communication, or causes a student to be maladjusted.
	For a preschool student, performance on a norm-referenced language test that measures at least one and one-half standard deviations below the mean. The results of this norm-referenced measure must be corroborated by information from a comprehensive developmental assessment and parental input. A CDA (comprehensive developmental assessment in all five domains) may be accomplished through a review of existing data, criterion-referenced assessments, norm-referenced assessments, observation, and parent input. For the purpose of determining eligibility, at least one norm-referenced assessment to obtain standard deviation information must be used to determine whether eligibility criteria are met. Additionally, eligibility for a preschool child under this category can only be determined if the child is not eligible under another preschool category or developmental delay.
	Related Requirements: I9, I10
300.8(c)(10) 300.307	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
300.309 ARS 15-761(33) R7-2-401.E.7.d	Specific Learning Disability (SLD): a determination of whether the child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both that is relative to age; state-approved, grade-level standards; or intellectual development that meets the public education
SF, SASF, SCSF	 agency criteria through one of the following methods: A discrepancy between achievement and ability The child's response to scientific, research-based interventions Other alternative research-based procedures

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Each PEA must establish its own local-school-board-approved criteria for SLD eligibility criteria. Documentation for determining a child eligible as having a specific learning disability should include a synthesis of data and criteria used, and both should match the PEA's board-approved policies and procedures. For additional information related to SLD determination, refer to the Specific Learning Disability Eligibility Criteria Hot Topic from October 2019. Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate. Related Requirements: 19, 110, 111
300.311(b)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Specific Learning Disability (SLD): a certification of each team member's agreement or disagreement must be included. This certification may be contained in the report or may be located on a separate eligibility statement.
	Note: If the evaluation being reviewed originated from another district and the team member agreement/disagreement was not documented, mark this item U .
	Related Requirements: I9, I10, I11
300.311(a)(6)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Specific Learning Disability (SLD): a determination of the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage must be included. Documentation can be found anywhere throughout the evaluation. Related Requirements: I9, I10, I11
ARS 15-761(29)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
SF, SASF, SCSF	Severe Intellectual Disability (SID): performance on a standard measure of intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior at least four SD below the mean for a student of the same age. This should include an explanation of scores that may have been unable to be measured based on the assessment scoring protocols as it relates to the student's performance. Note: Where there are multiple standard scores that are discrepant or may not fall into the range required, a synthesis of data is necessary to explain, specifically, which standard scores were used by the team to determine eligibility and why those scores are most accurate.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c)(12) ARS 15-761(38)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
R7-2-401.E.7.h	Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI): verification by a qualified professional of an acquired injury to the brain that is caused by an external physical force and
SF, SASF, SCSF	that results in total or partial functional disability, psychosocial impairment, or both that adversely affect educational performance. If there is evidence that
60-Day Correction	a student's condition has changed, look for documentation that the team discussed the need for an updated medical verification.
	Related Requirements: 19, 110
300.8(c) (13) ARS 15-761(39)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
R7-2-401.E.7.i ′	Visual Impairment (VI): verification by a qualified professional of a visual impairment that interferes with the student's performance in the educational
SF, SASF, SCSF 60-Day Correction	environment and that requires the provision of special education and related services. If there is evidence that a student's condition has changed, look for documentation that the team discussed the need for an updated medical verification.
	Related Requirements: I9, I10
300.324(a)(2)(iii) ARS 15-761(39)	Documentation supports the category and substantiates eligibility for:
ARS 15-214(A)(1)	Visual Impairment (VI): individualized Braille literacy assessment completed for students who are blind. This assessment should address the effect that
SF, SASF, SCSF	the visual impairment has on reading and writing performance that is commensurate with the student's ability.
	If a student with a visual impairment is not blind, mark this item U .

II.A.5 Initial Evaluations Completed within 60 Calendar Days of Receipt of Informed Written Consent of Parent

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.301(c)(i)	The initial evaluation of a student was completed within 60 calendar days of
R7-2-401.E.3	receipt of informed written consent from the parent(s). For students
R7-2-401.E.4	transitioning from the Arizona Early Intervention Program (AzEIP),
R7-2-401.E.5	consider the evaluation as an initial evaluation.
SF, SASF, DRSF,	The 60-day evaluation period may have been extended for an additional 30
SCSF	days, provided that it was in the best interest of the child and that the
	parents and PEA agreed in writing to such an extension.
60-Day Correction	

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the PEA conducted the initial evaluation within 60 calendar days of receipt of informed parental consent. The 60-day period begins with the written informed consent and ends with the team's determination of eligibility. If the parent requested the evaluation and the team concurred, the 60-day period began when the PEA received the written informed consent.
	If the timeline for the evaluation was not met, mark this item O .
	Enter the number of days beyond 60 and why the timeline was not met on the Student Form.
	If another PEA conducted this evaluation, or if the parent repeatedly failed or refused to make the child available, the timeline does not apply. Mark this item ${\bf U}$.
	For initial evaluations of students who did not qualify, make the compliance call on this line item only.
	Related Requirements: I11

Section III: Individualized Education Program

When considering the line items within the IEP section, be sure to review the IEP in its entirety. Compliance calls should be made based on the IEP content as a whole.

