College of Education and Human Development
Division of Special Education and disAbility Research

Fall 2018
EDSE 662 638: Consultation and Collaboration
CRN: 83458, 3 – Credits

Instructor: Dr. Suzanne Jimenez	**Meeting Dates**: 9/12/2018 – 11/14/2018
Phone: 571-252-1011	**Meeting Day(s)**: Wednesday
E-Mail: sjimene4@gmu.edu	**Meeting Time(s)**: 4:30 pm – 8:30 pm
Office Hours: by appointment	**Meeting Location**: LCPS Admin Bldg
Office Location: LCPS Admin Bldg	**Other Phone**: N/A

*Note: This syllabus may change according to class needs. Teacher Candidates/Students will be advised of any changes immediately through George Mason e-mail and/or through Blackboard.

Prerequisite(s): Teaching licensure, or enrollment in graduate degree program in education.
Co-requisite(s): None

Course Description
Provides professionals in special education, regular education, and related fields with knowledge and communication skills necessary for collaborative consultation and technical assistance to other educators and service providers. Note: Field experience required. Offered by Graduate School of Education. May not be repeated for credit.

Advising Contact Information
Please make sure that you are being advised on a regular basis as to your status and progress through your program. Mason M.Ed. and Certificate teacher candidates/students should contact the Special Education Advising Office at (703) 993-3670 for assistance. All other teacher candidates/students should refer to their faculty advisor.

Advising Tip
Did you know that to receive your teaching license you need to submit your request to VDOE? Depending on your situation, you can either submit your paperwork to VDOE through your county HR office or through GMU. For instructions, visit http://cehd.gmu.edu/teacher/instructions.

Course Delivery Method

This is a face-to-face class, with possible exceptions for special circumstances. Online classes will be announced in advance.

Learning activities include the following:
1. Class lecture and discussion
2. Application activities
3. Small group activities and assignments
4. Video and other media supports
5. Research and presentation activities
6. Electronic supplements and activities via Blackboard

Learner Outcomes

Upon completion of this course, teacher candidates/students will be able to:

1. Define collaboration, consultation, and teamwork and explain the essential characteristics of each.
2. Identify variables that may facilitate or constrain participation in collaboration, consultation, or teamwork settings.
3. Demonstrate communication skills of listening, avoiding communication roadblocks, dealing with resistance, being appropriately assertive, and resolving conflicts.
4. Apply problem-solving techniques in collaborating with professional colleagues, parents, and related and ancillary personnel to provide for students' learning and behavioral needs.
5. Develop self-assessment techniques for improving consultative and collaboration skills.
6. Plan activities that implement effective consultation and collaboration techniques.
7. Develop an Individualized Education Plan

Course Relationship to Program Goals and Professional Organizations

This course is part of the George Mason University, Graduate School of Education (GSE), Special Education Programs for teacher licensure in the Commonwealth of Virginia in the special education areas of Special Education: Students with Disabilities who Access the General Curriculum K-12, Visual Impairments PK-12, and Adapted Curriculum K-12. This program complies with the standards for teacher licensure established by the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), the major special education professional organization, as well as those established by the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support consortium (InTASC). The standards addressed in this class include CEC Standard 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences (InTASC 1,2); CEC Standard 3: Curricular content knowledge (InTASC 4,5); CEC Standard 5: Instructional planning and strategies (InTASC 7,8); CEC Standard 6: Professional learning and ethical practice (InTASC 9) & CEC Standard 7: Collaboration (InTASC 10).

Evidence-Based Practices

This course will incorporate the evidence-based practices (EBPs) relevant to communication, collaboration, and consultation. Evidence for the selected research-based practices is informed by meta-analysis, literature reviews/synthesis, the technical assistance networks which provide web-based resources, and the national organizations whose mission is to support students with

disabilities. We address both promising and emerging practices in the field of special education. This course will provide opportunities for teacher candidates/students to take an active, decision-making role to thoughtfully select, modify, apply, and evaluate EBPs in order to improve outcomes for students with disabilities.

