

2025-26 Alternative Assessment Justification

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Justification and Assurances for Exceeding the 1.0 Percent Cap

Purpose

In accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(c), local educational agencies (LEAs) contributing to the state exceeding the 1.0 percent cap must submit a justification and assurances.

1. Select LEA Name and ID#

420 - Houston County

2. Enter the Last Name, First Name of the individual submitting this form.

Roselli, Erin

3. Identify your role within the LEA. Special Education Director

- a. Special Education Director
- b. Special Education Coordinator
- c. Other

ELA Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through 2025-26

4. **ELA Participation Rates 2020-21** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.88

5. **ELA Participation Rates 2021-22** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.5

6. **ELA Participation Rates 2022-23** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.51

7. **ELA Participation Rates 2023-24** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.56

8. **ELA Participation Rates 2024-25** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.68

9. **ELA Participation Rates 2025-26** **2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data.* *

1.2

Math Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through

10. **Math Participation Rates 2020-21** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.9

11. **Math Participation Rates 2021-22** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.47

12. **Math Participation Rates 2022-23** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.48

13. **Math Participation Rates 2023-24** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.55

14. **Math Participation Rates 2024-25** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.54

15. **Math Participation Rates 2025-26** **2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data.* *

1.03

Science Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through 2025-26

16. Science Participation Rates 2020-21 *

1.47

17. Science Participation Rates 2021-22 *

1.37

18. Science Participation Rates 2022-23 *

1.5

19. Science Participation Rates 2023-24 *

1.72

20. Science Participation Rates 2024-25 *

1.67

21. Science Participation Rates 2025-26 *2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data. *

1.96

Number of Students Scoring

To calculate: Log into KITE - Reports - Alternate Assessment Reports - Year 2025 - LEA Name and select the .PDF file. The first table in the report provides the number of students scoring Advanced by grade and subject. Calculate the total number of students scoring Advanced for each subject.

22. In school year 2024-25, list the total number of students scoring "Advanced" for **ELA**. *

0

23. In school year 2024-25, list the total number of students scoring "Advanced" for **Math**.

0

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

Criterion One

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion One: The student has a significant cognitive disability. Only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities should be considered for the alternate assessment.

You must also describe the process for reviewing alternate assessment eligibility for any student scoring Advanced in at least one subject. Advanced performance scores may indicate that the student's skills exceed the eligibility criteria and should prompt a review of the student's continued participation in the alternate assessment.

In the questions below, describe the process used to ensure the IEP team considers only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (approximately 1.0 percent of the student population).

24. How are IEP teams informed of the criterion and expectations for determining if the student meets expectations for participation? *

IEP teams are informed of the criteria and expectations through a structured, consistent process that is grounded in state guidance. During eligibility discussions, teams utilize the Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines Determination of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation form to guide their work. This form ensures that each criterion is reviewed in a systematic way and that decisions are based on clearly defined expectations rather than individual interpretation. In addition, teams reference the Consideration for Participation in the Alternate Assessment Criterion document to support a deeper understanding of each requirement. These resources provide clarity around what the criteria look like in practice and help ensure that all decisions are supported by appropriate and sufficient evidence. When addressing Criterion 1, the team uses the department's definition of a significant cognitive disability as the foundation for discussion. The team reviews cognitive, adaptive, and behavioral data collectively to determine whether the student demonstrates the level of need required for alternate assessment participation. The school psychologist is an essential part of this process, helping the team interpret evaluation results and consider any factors that may have influenced testing performance to ensure the data accurately reflects the student's abilities.

25. What data are used to make the determination (e.g., cognitive and adaptive behavior data)? *

To make a determination regarding participation in the alternate assessment, the IEP team reviews multiple sources of data to ensure the decision is well-supported and reflects the student's overall functioning. This includes cognitive data, such as results from standardized intelligence assessments, to understand the student's overall cognitive functioning. The team also reviews adaptive behavior data, including standardized measures and input from teachers and families, to determine how the student functions in everyday environments across conceptual, social, and practical domains. In addition, the team considers behavioral data, academic performance, and classroom-based evidence, such as progress monitoring, work samples, and teacher observations. Information from evaluations and reevaluations, including reports from the school psychologist and other related service providers, is also used to provide a comprehensive view of the student's needs. The team carefully reviews all data together, rather than in isolation, and considers whether any external factors may have impacted testing performance. This ensures that the

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

Criterion One

determination is based on accurate, meaningful information that reflects the student's true abilities and level of support needed.