III.A.1 Current IEP

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.323(a)	There is a current IEP.
300.323(b)	
	Student File Review Method: Record the meeting date when the most
SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	recent IEP was developed. If the IEP was developed or revised less than 365 days before the date of the file review, the IEP is current. Mark any other status in noncompliance (O).
60-Day Correction	, , ,
	This item cannot be marked U .
	If there is no current IEP, mark this item O and mark line items III.A.2 through III.A.8 with a U .

III.A.2 IEP Review/Revision and Participants

III./ \.Z ILI I\CVICV	W/Revision and Farticipants
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.320(a)	Each IEP is reviewed/revised at least annually.
300.323(a)	
300.324(b)	Student File Review Method: If the IEP being reviewed is an initial IEP,
R7-2-401.G.6	mark this item U . If another IEP exists, enter the meeting date the previous IEP was developed. Compare that date with the meeting date of the current
SF, SASF, SCSF	IEP to determine whether an IEP review was conducted within the last 365 days.
	Examples: December 4, 2025 to December 3, 2026 = I
	December 4, 2025 to December 4, 2026 = I
	December 4, 2025 to December 5, 2026 = O
	Related Requirements: 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 112, 113, 114
300.321(a)(1-7)	The IEP team meeting included the required participants.
300.321(b)(1)	
300.324(a)(4)(i)	Student File Review Method: Review the file for evidence of the following
300.325(a)(2)	participants:
300.321(e) (1) & (2)	One or both of the student's parents
05 0405 0005	Not less than one regular education teacher of the student; for
SF, SASF, SCSF	preschool, this might be a Head Start teacher, PEA preschool teacher, or a kindergarten teacher
	 Not less than one special education teacher or special education provider of the student
	A representative of the PEA who is qualified to provide or supervise
	the provision of special education and who is knowledgeable of
	general curriculum and availability of resources (must have authority

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	to commit the resources needed to implement the IEP) • An individual who can interpret instructional implications of evaluations Note: For a student being placed in an approved private day school, look for evidence that a representative of the approved private day school participated in the IEP meeting.
	 The people listed above must have been in attendance at the meeting unless the statutory stipulations below are fulfilled: 1. A member of the IEP team is not required to attend an IEP meeting, in whole or in part, if the parent of a child with a disability and the PEA agree that the member's attendance is not necessary because the member's area of the curriculum or related services is not being modified or discussed in the meeting. 2. A member of the IEP team may be excused from attending an IEP meeting, in whole or in part, when the meeting involves a modification to or discussion of the member's area of the curriculum or related services, if A. the parent and the local educational agency consent to the excusal B. the member submits in writing to the parent and the IEP team input into the development of the IEP prior to the meeting. A parent's agreement under #1 and #2 above must be in writing.
	Related Requirements: I1, I2, I3, I4, I7, I8, I12, I13, I14