Required Textbooks
Friend & Cook, *Interactions: Collaboration Skills for School Professionals*, Pearson, 8th edition (2017), ISBN 9780134168548

Gibb & Dyches, *IEPs: Writing Quality Individualized Education Programs*, Pearson, 3rd edition (2016), ISBN 9780133949520

Recommended Textbooks
American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Course Performance Evaluation
Students are expected to submit all assignments on time in the manner outlined by the instructor (e.g., Blackboard, Tk20, hard copy).

> **Tk20 Performance-Based Assessment Submission Requirement**
> It is critical for the special education program to collect data on how our students are meeting accreditation standards. Every teacher candidate/student registered for an EDSE course with a required Performance-based Assessment (PBA) is required to upload the PBA to Tk20 (regardless of whether a course is an elective, a one-time course or part of an undergraduate minor). A PBA is a specific assignment, presentation, or project that best demonstrates one or more CEC, In TASC or other standard connected to the course. A PBA is evaluated in two ways. The first is for a grade, based on the instructor's grading rubric. The second is for program accreditation purposes. Your instructor will provide directions as to how to upload the PBA to Tk20.
>
> For EDSE 662, the required PBA is Individualized Education Program (Spec Ed General) OR Collaborative Team Improvement Project (Adapted/VI). Failure to submit the assignment to Tk20 will result in reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Teacher candidates/students have until five days prior to the University-stated grade change deadline to upload the required PBA in order to change the course grade. When the PBA is uploaded, the teacher candidate/student is required to notify the instructor so that the "IN" can be changed to a grade. If the required PBA is not uploaded five days prior to the University-stated grade change deadline and, therefore, the grade not changed, it will become an F. Please check to verify your ability to upload items to Tk20 before the PBA due date.

Assignments and/or Examinations
   Performance-based Assessment (Tk20 submission required)

The purpose of this assessment is to have candidates demonstrate knowledge of the individualized planning process required for the development of educational programs for students with mild to moderate exceptional learning needs. Candidates will demonstrate their ability to develop the critical components of an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) that are legally sufficient and educationally appropriate for the described case study student. Candidates also will also demonstrate an understanding of how these components come together to build a framework for the student's educational program by writing a narrative that includes:

1. justification for their decisions within the IEP,
2. explanation of the collaborative process required.

Throughout the assignment it is critical to incorporate collaborative aspects of developing an IEP with stakeholders, including the student (as appropriate), family members, general educators, related service providers, school administrators, and other relevant parties. In continuously considering the collaborative aspects of the IEP process, candidates will participate in in-class cooperative learning opportunities, such as role-play exercises, and activities designed to prepare for the IEP product and writing of the narratives.

Additional direction, grading rubrics and case study examples will be provided in class.

   College Wide Common Assessment (TK20 submission required)
   N/A

   Performance-based Common Assignments (No Tk20 submission required)
   N/A

   Other Assignments

LCPS IEP Writing Module will be completed by all participants and materials will be provided. Full completion with 100% mastery required.

Each student will participate in a collaborative group to develop and present a mini-lesson on an assigned model of co-teaching. Directions and rubric to be provided in class.

Demonstrated mastery of the Consultancy Protocol through participation and reflection. Introduction to the Professional Partner resume with foundation submission.

Course Policies and Expectations
Attendance/Participation

- Course participants register for cohort classes with an understanding about the compacted semester time frame: that the time allocation for class sessions is extensive and that all work is to be completed within the cohort semester. Course participants also register for cohort classes with the understanding that these are graduate level courses, not school division professional development, and appropriate standards and rigor are applied to the course requirements. Teacher candidates/students who are unable to attend class and complete course requirements within the cohort semester are advised to discuss options with their academic advisors.

- Students are expected to (a) attend all classes during the course, (b) arrive on time, (c) stay for the duration of the class time and (d) complete all assignments. Attendance, timeliness, and professionally relevant, active participation are expected. Attendance and professional participation at all sessions is very important because many of the activities in class are planned in such a way that they cannot necessarily be recreated outside of the class session. Please notify me in advance by phone or email if you will not be able to attend class.