26. How is adaptive behavior data incorporated into the decision-making process? *

Adaptive behavior data is a key part of the decision-making process and is considered alongside cognitive and academic information to provide a more complete picture of the student's functioning. The IEP team reviews results from standardized adaptive behavior assessments, as well as input from teachers and families, to understand how the student performs in all settings. The team looks at how the student functions across the major adaptive domains—conceptual, social, and practical skills. This includes areas such as communication, daily living skills, social interactions, and the ability to apply skills independently. The team considers whether the student requires extensive, ongoing support in these areas and whether those needs are consistent across settings. Adaptive behavior data is not reviewed in isolation. Instead, it is compared with cognitive and behavioral data to ensure there is a consistent pattern that reflects a significant level of need. The team also considers the context of the data, including who provided the input and whether any factors may have influenced the results.

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility: Criterion Two

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion Two: The student is learning content linked to (derived from) state content standards. All students, regardless of the assessment or the least restrictive environment (LRE) should receive standards-aligned instruction that is rigorous, meaningful, and sufficient in duration to increase student outcomes. Special education services are provided in addition to, not in place of, standards-based instruction.

In the questions below, describe the evidence used to ensure the student was provided access to grade-level, standards-aligned instruction. This should include an explanation of the process used to ensure the student received instruction aligned to grade-level standards at an appropriate level of rigor, intensity, and duration comparable to their peers.

27. How does the IEP team ensure the student's performance and skill level are due to a significant cognitive disability rather than an instructional disadvantage? *

The IEP team takes intentional steps to ensure that a student's performance and skill level are reflective of a significant cognitive disability rather than the result of an instructional disadvantage. As part of the determination process, the team begins by reviewing the student's instructional history to confirm that the student has had consistent access to grade-level standards, high-quality core instruction, and appropriate interventions. Consideration is also given to factors such as attendance, mobility, and any interruptions in schooling that may have impacted learning. In addition, the team reviews progress monitoring data and the student's response to targeted, evidence-based interventions over time. When a student demonstrates limited or minimal progress despite appropriate supports, this provides important context for the team as they consider the presence of a disability rather than a gap in instruction. The team then examines cognitive, adaptive, and academic data collectively to identify whether there is a consistent pattern of need across multiple areas of functioning. This comprehensive review helps ensure that academic challenges are not considered in isolation. Input from the school psychologist and other qualified professionals is essential in interpreting evaluation results and determining whether the data accurately reflects the student's abilities. The team also considers any external factors, such as language proficiency or environmental influences, that could have affected performance.

28. What data are used to make an informed determination? *

In making a determination for alternate assessment participation, the IEP team relies on multiple sources of data to ensure the decision reflects the student's overall level of functioning. The team reviews cognitive data, including results from standardized intelligence assessments, to understand the student's general cognitive abilities. Adaptive behavior data is also a critical component, drawn from standardized assessments and input from both school staff and families to show how the student functions in daily life across settings. In addition, the team considers academic data, such as classroom performance, grades, progress monitoring, and response to interventions, to determine how the student is accessing and progressing within the general education curriculum. Behavioral data and observational information are reviewed to provide further context regarding the student's functioning in the school environment. The team also uses evaluation and reevaluation reports, including input from the school psychologist and other related service providers, to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the student's needs. Throughout the process, the team looks for consistency across these data sources and considers any factors that may have influenced performance.

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility: Criterion Three

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion Three: The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

In the questions below, describe the process used to determine that the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports.