III.A.3 General Required Components of the IEP Are Included

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.320(a)(1)	The IEP includes the student's present level of academic achievement and
300.324(a)(1)	functional performance (PLAAFP), which should include strengths and needs and how the disability affects the student's involvement and progress
SF, SASF, SCSF	in the general curriculum. Information should relate to the most recent evaluation data as well as include current classroom data.
	By the end of the student's 9 th grade year, or age 16, whichever is first, the student's current functioning in relation to identified post school outcomes should be described in the PLAAFP (or in another section of the IEP related to transition).
	Student File Review Method: Review the IEP to determine whether there is a present level of academic achievement and functional performance. Look for documentation more extensive than test scores or grade-level equivalents. Areas pertinent to the student's needs must be addressed in the PLAAFP.
	This requirement includes preschool students at the functional or readiness level. In annual IEP reviews of preschool students, assessment data from Teaching Strategies GOLD/My Teaching Strategies/COS may be included.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Related Requirements: I1, I2, I3, I4, I7, I8, I12, I13, I14
300.320(a)(2)(i) SF, SASF, SCSF	The IEP includes measurable annual goals, including academic and functional goals, that reflect the needs identified in the PLAAFP and current assessment data. How the goals will be measured must be clearly documented.
	Student File Review Method: Review the IEP to determine whether there are annual goals that are measurable and reflect student needs. Baseline measurement must be documented either in the PLAAFP or in the goal statement for progress toward the goal to be measurable. Both the measurability and means to measure progress must be evident for this component to be in compliance. A tool to assist the team in developing measurable annual goals can be found on the PSM website .
300.320(a)(6)(ii)	The IEP documents the student's eligibility for Alternate Assessments.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: If the IEP team determines eligibility for the
60-Day Correction	student to participate in Arizona's Alternate Assessment(s), then the most current Arizona Alternate Assessment Eligibility Determination Form should be in the student's file, to include Alternate ELPA. This includes agreement/ disagreement from all IEP team members. (could be documented in a variety of ways; through signatures, PWN, etc.) Alternate assessment eligibility should be considered regardless of student grade level as it may impact the student's ability to participate in alternate state assessments, screeners, and district alternate assessments, if not included.
	 Examples: Current AZ Alternate Assessment Eligibility Form is in the file and is fully completed to show eligibility for the Alternate Assessments. = I Form is in the file but is not fully completed. = O Form is not in the file. = O.
	Mark this item U if the student is not eligible for Alternate Assessments (inclusive of the alternate ELPA).
	Note: IEP teams need to determine eligibility for participation in the Alternate Assessment in accordance with timelines established by <u>ADE assessment.</u>
	Related Requirements: I3, I5, I6, I7
300.320(a)(2)(ii)	For a student taking alternate assessments only (inclusive of the alternate ELPA), the IEP shall include short-term instructional objective(s) or
SF, SASF, SCSF	benchmark(s) for each goal.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	 Student File Review Method: Determine whether the IEP of a child who takes alternate assessments includes a description of benchmarks or short-term objectives. Mark this item I if benchmark(s)/short-term objective(s) are present for all goals. Mark this item O if there are none. Mark this item O if benchmark(s)/objective(s) are missing for any goals. Mark this item U if the student is not eligible for alternate assessments. Related Requirements: I3, I5, I6, I7
300.320(a)(3)(ii)	The current IEP includes a description of when periodic reports on the
SF, SASF, SCSF	progress the child is making toward meeting the annual goals (such as through the use of quarterly or other periodic reports, concurrent with the issuance of report cards) will be provided.
	The current progress report was provided to the parents as outlined in the IEP and included a measurement of progress toward IEP goals.
	Student File Review Method: Review the current IEP to determine whether there is a description of when progress reports will be provided to parents. Review the most recent progress report to determine whether it was provided in accordance with the timeline described in the IEP.
	Timeline for progress reporting should be understandable to the parent. If multiple instances are documented in the IEP, then there should be evidence of the progress report for all instances.
	Information should be provided for each goal, and the rate of progress should be reported in a manner consistent with the PLAAFP and/or the associated goals.
	For recently implemented IEPs, progress reporting is still required for new goals even if the student's progress is still at baseline.
	If there is not a description of when progress reports will be provided, mark this item O .
	If the current progress report was not provided in accordance with the timeline described in the IEP, mark this item O .
	If annual measurable goals are out, mark this item O .

III.A.4 Special Education and Related Services

III.A.4 Special Education and Related Services		
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method	
300.18(b)	The IEP describes the specially designed instruction (special education	
300.39	services) to be provided.	
300.320(a)(4)		
ARS 15-763.A	Specially designed instruction (SDI) means "adapting, as appropriate, to	
ARS 15-183(C)(5) &	the needs of a student, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction	
(E)(5)	to address the unique needs that result from the student's disability and to	
R7-2-401.G.4	ensure access to the general curriculum as identified in the academic	
	standards adopted by the state board of education."	
SF, SASF, SCFS		
	Student File Review Method: Review the entire IEP for a clear description	
	of the specially designed instruction that adapts, as appropriate, to the	
	needs of a student, the content, methodology, or delivery of instruction to	
	address the unique needs that result from the student's disability and to	
	ensure access to the general curriculum.	
	Review the following items when general education or other non-special	
	education certified providers are noted in a student's individualized	
	education program (IEP) as the service provider for the specially designed	
	instruction:	
	An explanation of why the use of a general education teacher or	
	other non-special education-certificated provider is appropriate to	
	meet the needs of that specific student and to ensure access to the	
	general education curriculum	
	An explanation of how certificated special education personnel will be	
	involved in the planning, progress monitoring, or delivery of SDI	
	 Verify the certification of the special education teacher of the child 	
	present at the IEP meeting through the Arizona Department of	
	Education's Online Arizona Certification Information System (OACIS)	
	 Verify the certification of the individual who is providing SDI, if 	
	different from the special education teacher of the child (not	
	applicable for Charter PEAs)	
	Guiding questions teams can consider when discussing SDI:	
	What content is being taught and what instructional practices are in	
	place in the general education classroom?	
	 What differentiated instructional practices/Multi-Tiered Systems of 	
	Support are already in place in the general education classroom?	
	 What changes to content, delivery, or methodology are needed for 	
	the student?	
	What specially designed instruction is needed?	
	Additional resources related to <u>SDI can be located under training materials</u> .	
	Related Requirements: 15, 16	
300.34(a)	The IEP includes the consideration of related services to be provided.	
300.34(a) 300.320(a)(4)	The IEI moldes the consideration of related services to be provided.	
333.3 <u>2</u> 3(4)(1)		