Late Work

In-depth reading, study, and work on course requirements require outside class time. Students are expected to allot class study and preparation time weekly in addition to time spent on papers and assignments. The result of late work will be the loss of 10 points per day until the assignment is received by the instructor. Individual situations will be addressed with students outside of class.

Other Requirements

Professional courtesy and respect will be demonstrated by all students consistently. This applies in personal interactions, written work and social media posts.

Grading Scale
95-100% = A
90-94% = A-
85-89% = B
80-84% = B-
70-79% = C
Below 70 = F

*Note: The George Mason University Honor Code will be strictly enforced. Students are responsible for reading and understanding the Code. "To promote a stronger sense of mutual responsibility, respect, trust, and fairness among all members of the George Mason University community and with the desire for greater academic and personal achievement, we, the student members of the university community, have set forth this honor code: Student members of the

George Mason University community pledge not to cheat, plagiarize, steal, or lie in matters related to academic work." Work submitted <u>must</u> be your own or with proper citations (see https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/).

Professional Dispositions
Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times. See https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/polices-procedures/. In the College of Education and Human Development, dispositions are formally and separately evaluated in at least three points in each student's program – a self-evaluation at the start of their program, an instructor's evaluation in the middle of their program, and a university supervisor's evaluation during internship. When dispositions are assessed, it is important that for areas where a positive disposition is 'occasionally evident' or 'rarely evident,' the student takes steps to grow as an educator. See https://cehd.gmu.edu/epo/candidate-dispositions. In special education licensure programs, the mid-point evaluation is completed by instructors in EDSE 628, EDSE 661, and EDSE 616, and the internship evaluation is completed by instructors in EDSE 783, EDSE 784, and EDSE 785.

Class Schedule
*Note: Faculty reserves the right to alter the schedule as necessary, with notification to students.

Date	Topic	Assignment to be completed after this class	Assignment due at the beginning of this class
9/12	Introduction to collaboration	Friend Ch. 1,2,3,5	
9/19	Consultation and Problem-Solving	Friend Ch. 6,7,8	Friend 1,2,3,5
9/26	IEP writing: Process and practices	Friend 9 and 10	Friend 6,7,8
10/3	Online class: Collaboration across environments	IRIS modules/videos: see class instruction	Complete BB assignments as posted
10/10	Effective Communication for the collaborative process	Strengths profile; IEP draft	Friend 9/10
10/17	Problem Solving and facilitation skills and practice	Presentation draft	IEP draft
10/24	Listening, Responding and providing feedback; co-teaching and teacher assistants	IEP final draft with feedback; professional partner resume	Presentation draft
10/31	Consultation,Coaching,and Mentoring; Managing Difficult Interactions	Presentation final	Professional partner resume

| 11/7 | Online Class: Designing a personalized plan for working in a collaborative environment | Complete assignments provided in class and posted reading in BB | Presentations – all projects due; presentations on assigned week |
| 11/14 | Putting the Pieces together; team takeaways; Teaching with Strengths | Be sure to upload to TK20 | IEP project final; Presentations |

Core Values Commitment
The College of Education and Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles: http://cehd.gmu.edu/values/

GMU Policies and Resources for Students

Policies
- Students must adhere to the guidelines of the Mason Honor Code (see https://catalog.gmu.edu/policies/honor-code-system/).

- Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing (see http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/).

- Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their Mason email account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students **solely** through their Mason email account.

- Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with George Mason University Disability Services. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (see http://ods.gmu.edu/).

- Students must silence all sound emitting devices during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

Campus Resources

- Support for submission of assignments to Tk20 should be directed to tk20help@gmu.edu or https://cehd.gmu.edu/aero/tk20. Questions or concerns regarding use of Blackboard should be directed to http://coursessupport.gmu.edu/.

- For information on student support resources on campus, see https://ctfe.gmu.edu/teaching/student-support-resources-on-campus

For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, please visit our website https://cehd.gmu.edu/students/.