29. What data are used to support this determination? *

The IEP team follows a structured and collaborative process to determine whether a student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports. This determination is not made based on a single data point, but through a comprehensive review of the student's performance across multiple settings and over time. The team begins by reviewing the student's present levels of performance and instructional history, including access to grade-level standards and the types of supports and interventions that have been provided. From there, the team examines how the student responds to instruction, specifically looking at the intensity, frequency, and level of support required for the student to engage with and make progress in the curriculum. This includes consideration of whether the student requires repeated, explicit instruction, significant prompting, and individualized teaching strategies to acquire and maintain skills. A key part of the process is reviewing progress monitoring data and the student's response to interventions. When a student demonstrates minimal or very slow progress despite targeted, evidence-based supports, the team considers whether the level of need rises to the requirement for extensive, direct instruction. The team also discusses the student's ability to generalize skills across settings and whether ongoing, substantial supports are needed for the student to apply learned skills independently. To support this determination, the team uses multiple sources of data. This includes cognitive assessment results, adaptive behavior data, and academic performance data, such as progress monitoring, classroom work samples, and grades. The team also reviews behavioral data, teacher observations, and input from related service providers. Evaluation and reevaluation reports, including interpretation from the school psychologist, are used to ensure that the data accurately reflects the student's needs.

30. How do IEP teams determine the type and level of supports needed, including for students whose least restrictive environment (LRE) is a highly modified special education setting for all or part of the day? *

IEP teams determine the type and level of supports needed through a structured, data-driven process that is grounded in the student's individualized needs and aligned with least restrictive environment (LRE) requirements. The process begins with a comprehensive review of the student's present levels of performance, including an analysis of how the student's disability impacts access to and progress in the general education curriculum. The team reviews multiple sources of data, including progress monitoring, response to intervention, classroom performance, work samples, evaluation and reevaluation reports, and input from teachers and related service providers. This information is used to identify specific skill deficits, patterns of need, and the level of support required for the student to engage in and make meaningful progress in instruction. Based on this analysis, the IEP team considers supports along a continuum, beginning with accommodations, supplementary aids and services, and specially designed instruction within the general education setting. The team carefully evaluates whether these supports are sufficient to meet the student's needs. If the student does not demonstrate adequate progress despite the provision of appropriate supports, the team considers the need for increased intensity of instruction, including more direct, individualized teaching, additional adult support, and specialized instructional strategies. For students whose LRE includes a highly modified special education setting for all or part of the day, the IEP team ensures that this decision is directly supported by data. The team documents that the student requires a level of individualized instruction and substantial supports that cannot be effectively implemented in the general education environment, even with supplementary aids and services.

31. How does the IEP team distinguish between supports required due to the student's disability and supports that are available as part of the

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility: Criterion Three

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

instructional environment? *

The process begins with a thorough analysis of the student's present levels of performance and the documented impact of the disability. The team identifies specific areas where the student is unable to access or make progress in the general education curriculum without additional support. These needs are directly linked to the student's disability and form the basis for specially designed instruction, accommodations, and related services outlined in the IEP. The team then considers what supports are available to all students within the instructional environment, including Tier I core instruction, differentiation, and general classroom strategies. For some students, this comparison also includes examining performance within more highly structured environments or highly modified special education settings. The team reviews how the student performs across these settings to determine whether the level of structure, intensity, or modification is necessary due to the disability, or simply reflects the supports available within that environment. Progress monitoring and response to intervention data are critical in this process. The team analyzes how the student responds to varying levels of support, including general education supports, supplemental interventions, and more intensive or specialized instruction. If the student demonstrates limited progress without individualized, intensive supports—or requires a highly structured or modified setting to make meaningful progress—the team determines that these supports are necessary due to the disability rather than the environment alone.

Disproportionality

Using data by primary eligibility (disability) category and demographic groups, describe LEA patterns of participation in the alternate assessment, including any disproportionate participation and a plan for reducing or eliminating disproportionality. Include a description of the LEA population demographics as compared to statewide demographics.

32. Describe any identified disproportionality in alternate assessment participation and the LEA's plan to address and reduce disproportionate participation, as applicable.