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
R7-2-401.G.4	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the IEP team considered
SF, SASF, SCSF	the need for related services. If there are no related services indicated on the IEP, there must be some documentation that the team considered and rejected the need. If the team determined that related services were needed, the services must be clearly specified in the IEP. Transition services may be considered as a related service if they are required to assist a child with a disability to benefit from special education.
	 Examples: Door-to-door transportation = I Educational interpreter = I Occupational therapy (sensory integration) = I Counseling for stress management strategies = I Speech therapy (expressive language) = I Parental counseling and training = I Team considered related services: none were needed = I N/A = O Related Requirements: I5, I6
300.320(a)(4)	The IEP includes any supplementary aids, services, and program
300.324(a)(3)(ii) 300.34(a) 300.42 R7-2-401.B.1,13 SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSEAI	modifications to be provided. Student File Review Method: Review the entire IEP to determine whether supplementary aids and services are to be provided or if program modifications are to be made.
	Supplementary aids and services are defined as "aids, services, and other supports that are provided in general education classes or other education-related settings to enable students with disabilities to be educated with nondisabled students to the maximum extent appropriate." Examples include, but are not limited to, orientation and mobility training, interpreter assistance, assistive technology devices or services, and instructional aides.
	Program modifications are defined as "substantial changes in what a student is expected to learn and to demonstrate. Changes may be made in the instructional level, the content, or the performance criteria. Such changes are made to provide a student with meaningful and productive learning experiences, environments, and assessments based on individual needs and abilities."
	 Examples: Student will use a pencil grip whenever she is working on a written assignment. = I Student may use a calculator for math problems. = I Student will utilize a daily communication book (or homework assignment notebook) that will move between home and school with

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	relevant notes for the parent/teacher. = I
	Student will require an aide for toileting assistance. = I
	A social skills coach will meet with student twice a week during P.E. = I
	Student will have a sign language interpreter during classroom discussions. = I
	 Considered and not required at this time. = I N/A = O
	Left blank and not addressed elsewhere in the IEP = 0
	Related Requirements: 15, 16
300.320(4) 300.324(a)(3)(ii)	The IEP includes a statement of supports that will be provided to school personnel.
SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSEAI	Student File Review Method: Determine whether appropriate supports were considered. This area of the IEP should not be left blank but may be incorporated in various locations in the document.
	 Examples: Considered, but not needed at this time = I In-service training on tube feeding = I Staff and parent in-service on use of assistive technology device = I
	 Special education consultation on modifications for weekly tests in spelling = I Paraprofessional training on positive behavioral supports = I Special education consultation (when this is not individualized) = O
	 N/A = O Teacher training = O Providing copy of IEP = O
	1 Toviding dopy of IET
	Related Requirements: 15, 16
300.320(a)(7)	The location, frequency, and duration of each special education service,
SF, SASF, SCSF	related service, supplementary aid and service, support for school personnel, and modification are included.
	Student File Review Method: Location of services generally refers to the type of environment that is the appropriate place for provision of the service. The location should not be a specific room (e.g., Mrs. Smith's class) but should reflect the type of location (special education classroom or general math class).
	Frequency generally refers to how often a child will receive a service (such as the number of times per day or per week).
	Duration generally refers to how long each session will last (such as the number of minutes).
	25

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	This item cannot be marked U .
	Examples: Location: Special Education Classroom = I General Education Classroom = I General Education Classroom/Special Education Classroom = O Special schools = O Mr. Wilson = O
	 Frequency and duration: Pre-teaching vocabulary: Three 30-minute sessions per week = I Pre-teaching vocabulary: 90 minutes per week = O Receptive language therapy: Four 10-minute sessions per month = I Receptive language therapy: 40 minutes/month = O Counseling: Two 30-minute sessions per month = I Counseling: 3500 minutes/yr. = O Consultation for modifying assignments: Once weekly for 30 minutes = I Consultation for modifying assignments: as needed = O
	For more information on location, frequency, and duration, refer to the <u>Frequency and Duration Hot Topic</u> from March 2018.
300.106 ARS 15-881 R7-2-408	The IEP includes consideration of the need for extended school year services (ESY).
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method : Determine whether the decision about the need for ESY was made on an individual basis at the IEP meeting. ESY cannot be excluded on the basis of a particular category of disability, the age of the student, or the availability of PEA resources. If the IEP indicates that ESY eligibility will be determined at a later date, a decision for services during the summer must be made no later than 45 days prior to the last day of school.
	This item cannot be marked U .
	If there is an indication that ESY services were considered on an individual basis, mark this item I .
300.320(a)(5)	The extent to which the student will not participate with nondisabled peers is explained.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Determine whether the IEP contains an explanation of the extent to which the student will not be involved with nondisabled students and why the instruction cannot be provided in a less restrictive environment. This explanation could be documented in a variety of ways or places within the IEP. The explanation must be