Appendix
Assessment Rubric(s)

EDSE 662 CAEP Assessment	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 3
Present Levels of Performance CEC/IGC Standards 1 & 4 Candidate understands how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and uses this knowledge to provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities. Candidate uses multiple methods of assessment and data sources in making educational decisions.	• Candidate writes a present levels of performance statement that: o lacks consistent or logical links to evaluations and assessments and/or o fails to include educational implications of the student's exceptionality, and/or o fails to consider variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures. • Candidate fails to demonstrate respect for the student by using biased and negative language. • Candidate fails to show evidence of the similarities and differences between the student's development and typical human development. • Candidate includes statements irrelevant to the performance within the past calendar year or since the last IEP. • Candidate uses educational jargon and/or does not define terms that may not be understood by all who participate in the IEP development.	• Candidate interprets information from formal and informal assessments to write an appropriate, relevant present levels of performance statement with: o clear links to evaluations and assessments (such as interviews, observations, informal and classroom assessments, and standardized tests), o reference to the similarities and differences between the student's development and typical human development, o description of educational implications of the characteristics of various exceptionalities and sensory impairments (as applicable), and o description of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures (as applicable). • Candidate identifies specific areas of need and for each identified area describes what the student: o currently can do, o currently cannot do that is appropriate for curriculum-based or age-based or ability-based expectations, and o needs to do within the coming IEP year. • Candidate uses unbiased, objective language, defines terms and acronyms to assist understanding by all who participate in the IEP development.	• Candidate interprets information from formal and informal assessments to write an appropriate, relevant present levels of performance statement with: o clear links to evaluations and assessments (such as interviews, observations, informal and classroom assessments, and standardized tests), o reference to the similarities and differences between the student's development and typical human development, o description of educational implications of the characteristics of various exceptionalities and sensory impairments (as applicable), and o description of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures (as applicable). • Candidate identifies specific areas of need and for each identified area describes what the student: o currently can do, o currently cannot do that is appropriate for curriculum-based or age-based or ability-based expectations, and o needs to do within the coming IEP year. • Candidate uses unbiased, objective language, defines terms and acronyms to assist understanding by all who participate in the IEP development. • Candidate describes strengths and areas in need of improvement in relation to Virginia Standards of Learning.

EDSE 662 CAEP Assessment	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 3
Measurable Annual Goals CEC/IGC Standard 3 Candidate uses knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	• Candidate writes annual goals that: o do not reflect information in the present levels of performance section and/or o do not identify appropriate targets for student growth and/or o are not priorities and/or o are not clearly stated. • Candidate writes goal statements that: o do not include appropriate statements of conditions ("givens") and/or o are not measurable/do not include observable behaviors and/or o do not include appropriate levels of mastery.	• Candidate writes clearly stated appropriate age and ability annual goals that: o reflect areas of need identified in the present levels of performance AND o identify appropriate targets for student growth within a year. • Candidate includes for each goal: o measurable/ observable behavior(s) AND o condition(s) under which the student's performance will be demonstrated AND o appropriate and clear levels of mastery. • Candidate writes goals that focus on decreasing and/or increasing (as appropriate) academic, behavioral/social, life, and study/ organizational skills. • Candidate demonstrates (if appropriate) consideration of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures.	• Candidate writes clearly stated appropriate age and ability annual goals that: o reflect areas of need identified in the present levels of performance AND o identify appropriate targets for student growth within a year. • Candidate includes for each goal: o measurable/ observable behavior(s) AND o condition(s) under which the student's performance will be demonstrated AND o appropriate and clear levels of mastery AND o a statement of maintenance AND o a statement of generalization. • Candidate writes goals that focus on decreasing and/or increasing (as appropriate) academic, behavioral/social, life, and study/ organizational skills. • Candidate demonstrates (if appropriate) consideration of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures. • Candidate bases goals on the scope and sequence of the Virginia Standards of Learning.