The LEA has reviewed alternate assessment participation data to identify any areas of disproportionality across disability categories. For the current year, students identified with Autism represent 38.46% of those participating in the alternate assessment, which is slightly above the state rate of 35.88%, but reflects a decrease from the prior year. Students identified with Emotional Disturbance represent 7.69% (1 out of 13 students), which is above the state rate of 0.45%. Additionally, students identified with Orthopedic Impairment represent 7.69%, which exceeds the state rate of 0.30%. While these percentages indicate areas of disproportionality, the LEA recognizes the importance of continued monitoring and targeted action to ensure appropriate participation decisions. IEP teams are consistently trained and reminded that no single disability category determines eligibility for alternate assessment participation. Instead, teams utilize the state-provided Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria documents and the Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines Determination of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation form to guide decision-making. These tools ensure that participation decisions are based on individual student needs, supported by comprehensive data, and aligned with established criteria. To address and reduce disproportionate participation, the LEA has developed a plan focused on ongoing data analysis, staff training, and strengthening instructional practices. District and school-level administrative teams regularly review participation data, particularly within categories identified as disproportionate, to identify trends and determine areas for additional professional development. Training efforts emphasize appropriate use of the alternate assessment criteria, the importance of individualized decision-making, and ensuring access to grade-level standards for all students. In addition, the LEA is prioritizing increased supports and services within the general education environment to promote inclusive practices and reduce unnecessary reliance on alternate assessments. Efforts also include strengthening parent and guardian engagement in the IEP process, enhancing transition planning, and ensuring that evaluation practices are thorough and accurately reflect student needs.

*(For example, if the LEA student population is evenly distributed among White, Black, and Hispanic students, the alternate assessment participation data should reflect a similar distribution across those groups.) **

Informed Parent Participation

Students who participate in alternate assessments are significantly less likely to earn a traditional diploma due to the highly modified content and potential for lower expectations.

In the questions below, describe the processes and practices used to ensure parents are fully informed of the eligibility requirements and implications of alternate assessment participation.

33. How are parents informed of the eligibility criteria and implications of participation? *

When a student is being considered for participation in the alternate assessment, the IEP team ensures that parents are provided with clear, thorough information and are meaningfully included in the decision-making process. The team reviews the eligibility requirements with parents, including Criteria I, II, and III, and explains how each area must be considered when making the determination. Parents are provided with the state-developed Parent Guide to Alternate Assessments, which outlines the purpose of alternate assessments, the eligibility criteria aligned to state and federal expectations, and the differences between alternate and general assessments. This resource is available in multiple languages to support accessibility. The team uses this guide as a foundation for discussion and encourages parents to ask questions and actively engage throughout the process. During the IEP meeting, the team uses state-developed frameworks and rubrics to guide the review of relevant data. This includes cognitive and adaptive behavior data, instructional history, alignment to alternate academic standards, and evaluation and progress monitoring results. The team discusses and documents this information to ensure that the decision is individualized and based on a comprehensive understanding of the student's needs. The team also ensures that parents understand the potential long-term implications of alternate assessment participation, including the impact on the student's path toward earning a traditional high school diploma. This is addressed both through the provided materials and through direct discussion during the meeting.

34. How are parents included in the IEP team decision-making process? *

Parents are included as essential members of the IEP team and are actively involved throughout the decision-making process. They are invited to all IEP meetings with sufficient notice and are encouraged to participate in discussions, ask questions, and share input regarding their child's strengths, needs, and experiences outside of the school setting. During the meeting, the team ensures that information is presented in a clear and understandable way. Data related to the student's performance—including evaluations, progress monitoring, and classroom observations—is reviewed with parents so they can fully understand how decisions are being made. Parents are given opportunities to provide insight, ask for clarification, and contribute to the development of the IEP. When decisions such as participation in the alternate assessment are being considered, parents are provided with supporting materials, including state-developed guidance documents, and the team walks through the criteria and rationale together. The potential impact of these decisions, including long-term outcomes, is clearly explained. The team also ensures that parents understand their rights, including the ability to agree or disagree with decisions and to request additional information or meetings if needed. Throughout the process, the goal is to maintain open communication, ensure transparency, and support parents as informed partners in making decisions that are in the best interest of their child.

35. Participation in the alternate assessment must be reviewed at least annually. Students may transition to the general assessments at any time, as determined by the IEP team.

