

ASD Checklist

Citation	Question
Initial Evaluations/MET Reports	
☐ R 340.1721b(1)	There was evidence that parental consent for an evaluation was requested within 10 school days from the receipt of a written request for an initial evaluation.
☐ R 340.1721b(1)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐ § 300.304(a) R 340.1721b(1)	Notice of the proposed evaluation was provided.
☐ R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐ § 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐ § 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐ § 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐ § 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐ § 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.304(c)(2)	Assessments and other evaluation materials included those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely to provide a single general intelligence quotient.
☐	§ 300.300(b)	There was evidence that parental consent for the initial provision of special education and related services was received.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)	If a review of existing evaluation data was conducted by the IEP team for an initial, the MET completed the evaluation as determined by the IEP team in addition to requirements applicable to the suspected impairment.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(a)	A full and individual evaluation by a MET was completed.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)	A written report from the MET was available.
☐	R 340.1721a(2)(b)	The MET made a recommendation of eligibility.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)(i) § 300.304(c)(6)	The MET report contained information needed to determine the student's present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) and educational needs.
Determination of Eligibility		
☐	§ 300.306(a)(1)	An IEP team determined eligibility and the educational needs of the student.
☐	§ 300.306(c)(2)	An IEP was developed in accordance with §§ 300.320 through 300.324.
☐	R 340.1715(1)	The disability adversely affected the student's educational performance in one or more of the following areas: • Academic • Behavioral • Social

	Citation	Question
☐	R 340.1715(2)(a)	Qualitative impairments in reciprocal social interactions included marked impairment in at least two of the following areas: • Use of multiple nonverbal behaviors such as eye-to-eye gaze, facial expression, body postures, and gestures to regulate social interaction. • Peer relationships appropriate to developmental level. • Spontaneous seeking to share enjoyment, interests, or achievements with other people, for example, by showing, bringing, or pointing out objects of interest. • Social or emotional reciprocity.
☐	R 340.1715(2)(b)	Qualitative impairments in communication included at least one of the following: • Delay in, or lack of, the development of spoken language not accompanied by an attempt to compensate through alternative modes of communication such as gesture or mime. • Marked impairment in pragmatics or in the ability to initiate, sustain, or engage in reciprocal conversation with others. • Stereotyped and repetitive use of language or idiosyncratic language. • Lack of varied, spontaneous make-believe play or social imitative play appropriate to developmental level.
☐	R 340.1715(2)(c)	Restricted, repetitive, and stereotyped behaviors included at least one of the following: • Encompassing preoccupation with one or more stereotyped and restricted patterns of interest. • Inflexible adherence to specific, nonfunctional routines or rituals. • Stereotyped and repetitive motor mannerisms. • Persistent preoccupation with parts of objects.
☐	R 340.1715(3)	Responses to sensory stimuli were unusual or inconsistent.
☐	R 340.1715(4)	The primary diagnosis was not schizophrenia or emotional impairment.
☐	R 340.1715(5)	The MET included at a minimum: • A psychologist or psychiatrist. • An authorized provider of speech and language. • A school social worker.

	Citation	Question
Review of Existing Evaluation Data		
☐	R 340.1721b(1) (For IEPs held after Oct. 17, 2011)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a FAPE was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐	§ 300.303 (b)(2)	A reevaluation occurred within the past 36 months or there is documentation that the parent and local agreed that no reevaluation was necessary.
☐	§ 300.305(a) § 300.321(a)	The review of existing evaluation data included the following participants: • IEP team members • Other qualified individual(s), as appropriate • Student, if appropriate
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(i)	Evaluations and information provided by the parents were reviewed.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐	§ 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(ii)	Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments and classroom-based observations were reviewed.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(iii)	Observations by teachers and related services providers were reviewed.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)	There was evidence that parents provided input.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(i)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether the student had a disability and the educational needs.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(ii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine the PLAAFP and related educational needs.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine if the student needed special education and/or related services.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iv)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services were needed.
☐	§ 300.305(d)(1)	If no additional data were needed to determine whether the student had a disability or to determine the student's educational needs, the parents were given notice about the determination, the reason(s) for the determination, and their rights to request an assessment.

CI Checklist

	Citation	Question
Initial Evaluations/MET Reports		
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	There was evidence that parental consent for an evaluation was requested within 10 school days from the receipt of a written request for an initial evaluation.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐	§ 300.304(a) R 340.1721b(1)	Notice of the proposed evaluation was provided.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐	§ 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.304(c)(2)	Assessments and other evaluation materials included those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely to provide a single general intelligence quotient.
☐	§ 300.300(b)	There was evidence that parental consent for the initial provision of special education and related services was received.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)	If a review of existing evaluation data was conducted by the IEP team for an initial, the MET completed the evaluation as determined by the IEP team in addition to requirements applicable to the suspected impairment.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(a)	A full and individual evaluation by a MET was completed.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)	A written report from the MET was available.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)	The MET made a recommendation of eligibility.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)(i) § 300.304(c)(6)	The MET report contained information needed to determine the student's present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAPF) and educational needs.
☐	§ 300.306(a)(1)	An IEP team determined eligibility and the educational needs of the student.
☐	§ 300.306(c)(2)	An IEP was developed in accordance with §§ 300.320 through 300.324.
☐	R 340.1705(1)	There was evidence that the impairment was manifested during the developmental period.