| Short Term Objectives or Benchmarks

CEC/IGC Standard 3

Candidate uses knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	• Candidate does not appropriately match the use of short-term objectives or of benchmarks to the task described in the goal. • Candidate mixes together under one goal the use of short-term objectives and benchmarks. • Candidate writes individualized learning short-term objectives/ benchmarks that are unclear and/or: ○ are not directly related to the annual goals and/or ○ are not sequentially age or ability appropriate and/or ○ include components that are inappropriate for performing the identified task(s) ○ do not appropriately include observable behaviors ○ do not appropriately include conditions under which the behaviors are demonstrated, and ○ do not appropriately include degrees of mastery.	• Candidate appropriately selects short-term objectives OR benchmarks to accompany each goal and does not mix using them under one goal. • Candidate writes clearly stated individualized short-term objectives/benchmarks that ○ relate to the associated annual goal AND ○ are sequential age and ability appropriate. • Candidate includes for each short-term objective or benchmark: ○ the measurable/ observable behavior AND ○ the condition(s) under which the behavior will be demonstrated AND ○ the target degree of mastery • Candidate writes short-term objectives/benchmarks that focus on decreasing and/or increasing (as appropriate) academic, behavioral/social, life, and study/ organizational skills. • Candidate demonstrates (if appropriate) consideration of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures.	• Candidate appropriately selects short-term objectives OR benchmarks to accompany each goal and does not mix using them under one goal. • Candidate writes clearly stated individualized short-term objectives/benchmarks that ○ relate to the associated annual goal AND ○ are sequential age and ability appropriate. • Candidate includes for each short-term objective or benchmark: ○ the measurable/ observable behavior AND ○ the condition(s) under which the behavior will be demonstrated AND ○ the target degree of mastery AND ○ a statement of maintenance AND ○ a statement of generalization. • Candidate writes short-term objectives/benchmarks that focus on decreasing and/or increasing (as appropriate) academic, behavioral/social, life, and study/ organizational skills. • Candidate demonstrates (if appropriate) consideration of variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures. • Candidate bases short-term objectives/benchmarks on the scope and sequence of the Virginia Standards of Learning.

EDSE 662 CAEP Assessment	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 3
Services, Least Restrictive Environment (LRE), Placement

CEC/IGC Standard 1

Candidate understands how exceptionalities may interact with development and learning and uses this knowledge to | Candidate lists program or primary related services that do not or inconsistently align with areas of need based on the present levels of performance. | • Candidate lists appropriate program and primary services and related services (if applicable) that demonstrate an understanding of:
○ the continuum of placement and services available for individuals with exceptional learning needs and
○ the concept of the least restrictive environment and
• Candidate identifies appropriate program and primary services and related services (if applicable) that | • Candidate lists appropriate program and primary services and related services (if applicable) that demonstrate an understanding of:
○ the continuum of placement and services available for individuals with exceptional learning needs and
○ the concept of the least restrictive environment and
• Candidate identifies appropriate program and primary services and related services (if applicable) that |

| | | o align consistently with the individual's areas of need based on present levels of performance and
o provide supports needed for the student to be successful in the least restrictive environment.
• Candidate includes for all services appropriate statements of the following:
o location
o frequency
o setting
o duration
o start and end dates. | o align consistently with the individual's areas of need based on present levels of performance and
o provide supports needed for the student to be successful in the least restrictive environment.
• Candidate includes for all services appropriate statements of the following:
o location
o frequency
o setting
o duration
o start and end dates.
• Candidate includes a rationale for how services relate to the individual's needs.
• Candidate includes a statement that the student:
o may participate in all regular school extra-curricular and non-academic activities OR
o may not participate in specific, stated regular school extra-curricular and/or non-academic activities, with explanation and rationale. |
| provide meaningful and challenging learning experiences for individuals with exceptionalities. | | | |