What processes are in place to ensure these decisions are fully discussed and reviewed at least annually? *The LEA has established clear processes to ensure that decisions regarding alternate assessment participation are fully discussed and reviewed at least annually as part of the IEP process. At a minimum, these decisions are revisited during each student's annual IEP meeting, where the team is required to review and update all components of the IEP, including assessment participation. During the annual review, the IEP team reconvenes to examine current data, including progress monitoring, updated evaluations (if applicable), classroom performance, and input from teachers, related service providers, and parents. The team uses the state-required Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines Determination of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation form and supporting criterion documents to guide the discussion and ensure that all eligibility requirements continue to be met. To support consistency, the

district provides ongoing training and guidance to staff on the appropriate use of these tools and the expectations for data-based decision-making. Case managers are responsible for ensuring that all required documentation is completed and reviewed during the meeting, and administrative staff conduct periodic monitoring of IEPs to ensure compliance and fidelity to the process. Additionally, the LEA emphasizes that participation in the alternate assessment is not a one-time decision. The team is expected to reconsider eligibility annually, using current data to determine whether the student continues to meet criteria. Any changes in performance, instructional supports, or evaluation data are carefully considered to ensure that the decision remains appropriate.

Ensuring Students Are Making Academic Progress

In *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District*, the U.S. Supreme Court clarified that an IEP must be "reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances." Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education denied the state's 2024-25 waiver request, noting that it did "not find that approving the waiver will advance student academic achievement, as required in section 8401(b)(1)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)."

Thus, LEAs that contribute to the state exceeding the 1.0 percent cap must provide assurances that students participating in alternate assessments are provided access to and engagement in standards-based instruction and are making appropriate academic progress.

36. Describe the policies, procedures, and practices used in your LEA to ensure students are provided instruction that meets the requirements set forth by ESEA and *Endrew F.*, and that students make appropriate academic progress.*

The LEA has established policies, procedures, and practices to ensure that students with disabilities receive instruction aligned with the requirements of the Every Student Succeeds Act and the standard set forth in *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District RE-1*, ensuring access to meaningful educational benefit and appropriate academic progress. At the core of this work is a commitment to providing all students access to grade-level standards through high-quality, standards-aligned Tier I instruction. The district utilizes a structured collaborative planning (PLC) process, ensuring that general and special education teachers engage weekly in instructional planning, data analysis, and alignment to state standards. This process supports the development of lessons that are rigorous, accessible, and responsive to student needs. IEP development procedures are designed to ensure that each student's plan is individualized, data-driven, and reasonably calculated to enable progress appropriate in light of the student's circumstances. Present levels of performance are developed using multiple data sources, including evaluations, progress monitoring, classroom performance, and input from families and service providers. Annual goals are aligned to identified areas of need and include measurable criteria to track progress over time. Specially designed instruction, accommodations, and related services are clearly outlined to ensure access to and progress in the general education curriculum. The LEA emphasizes the use of ongoing progress monitoring and data-based decision-making. Teachers regularly collect and analyze student data to determine the effectiveness of instruction and interventions. This data is reviewed during PLC meetings and IEP reviews to make timely adjustments to instruction, supports, and services. If a student is not making expected progress, the IEP team reconvenes to revise the plan, ensuring alignment with the expectations outlined in *Endrew F.* for meaningful progress. In addition, the district has implemented practices to support inclusive instruction and least restrictive environment (LRE) access. Special education staff collaborate with general education teachers to provide co-planning, co-teaching, and targeted supports within the general education setting whenever appropriate. For students requiring more intensive supports, instruction is individualized and may be delivered in smaller, structured settings, while still maintaining a focus on standards-based instruction and skill generalization. To ensure fidelity and continuous improvement, the LEA conducts regular monitoring of IEPs, provides ongoing professional development aligned to state guidance, and utilizes walkthrough tools, such as the Instructional Practice Guide (IPG), to evaluate instructional quality. Administrative teams review data trends, student outcomes, and compliance indicators to guide decision-making and provide targeted support to schools and staff.

Support Requested

37. Please describe any support needed from the department to assist in meeting the requirements outlined in this form. All reasonable

requests will be considered. * The LEA would benefit from continued partnership and targeted support from the department to strengthen implementation and ensure ongoing alignment with state and federal expectations. Specifically, the district would benefit from additional professional development and training opportunities focused on alternate assessment eligibility, IEP development aligned to Endrew F., and best practices for specially designed instruction. Training that includes practical examples, case studies, and opportunities for guided practice would support consistency across teams and strengthen decision-making. The LEA would also benefit from clarification documents and exemplars, particularly related to distinguishing between significant cognitive disability and other learning needs, determining appropriate levels of support, and documenting decisions within the IEP. Access to model IEP components, compliant documentation samples, and annotated examples would further support staff in implementing expectations with fidelity.