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	individualized.
	The student's LRE must be determined on an individualized basis dictated by student's strengths/needs and not on a certain disability category, disability-driven program, or a PEA's staffing.
	This item cannot be marked U .
	 Guiding questions teams can consider when discussing LRE: What is the student's current level of functioning? What services does the child need to access and progress in the general curriculum?
	 What modifications does the child need to access and progress in the general education curriculum?
	 What additional supports does the child need to access and progress in the general education curriculum?
	 Can the services, supports and/or modifications be provided in the general education classroom? If not, why?
	A tool to assist the team in discussing placement can be found on the <u>PSM</u> <u>website</u> .
	Related Requirements: I5, I6
ARS 15-943(2)(b) ARS 15-1042	Student's reported LRE matches current IEP placement.
` , ` ,	Student's reported LRE matches current IEP placement. Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP.
ARS 15-1042 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)	Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP.
ARS 15-1042 20 U.S.C.	 Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP. Examples: SPED72 reports student LRE Code as A and current IEP shows placement with nondisabled peers for more than 80% of the day. = I SPED72 reports student as LRE Code A, but most recent IEP changed placement with nondisabled peers to less than 40% (LRE
ARS 15-1042 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)	 Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP. Examples: SPED72 reports student LRE Code as A and current IEP shows placement with nondisabled peers for more than 80% of the day. = I SPED72 reports student as LRE Code A, but most recent IEP changed placement with nondisabled peers to less than 40% (LRE C) of the day. = O IEP documentation shows student placed in a self-contained environment with no exposure to nondisabled peers and SPED72 reports student as LRE Code as C. = I
ARS 15-1042 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)	 Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP. Examples: SPED72 reports student LRE Code as A and current IEP shows placement with nondisabled peers for more than 80% of the day. = I SPED72 reports student as LRE Code A, but most recent IEP changed placement with nondisabled peers to less than 40% (LRE C) of the day. = O IEP documentation shows student placed in a self-contained environment with no exposure to nondisabled peers and SPED72
ARS 15-1042 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A)	 Student File Review Method: Compare the current LRE Code reported on the SPED72 to the current placement documented in the most recent IEP. Examples: SPED72 reports student LRE Code as A and current IEP shows placement with nondisabled peers for more than 80% of the day. = I SPED72 reports student as LRE Code A, but most recent IEP changed placement with nondisabled peers to less than 40% (LRE C) of the day. = O IEP documentation shows student placed in a self-contained environment with no exposure to nondisabled peers and SPED72 reports student as LRE Code as C. = I IEP documentation shows student being educated in an environment where there is no exposure to nondisabled peers, but

III.A.6 Postsecondary Transition Components

Documentation of transition services for students to be in effect in the IEP in place when the student ends 9th grade or age 16, whichever is first, or earlier, as determined necessary by the student's IEP **Review the entire IEP for documentation of these components.** ESS provides a sample <u>transition</u> planning grid that can be utilized to assist in transition planning.

<u>pianning gnd</u> that can t	pe utilized to assist in transition planning.
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.320(b)(1) SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	Documentation of measurable postsecondary goals (MPGs) in the areas of education/training and employment, and, when appropriate, independent living skills.
3331	Student File Review Method: Review the IEP to determine whether it
60-Day Correction	includes measurable postsecondary goals in the following areas: education/training, employment, and, when appropriate , independent living skills. Goals must reflect the student's strengths, interests, and preferences; occur after high school; and be able to be measured. These areas may be combined into one goal or be contained in separate goals. The training/education and employment goals are required. The measurable postsecondary goal related to independent living is the only optional goal, and the IEP team determines if it is appropriate to include a goal in this area.
	If the postsecondary goals are stated in such a way that one could measure the achievement of the goal after leaving high school, mark this item I .
	If there is no evidence of postsecondary goals, if the postsecondary goals are not measurable, if the required areas are not addressed, or if the goals are not postsecondary, mark this item O .
	Related Requirements: I13
300.320(b)	Documentation that measurable postsecondary goals are updated annually.
SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	 Student File Review Method: Review the IEP to determine whether postsecondary goals were addressed/updated in conjunction with the development of the current IEP. If postsecondary goal(s) for education/training, employment, and independent living (as needed) are documented in the student's current IEP, mark the item I. If postsecondary goal(s) for education/training, employment, and independent living (as needed) are not documented in the student's current IEP, mark the item O.
	Related Requirements: 113
300.320(b)(1)	Documentation that the measurable postsecondary goal(s) (MPGs) were based upon age-appropriate transition assessment(s).

-	
Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that at least one age-appropriate transition assessment was used to provide information on the student's strengths, preferences, and interests regarding the postsecondary goal(s). The information may be located in multiple places within the IEP, including the PLAAFP or the transition services page. No specific number of assessments is required, and they may be formal or informal. Assessment data should clearly support student strengths, preferences, and interests as they relate to the MPGs. Formal or informal transition assessment(s) should be selected based on the individual needs of the student. Strengths: Documentation that student possesses the skills needed to perform the job/career Preferences: Requires action or effort from the student toward goals, activities, or interests (which could include completion of aligned transition services or activities) Interests: Expression of the student's likes or wants (is not indicative of strengths or preferences) • If the IEP contains documentation of strengths, preferences and interests that align to the MPGs and/or how assessment information was used in the development of the postsecondary goal(s) (whether measurable or not), mark this item I. • If there is simply a boilerplate statement, or if there is no documentation of any age-appropriate transition assessment(s) outlining strengths, preferences and interests, mark this item O. For additional information on secondary transition assessments view the secondary transition web page. Related Requirements: I13
300.320(b)(2)	Documentation of at least one transition service/activity that focuses on
SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	improvement of the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate movement from school to post-school, as identified in the measurable postsecondary goals.
	For each postsecondary goal, there must be documentation of a type of instruction, related service, community experience or development of employment, other post-school adult living objectives, and, if appropriate, acquisition of daily living skill(s) and provision of a functional vocational evaluation listed in association with meeting the postsecondary goal(s).