	Citation	Question
☐	R 340.1705(1)(a)	The developmental rate was at or below two standard deviations below the mean as determined through intellectual assessment.
☐	R 340.1705(1)(b)	Standardized test scores in reading and math were approximately within the lowest six percentiles.
☐	R 340.1705(1)(c)	Lack of development was primarily in the cognitive domain.
☐	R 340.1705(1)(d)	An impairment of adaptive behavior was documented.
☐	R 340.1705(1)(e)	The student's educational performance was adversely affected.
☐	R 340.1705(2)	The MET included a psychologist.
☐	R 340.1721b(1) (For IEPs held after Oct. 17, 2011)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a FAPE was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐	§ 300.303 (b)(2)	A reevaluation occurred within the past 36 months or there is documentation that the parent and local agreed that no reevaluation was necessary.
☐	§ 300.305(a) § 300.321(a)	The review of existing evaluation data included the following participants: • IEP team members • Other qualified individual(s), as appropriate • Student, if appropriate
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(i)	Evaluations and information provided by the parents were reviewed.

	Citation	Question
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐	§ 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(ii)	Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments and classroom-based observations were reviewed.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(iii)	Observations by teachers and related services providers were reviewed.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)	There was evidence that parents provided input.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(i)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether the student had a disability and the educational needs.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(ii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine the PLAAFP and related educational needs.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine if the student needed special education and/or related services.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iv)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services were needed.
☐	§ 300.305(d)(1)	If no additional data were needed to determine whether the student had a disability or to determine the student's educational needs, the parents were given notice about the determination, the reason(s) for the determination, and their rights to request an assessment.

EI Checklist

	Citation	Question
Initial Evaluations/MET Reports		
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	There was evidence that parental consent for an evaluation was requested within 10 school days from the receipt of a written request for an initial evaluation.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a FAPE was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐	§ 300.304(a) R 340.1721b(1)	Notice of the proposed evaluation was provided.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐	§ 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(2)	Assessments and other evaluation materials included those tailored to assess specific areas of educational need and not merely to provide a single general intelligence quotient.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.300(b)	There was evidence that parental consent for the initial provision of special education and related services was received.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)	If a review of existing evaluation data was conducted by the IEP team for an initial, the MET completed the evaluation as determined by the IEP team in addition to requirements applicable to the suspected impairment.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(a)	A full and individual evaluation by a MET was completed.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)	A written report from the MET was available.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)	The MET made a recommendation of eligibility.
☐	R 340.1721a(1)(b)(i) § 300.304(c)(6)	The MET report contained information needed to determine the student's present level of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) and educational needs.
☐	§ 300.306(a)(1)	An IEP team determined that the student had a disability and the educational needs of the student.
☐	§ 300.306(c)(2)	An IEP was developed in accordance with §§ 300.320 through 300.324.
☐	R 340.1706(1)	Behavioral problems were primarily in the affective domain.
☐	R 340.1706(1)	There was evidence that behavioral problems were manifested over an extended period of time.
☐	R 340.1706(1)	Behavioral problems adversely affected the student's educational performance to the extent that the student could not profit from regular learning experiences without special education support.

	Citation	Question
☐	R 340.1706(1)(a)-(d)	Behaviors were manifested by one or more of the following: • Inability to build and maintain satisfactory relationships within school environment. • Inappropriate behaviors/feelings, or depression under normal circumstances. • General pervasive mood of unhappiness. • Physical symptoms or fears.
☐	R 340.1706(2)	The emotional impairment was not based on a social maladjustment.
☐	R 340.1706(3)	Intellectual, sensory, or health factors were not the primary cause of the student's impairment.
☐	R 340.1706(4)(a)	The student's performance in the educational setting and in other settings, such as adaptive behavior within the broader community, was obtained.
☐	R 340.1706(4)(b)	A systematic observation of the behaviors of primary concern that interfere with educational and social needs was obtained.
☐	R 340.1706(4)(c)	Intervention strategies to improve the behaviors were implemented and length of time these strategies were used was documented.
☐	R 340.1706(5)	The MET report included data provided by both a psychologist or psychiatrist and a school social worker.
☐	R 340.1721b(1) (For IEPs held after Oct. 17, 2011)	The time from receipt of parental consent for an evaluation to the notice of a FAPE was not more than 30 school days or within a time line agreed to by the parent and the local.
☐	§ 300.303 (b)(2)	A reevaluation occurred within the past 36 months or there is documentation that the parent and local agreed that no reevaluation was necessary.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.305(a) § 300.321(a)	The review of existing evaluation data included the following participants: • IEP team members • Other qualified individual(s), as appropriate • Student, if appropriate
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(i)	Evaluations and information provided by the parents were reviewed.
☐	R 340.1721b(1)	Parental consent to evaluate was received in writing.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(1)	A variety of assessment tools and strategies were used including information provided by the parent.
☐	§ 300.304(a)(2)	A single measure or assessment was not the sole criterion for determining eligibility.
☐	§ 300.304(b)(3)	Technically-sound instruments were used.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(i)	Assessments and other evaluation materials were selected and administered so as to be racially and culturally non-discriminatory.
☐	§ 300.304(c)(1)(ii)	Assessments were provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(ii)	Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments and classroom-based observations were reviewed.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(1)(iii)	Observations by teachers and related services providers were reviewed.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)	There was evidence that parents provided input.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(i)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether the student had a disability and the educational needs.

	Citation	Question
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(ii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine the PLAAFP and related educational needs.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iii)	The team identified additional data needed to determine if the student needed special education and/or related services.
☐	§ 300.305(a)(2)(iv)	The team identified additional data needed to determine whether any additions or modifications to the special education and related services were needed.
☐	§ 300.305(d)(1)	If no additional data were needed to determine whether the student had a disability or to determine the student's educational needs, the parents were given notice about the determination, the reason(s) for the determination, and their rights to request an assessment.