



Regional Office Secretary Responsibilities for Review of IEPs and Data Entry

The State Procedures Coordinating Council has discussed this area, with recommendations and response from the Iowa Directors of Special Education / State Coordinators Council. State recommendations were made for the types of review process that should occur between the “submit to implement” window for each student Web IEP. Please see the addendum to this procedures brief, with segments of from the state procedures, and the coordinator’s council.

Regional Office Secretary Responsibilities for Review of Submitted IEPs:

- Regional Office Secretaries will review IEPs for data accuracy and completeness, and, at AEA discretion, provide an editorial review.
- Regional Office Secretaries will identify IEPs that require a review of weighting, using the state matrix, and will request a review by a Regional Administrator. The AEA is responsible for determining weightings, but procedures for accomplishing this may vary between each AEA. **At minimum, submitted IEPs that reflect a change (increase) in weighting will be flagged and reviewed against the matrix by a Regional Administrator.** See also the procedures brief, “*IEP Submit to Implement Process – Receiving IEPs in AEA Regional Offices: Data Verification Process.*” This document gives more detail on procedures for identifying IEPs that would require a weighting review.
- Regional Office Secretaries will not conduct compliance/quality reviews from the web submission to web implementation process and time window. These reviews would occur outside the submit-to-implement process and time window (through I-STAR or other Quality IEP Review processes). If Regional Office Secretaries encounter issues of severe quality concerns, this should be reported to the Regional Administrator.
- State procedures suggest that no more than 30 days should elapse between a student staffing, when an IEP is developed, and final (electronic) implementation of the IEP by the AEA (allowing finalized copies to be distributed to all parties).

In what cases would Regional Office Secretaries return IEPs to the author for corrections or to request additional documentation?

A GHAEA procedures document, *"IEP Submit to Implement Process -Receiving IEPs in AEA Regional Offices: Data Verification Process,"* was developed and is available as a separate document, also available on this website. This document indicates situations and scenarios when a Regional Office Secretary would work with a teacher on corrections and hold implementation of the IEP until correction (or missing documents) are obtained. An *"IEP Data Verification Checklist"* has also been developed (and available on this site) to guide Regional Office Secretaries in the IEP review process.

Regional Office Secretary Responsibilities for IMS Data Entry:

- Regional Office Secretaries will enter all required data into IMS fields during the "submit to implement" process. Data will be entered at the regional level for both IEPs and IFSPs.
- Regional Office Secretaries will follow the universal data entry procedures as outlined in the IMS manual available on <http://www.iowaidea.org/vnews/display.v/SEC/IMS>
- Regional Office Secretaries will attend periodic ICN trainings on IMS data entry to stay current with changes in procedures.
- Regional Office Secretaries will periodically run the *"Required Data Report"* and the *"Data Entry Verification Report"* to ensure accurate data entry and to monitor for missing fields (avoiding a larger data clean-up prior to Child Find Count). The month prior to the Child Find Count, reports will need to be run and checked frequently.
- Each Regional Office Secretary needs open access to all district information (system managers) to allow them to enter staff assignments and make necessary changes.

Addendum

“Web-Submit to Web-Implement” Recommendations (10/21/09) State Special Education Procedures Coordinating Council

Recommendation 1

After submission on the web, all IEPs are reviewed for data completeness and accuracy (count data and data necessary for LEA, AEA, state and federal reporting (i.e., LRE, race/ethnicity, etc.) and the data necessary to organize and access information (name, date of birth, student ID, etc.)*. The IEP may be returned to the author for correction of data elements **if** IEP team action is not required. Any change from the document(s) provided to parents at the time of the meeting or completion of an amendment without a meeting must be communicated to the parents.

Example. The service description does not match LRE minutes resulting in potentially inaccurate LRE data and incorrect communication to the parents:

Description: 45 minutes of the literacy block will be co-taught in the general education setting.

Minutes per day: General Education: 0; Special education: 45

Recommendation 2

AEAs may provide a proofing/editorial review*. If an AEA chooses to do this, the process must include **prompt** return to or contact with the author or other team members in order to make any necessary changes.

Examples of proofing/editorial review/corrections:

Misspellings, use of abbreviations that may not be commonly understood

Errors in birth date, parent address, etc.

Incorrect names or pronouns (this sometimes occurs when working on multiple IEPs or when copying and pasting and failing to make complete substitutions – e.g., “he” vs. “she”, “Jenny” vs. “Manuel”)

Recommendation 3

AEAs will continue to apply the Weighted Matrix in the manner that personnel have been trained and guided by supporting materials. The weighting process will continue to be conducted through procedures and assignment of personnel responsibilities of individual AEA choice and design. Through the AEA weighting process, clarifying information may be requested from the IEP author or other IEP team members if the IEP is unclear regarding information needed for weighting determinations*.