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Strategies may address activities performed on the school campus and during school hours as well as off-site and during non-school hours. The IEP team does not need to include all components if they are not appropriate for the student.
	Services/activities are only needed in areas that will reasonably enable the student to reach the measurable postsecondary goals.
	Student File Review Method: Review the IEP for evidence of at least one transition service/activity to assist the student in reaching each of their measurable postsecondary goals. One transition service/activity may support multiple measurable postsecondary goals. Services/activities should be unique to the student and related to the student's MPGs. Boilerplate statements, or services/activities available to all students would not be considered individualized and therefore may not be compliant.
	Related Requirements: I13
300.320(b)(2) SF, SASF, DRSF,	Transition services include courses of study that focus on improving the academic and functional achievement of the student to facilitate the movement from school to post-school.
SCSF	Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that transition services include course(s) of study that align with the student's postsecondary goal(s). Course of study should include course(s) that lead to a diploma but should not be a generic or a general graduation plan. A single course can support more than one MPG.
	If there is evidence of a course title that clearly aligns with the student's MPGs (student MPG is to be a chef and "Culinary Arts" is listed as a course), mark this item I.
	If the course of study only includes courses required for graduation and there is no documentation clarifying how the course(s) support the MPGs, mark this item O .
	If the courses of study do not align with the student's identified measurable postsecondary goals and/or there is no clarifying documentation as to how the course(s) support the student's MPGs, mark this item O .
	Related Requirements: I13
20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)	Documentation of annual IEP goals that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.
SF, SASF, DRSF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: Review the IEP for documentation of annual goal(s) that is/are related to the student's transition service needs. At least one annual IEP goal that supports each measurable postsecondary goal is

required. One annual IEP goal (whether measurable or not) can support multiple postsecondary goals. Related Requirements: I13 Documentation that the student was invited to the IEP meeting when postsecondary transition services were being discussed. Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that the student was invited to the meeting.
Related Requirements: I13 Documentation that the student was invited to the IEP meeting when postsecondary transition services were being discussed. Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that the student was
Documentation that the student was invited to the IEP meeting when postsecondary transition services were being discussed. Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that the student was
postsecondary transition services were being discussed. Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that the student was
Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that the student was
If the student was in attendance or there is clear evidence that the student was invited (meeting notice addressed to student), mark this item I.
If there is no documentation evident, mark this item O .
Related Requirements: I13
Evidence that a representative of another agency that is likely to provide and/or pay for transition services has been invited to the meeting after
consent from the parent or the student who has reached the age of majority.
Student File Review Method: For the current year, is there evidence in the IEP that representatives of any of the following agencies (including, but not limited to, these listed) were invited to participate in the IEP development: postsecondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community? If so, was consent obtained from the parent (or student, for a student at the age of majority) prior to the meeting invitation? • There is written evidence of consent of parent or adult student and clear evidence that the agency was then invited after consent. = I • There is an agency invited but no evidence of written consent. = O • The IEP team determined that no outside agency was needed. = U Related Requirements: I13

III.A.7 Additional Postsecondary Transition Components

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
WIOA Section 511	Progress reports for a transition-aged student must address the student's
Letter to Pugh	progress toward meeting their postsecondary goals by documenting the
	transition service(s) provided/completed by the student during the progress
SF, SASF, SCSF	reporting period.
	Student File Review Method: Look for documentation that indicates
	progress on transition service(s)/activity(ies) during the most recent
	progress reporting period that are explicitly stated in the IEP and/or are
	aligned to the student's MPGs.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Documentation can be included along with the progress reporting for annual goals or as a separate report.
300.320(c) SF, SASF, SCSF	By age 17, the student's IEP must contain a statement that the student has been informed of the rights that will transfer to the student at age 18.
	Student File Review Method: Look for a statement in the IEP that the parent and student have been informed of the rights that will transfer to the student upon reaching the age of majority. Documentation may consist of items such as prior written notice or a statement within the IEP.
	If the student is 17, and there is evidence that the student and parent have been informed that rights transfer, mark this item I .
	If the student is 17, and there is no evidence that the student and parent have been informed that rights transfer, mark this item O .
	This item may be marked U for any student not yet age 17 or for any student whose IEP was developed after their 18 th birthday.
	Related Requirements: I1, I2, I3, I4, I5, I6, I7, I12, I13, I14
300.305(e)(2)&(3) SPW	There is documentation of a summary of academic achievement and functional performance including recommendations to assist an exiting student in meeting her/his postsecondary goals.
	Agency Review Method: Look for documentation that includes three components: summary of academic achievement, summary of functional performance, and recommendations to assist the student in meeting postsecondary goal(s). Documentation must be more extensive than scores or grade-level equivalents. All areas pertinent to the student's needs must be addressed.
	Ask the PEA for copies of the summary of academic achievement and functional performance developed for students who have graduated/aged out at the end of the previous school year.
	If the PEA has documentation of summaries of academic achievement and functional performance and recommendations, mark this item I.
	If PEA has documentation of summaries of academic achievement and functional performance, but all three components are not included, mark this item O .
	If the PEA does not have documentation of summaries of performance for students who have graduated/aged out, mark this item O .