EDSE 662 CAEP Assessment	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 3
Accommodations and Modifications CEC/IGC Standard 3 Candidate uses knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	• Candidate uses the terms "accommodations" and "modifications" inappropriately, including using them interchangeably or inconsistently. • Candidate does not identify accommodations and/or modifications, need for which is made evident in the present levels of performance component. • Candidate identifies inappropriate accommodations and/or modifications.	• Candidate identifies (as appropriate) accommodations and provides for each accommodation recommended to support the student in accessing the general education curriculum a rationale tied to the present levels of performance. • Candidate describes accommodations with clarity and correlates each accommodation to the learning focus that the accommodation supports. • Candidate identifies as appropriate and with rationale modifications to the curriculum. • Candidate identifies with rationale, when appropriate, assistive technologies that serve as accommodations to support the learner. • Candidate identifies with rationale based on present levels of performance	• Candidate identifies (as appropriate) accommodations and provides for each accommodation recommended to support the student in accessing the general education curriculum a rationale tied to the present levels of performance AND to the goals that have been identified. • Candidate describes accommodations with clarity and correlates each accommodation to the learning focus that the accommodation supports. • Candidate identifies as appropriate and with rationale modifications to the curriculum. • Candidate identifies with rationale, when appropriate, assistive technologies that serve as accommodations to support the learner. • Candidate identifies with rationale based on present levels of performance appropriate accommodations and/or modifications that support student

| | | appropriate accommodations and/or modifications that support student access to non-academic and extracurricular activities in education settings, if applicable. | access to non-academic and extracurricular activities in education settings, if applicable.
• All rationales for accommodations and/or modifications include, as appropriate, discussion of the impact of:
o perceptual and information processing skills
o work completion abilities
o test taking abilities,
o variations in beliefs, traditions, and values across and within cultures. |

EDSE 662 CAEP Assessment	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Meets Expectations 2	Exceeds Expectations 3
Participation in State Assessments CEC/IGC Standard 3 Candidate uses knowledge of general and specialized curricula to individualize learning for individuals with exceptionalities.	• Candidate does not list student participation in state assessments or provide explanation with rationale stating why the student is not participating. • Candidate selects inappropriate levels of student participation in state assessments based on present levels of performance and student's exceptional condition(s).	• Candidate selects appropriate levels of student participation in state assessments based on present levels of performance and student's exceptional condition(s). • Candidate lists appropriate accommodations for state assessments. • Candidate provides for each accommodation a rationale based on the present levels of performance component.	• Candidate selects appropriate levels of student participation in state assessments based on present levels of performance and student's exceptional condition(s). • Candidate lists appropriate accommodations and correlates specific accommodations to each state assessment. • Candidate provides for each accommodation on each state assessment a rationale based on the present levels of performance component, including discussion of the impact exceptional conditions (such as perceptual and information processing skills) can have on an individual's testing abilities
Legal Compliance of IEP CEC/IGC Standard 6 Candidate uses foundational knowledge of the field and his/her ethical principles and practice standards to inform special education practice, to engage in lifelong learning, and to advance the profession.	• Candidate writes components of the IEP using: o biased or inflammatory language and/or o unclear or ambiguous statements and/or o inaccuracies (including spelling, grammatical, and other writing mechanics errors) and/or o jargon or terms that may not be understood by all who participate in the development of the IEP. • Candidate writes a narrative statement about principles and practices that inform	• Candidate writes components of the IEP that comply with all relevant laws and policies and demonstrate best practices. • Candidate writes a narrative statement about principles and practices that inform the IEP process. The statement reflects knowledge of accepted and supported practices in the field of special education. • Candidate writes all components of the IEP project with clarity, accuracy (including spelling, grammar, and other writing mechanics), use of neutral, objective, non-inflammatory language, and explanation of terms and acronyms to support understanding by all who	• Candidate writes components of the IEP that comply with all relevant laws and policies and demonstrate best practices. • Candidate writes a narrative statement about principles and practices that inform the IEP process. The statement reflects knowledge of accepted and supported practices in the field of special education. • Candidate writes all components of the IEP project with clarity, accuracy (including spelling, grammar, and other writing mechanics), use of neutral, objective, non-inflammatory language, and explanation of terms and acronyms to support understanding by all who participate in the development of the IEP.

	the IEP process and written document that: ○ reflect unsuitable practices as stated above and/or ○ are inaccurate and/or ○ support practices contrary to legal compliance or ethical standards.	participate in the development of the IEP. • All components of the IEP project align/make sense with one another.	• All components of the IEP project align/make sense with one another. • Candidate includes documentation for procedural safeguards and advocates for appropriate services for the individual with exceptionalities.