Recommendation 4

Remove any compliance/quality reviews from the web submission to web implementation process and time window. AEAs will carry out compliance/quality reviews of a *sample* of IEPs*. These reviews would occur *outside* the submit-to-implement process and time window and would be in addition to I-STAR reviews. Data gathered through this process will be used primarily to inform the AEA of school and AEA needs for professional development or other kinds of support.

Note: Further discussion is needed regarding:

- the consistent implementation of compliance/quality reviews across AEAs (a common review “checklist”, agreed-upon timelines, sample sizes, etc.) while allowing for the differentiation of these reviews related to district and AEA needs,
- the definition of “quality” as it relates to the IEP and related documents and processes, and
- the resource commitments needed to carry out compliance/quality reviews.

- * **Related issue.** Any review process, formal or informal, has the potential to identify noncompliance. Clear, consistent expectations and procedures are incorporated in the I-STAR review process. Similar expectations and procedures are needed for other cases of identification of noncompliance. Procedures must include guidance regarding the circumstances when an informal response is sufficient and appropriate, when formal action is needed, and when an IEP team will be asked to reconvene or amend an IEP immediately, correct an IEP at next review, or take other action.

Response/Recommendations from Iowa Directors of Special Education – 11/13/09

Coordinating Council discussion/recommendation. All AEAs have carried out review processes following web submission of IEPs. The Special Education Procedures Coordinating Council recommended:

- Review IEPs for data accuracy and completeness, weighting and, at AEA discretion, provide an editorial review.
- Remove any compliance/quality reviews from the web submission to web implementation process and time window. Carry out compliance/quality reviews of a sample of IEPs. These reviews would occur outside the submit-to-implement process and time window and would be in addition to I-STAR reviews.

Director response. Carry out the following reviews, **only**: data accuracy and completeness, weighting and, at AEA discretion, an editorial review. Discontinue compliance/quality reviews on or before January 1, 2010. AEAs may choose to provide focused reviews in response to AEA/LEA needs (e.g., Indicator 13 reviews).

From the State Special Education Procedures Manual (July, 2010)

Completing The IEP Development Process

The IEP development process is complete when all discussion, decision making and commitment of resources that is required of IEP teams is finished through the meeting process or through the amendment without a meeting process.

When a meeting is held (initial, review or reevaluation IEPs; IEP amendments with a meeting), all discussions, decision making and commitment of resources must occur within the context of the IEP meeting. If discussion, decision making and commitment of resources is not completed, the team must reconvene.

When a meeting is not held (amendments without a meeting) all discussions, decision making and commitment of resources must include communication with the parents and/or age-of-majority student and all IEP team members whose participation is relevant to the part(s) of the IEP being amended. If it becomes apparent that discussion, decision making and commitment of resources cannot be completed without meeting, the IEP team must convene.

Put the IEP into Effect

When the IEP development process is completed, the LEA and/or AEA must:

- Provide all agreed-upon services and supports to the eligible individual:
 - immediately following the meeting, **or**
 - immediately upon parent receipt of documentation of an amendment without a meeting, **or**
 - on a date specified in the IEP, **or**
 - on the date specified in a Prior Written Notice.
- Inform all relevant parties of their responsibilities immediately or, if a delay in implementation is known (e.g., time is need to make transportation arrangements, the IEP will be implemented following a school break, etc.), inform all relevant parties as soon as practicable.

Provide an IEP Draft to the Parents

Provide parents a copy of a draft IEP:

- at the conclusion of the IEP meeting, **or**
- when an amendment is completed, **or**
- within five (5) school days of an IEP meeting or completion of an amendment.

Inform the parents of when they will receive a draft copy of the IEP.

Finish the IEP Documentation Process

If the IEP documentation was not completed at an IEP meeting, finish the IEP and any related documents. In completing documentation, keep in mind that:

- The IEP, as developed by the IEP team, will be in use immediately or at a time determined by the IEP team.
- The IEP submitted on the web will be proofread and reviewed for accuracy of information.
- Any changes made to the IEP without a meeting or amendment process may not be substantive.
- Any substantive changes proposed during the review must be discussed at a subsequent IEP meeting or through an IEP amendment process.

Submit the IEP on the web

Complete the AEA IEP review processes.

Implement the IEP on the web.

Send parents a copy of the final IEP document(s) and distribute the final IEP document(s) to others who are to be sent a copy within 30 calendar days of the meeting or completion of an amendment without a meeting.