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	If the PEA had no students aged 16–21 graduating/aging out last year, mark
	this item U .
	Related Requirements: 11, 12, 114

III.A.8 Documentation That IEP Reflects Student Needs

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.320(a) (1-2)	Documentation that IEP reflects individual student needs.
SF, SASF, SCSF, SCSI	This item is looking at the cohesiveness of the IEP as a whole and requires that the IEP reflects the student's individual needs to afford the student a FAPE.
60-Day Correction	
	Student File Review Method : There should be a clear alignment between the student needs (as articulated in the evaluation and PLAAFP) and the goals and services identified on the IEP.
	Consider all of the following: • Evaluation information (if conducted within the last year) • PLAAFP • IEP goals
	Services (including extreme changes in service delivery model from previous IEP)
	Secondary transition components
	Mark this item O if the IEP does not enable the student to receive a FAPE. Record the specific reason(s) for noncompliance on the Student Form.
	Related Requirements: 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 112, 113, 114

Return to Table of Contents

Section IV: Procedural Safeguards/Parental Participation

IV.A.1 Notices Sent at Required Times and in a Language and Form That Is Understandable to Parents

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.504(a)	Procedural safeguards notice (PSN) provided to parents within the last 12
R7-2-401.Í.1	months.
SF,SASF, SCSF,	Student File Review Method: If documentation is evident that the parent
SCSI	was given a copy of a PSN at least one time during the current year, mark
	this line item I.
60-Day Correction	
	Related Requirements: 18
300.503(c)	Required notices are provided in the native language of the parent.
SF, SASF, SCSF,	Student File Review Method: Review the file for copies of the most recent
SCSI	notices (invitations to meetings, PSN, and PWNs) sent to the parents.
	Compare the language of the notices to the primary language indicated on
60-Day Correction	the HLS. If the notices were provided in a language other than the parent's
	native language, there must be documentation of the parent's request (as
	evidenced by the parent) for notices to be provided in English. The
	language of the student must be considered when the student is invited to
	the IEP meeting.
	Polated Possiromentos II IO
	Related Requirements: I1, I2

IV.A.2 PWN Sent at Required Times and Contains Required Components When considering the line items within the PWN, be sure to review the PWN in its entirety. Compliance calls should be made based upon the PWN content as a whole A tool to assist teams with documenting PWN components can be found on the PSM website.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.503(a)	PWN given to parents at required times.
SF, SASF, SCSF	 Student File Review Method: Determine the required times when PWN should have been given in the last twelve months. PWN must be provided at the following times (not an exhaustive list): When a student is referred for an initial evaluation Before/simultaneous to obtaining consent for the collection of additional data in the evaluation process. This is the proposal to collect additional data for evaluation. After the team has determined the eligibility of a student for special education. This determination completes the evaluation process. When there is a change or refusal to change the provision of FAPE before implementation of an initial IEP or before a revised IEP can be implemented. In the case of a phase out or graduation with a regular

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	diploma, a parent should know that all special education services will
	 When there is a change or refusal to change the educational placement, including an initial placement Prior to the eleventh day of suspension and/or before an accumulation of suspensions constituting a pattern and/or at the beginning of an expulsion, all of which require a change in services and the provision of FAPE. Prior to placement in an interim alternative educational setting (IAES), a PWN must be issued. Prior to ceasing services when a parent revokes consent for the provision of special education services Verify the purpose of each PWN given for specified events. Use this information to determine compliance. If a single notice covered multiple purposes, determine process compliance (notice given at the correct time) for all that are appropriate. The content required within a PWN must be addressed for each action proposed or refused when one PWN is provided
	for multiple actions proposed/refused.
	If the PWN was given at the appropriate time, mark this item I.
	Related Requirements: 18
300.503(b)(1) SF, SASF, SCSF	The PWN includes a description of action(s) proposed or refused by the PEA. All actions and refusals must be identified, should be student-specific, and should accurately reflect decisions made.
	Student File Review Method: Documentation must include a description of actions proposed or refused.
	Related Requirements: 18
300.503(b)(2) SF, SASF, SCSF	The PWN includes an explanation of why the agency proposed or refused to take action.
	Student File Review Method: The statement must be student-specific (i.e., individualized to the student).
	Related Requirements: 18
300.503(b)(6)	The PWN includes a description of any options considered and why those options were rejected.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Poview Method: Decumentation must relate enceifically to the
	Student File Review Method: Documentation must relate specifically to the student and must be individualized. Related Requirements: 18
300.503(b)(3)	The PWN includes a description of evaluation procedures, tests, and records used as a basis for the decision.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
SF, SASF, SCSF	
	Student File Review Method: Documentation must support the
	individualized basis for the decision.
	Related Requirements: 18
	Troidisa Troquii omontor 15
300.503(b)(7)	The PWN includes a description of any other factors that are relevant to the
	agency's proposal or refusal.
SF, SASF, SCSF	Cturdent File Deview Methods Decumentation related to other feature result
	Student File Review Method: Documentation related to other factors must be evident and individualized for the student.
	be evident and individualized for the student.
	Related Requirements: 18
	·
300.503(b)(4)	If the PWN is issued for any reason other than an initial referral for
	evaluation, it includes a statement of how a copy of the PSN can be
SF, SASF, SCSF	obtained.
	Student File Review Method: There must be a statement related to
	contact information (name and number of whom to contact) within the
	district/at the school site so the PSN can be obtained.
	If the notice was for initial referral for evaluation, mark this item U .
	Related Requirements: 18
	The state of the s
300.503(b)(5)	The PWN includes sources to obtain assistance in understanding the notice.
05 0405 0005	
SF, SASF, SCSF	Student File Review Method: There must be contacts available, including the address and telephone numbers for several parent resources, which
	may include Arizona Department of Education/Exceptional Student
	Services, Disability Rights Arizona, or Raising Special Kids. One of the
	sources could be the PEA, including the PEA's phone number and a contact
	name.
	Balata d Banaina manta a 10
	Related Requirements: 18

IV.A.3 Discipline Procedures and Requirements (only for suspensions of more than 10 days that occurred within the last 12 months)

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
300.530(h)	For a student who has been suspended for more than 10 days in the school year, the parent was notified on the day the decision was made.
SF, SASF	
	Student File Review Method: Review the student's file to determine whether there is documentation that the parents were contacted in person or by telephone. This contact must be made on the same day as the decision to take the action.

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
	Documentation of parent notification exists. = I
	No documentation of parent notification exists. = O
	Related Requirements: 4
300.530(c) 300.530(e) SF, SASF	If a change in placement has occurred because of behavioral issues, the IEP team conducted a manifestation determination meeting within 10 school days to determine the relationship between the student's disability and behavior.
	Student File Review Method: If a change in placement has occurred, review the file to determine whether a manifestation determination meeting was held within 10 school days.
	The team (PEA, parent, and relevant members of the IEP team as determined by the parent and the PEA) conducted a review and made a manifestation determination. = I
	There is no documentation that a meeting occurred and/or no determination was made. = O
	Related Requirements: 4
300.530(f)(1)(i) SF, SASF	If the behavior was determined to be a manifestation of the disability for a student who has been suspended for more than 10 days in the school year, a functional behavioral assessment (FBA) was conducted and a behavior
60-Day Correction	intervention plan (BIP) was implemented or , if already in place, the BIP was reviewed and modified, as necessary.
	Student File Review Method: If the team determined that the behavior is a manifestation of the student's disability, review the file to determine whether an FBA was conducted and whether a BIP was put in place or reviewed and revised as needed, if one was already in place.
	The behavior was determined to be a manifestation of the disability an FBA was conducted and a BIP was put in place or reviewed. = I
	If the behavior was not a manifestation of the disability, mark this item U .
	Related Requirements: 4
300.530(f) & (i)	If, as a result of a disciplinary action, the IEP team determined that behavior
SF, SASF	was a manifestation of the student's disability, the student was returned to the placement from which the student was removed, unless the removal was for possession of a weapon, of drugs, or for infliction of serious bodily

Statute and Forms	Explanation and Review Method
60-Day Correction	injury or when the parents and PEA agree to the change of placement.
	Student File Review Method: Look for evidence/documentation that the student was returned to the previous placement if the removal was not for the possession of a weapon, of drugs, or for infliction of serious bodily injury or if the parents and PEA agree to the change of placement. If the student was returned to the placement from which the student was removed, unless the parent and the PEA agreed to a change of placement, mark this item I.
	Related Requirements: 4
300.530(d)	Review the file to determine whether the student who has been suspended or expelled continued to be provided FAPE, including services and
SF, SASF	adaptations described in the IEP.
60-Day Correction	Student File Review Method: Determine whether there is a description indicating how FAPE will occur. If a new IEP or addendum was not written, there should be meeting notes or other documentation (PWN) regarding the services that will be provided and how they will be provided.
	If one or the other is documented, mark this item I.
	Related Requirements: 4

Return to Table of Contents