Student Identifica Number	tion	200263X295	SSID 2	965701778		Eligible (SLI)
Student SHABTA	AI TH	IOMAS			Date of Birth:	17-AUG-2019
Last		First	MI Section As Mo	ating Information		
	Perti	nent Dates	Section A: Wie	eting Information	Type of Me	eting
Date of Initial IEP Tea	m Meeting	29-AUG-202	22	Initial		Amendment of IEP dated
Date of Present Meetir	_	29-AUG-202	22	Iniuai		Amendment of IEP dated
Annual Review to be o	conducted	29-AUG-202	23	Annual Review		Early Start Transition
by Next Three Year Revie conducted by	ew will be	01-MAY-202	24	Other		Expulsion Analysis Individual Transition Plan
Three Year Review or was conducted on	Evaluation	29-AUG-202	22	Coulci		marviduai Transicion Fran
Transition to Kinderga conducted by	rten to be	01-MAY-202	24			
Location of Meeting		SP ED INF/PRI	E (1017)	District Name	Los Angeles	Unified School Dis
			Section B: Stu	ident Information		
Date of Birth	17-AUG-2	2019	Age	3	Grade	-1
Gender	Male (Female	Ethnic Code	Decline to State		
Location of the Psych Folder	SUPPORT	UNIT NOF	Student has no Psych Folder			
Location of the Cum Folder			Student has no Cum Folder	✓		
Home Language			Student Language		Alternate Mod Communication	(
Home Address of Student	6044 CAR	TWRIGHT AV	'E			
City	NORTH H	IOLLYV CA	ZIP Code	91606		
Home Telephone	(760) 880-	0700	Daytime Telephone		Emergency Telephone	
School of Attendance	Sp Ed Inf/	Pre (1017)	Location Code	1017		
School of Residence	Oxnard St	El	Location Code	5918		
Name of Parent/Guardian			Telephone			
Address						
City		CA	ZIP Code			
Surogate Parent			Telephone			
Attends CURRENT Sone of the following	SCHOOL as	a result of	Preschool Program	•		
Is the student living in Home (FFH)?	a Family Fos	ster	o O Yes	FFH#		
Is FFH Provider relate	d to student?	\bigcirc N	o O Yes	Relationship		
Licensed Children's In			o O Yes	LCI Name		
				LCI#		
Out of the home place	ment made by	_	egional Center uperior Court	Other	Health O	Department of Children's Service
Child's family living w	ithin I AIICI		o Yes	Ouler		

	73	INIVINI AT	IZED EDIT	CATION BROCE AN CEN	D).	Page 2 of 22
Los Angeles	IN S Unified School District	NDIVIDUAL	IZED EDU(CATION PROGRAM (IEI	(1)	
	SHABTAI THOMAS			Date of Birth 17-AUG	i-2019	
	Last First	MI Secti	on C: Lang	uage Acquisition		
Language Cla	assification:		vii ev zung	unge rrequisition	Start Date:	
	y Parent Request:		Yes O No		Reclassification Date:	
			res O No		Test Date:	
	ormance Level and Performance Descrip			<u> </u>		
Alternate ELI Descriptor:	PAC Performance Level and Performance	ce		~	Test Date:	
1		Section D	Goal Achie	vement from Current IEP		
			hieved	venient from current IEI		
Goal for: (ex	xample - Reading)	Yes	No	If No, explain the reason	n the goal/objective was not ac	chieved
1			\bigcirc			
Category	~					
	Objective 1 met	0	0			
	Objective 2 met	0	\circ			
2			0			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met	0	0			
	Objective 2 met	0	0			
3			\circ			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met	\circ	\circ			
	Objective 2 met		\bigcirc			
4		0	\circ			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met		\bigcirc			
	Objective 2 met		\circ			
5			\circ			
Category	~					
	Objective 1 met		\bigcirc			
	Objective 2 met		\bigcirc			
6			\circ			
Category	~					
	Objective 1 met		\bigcirc			
	Objective 2 met	\circ	\circ			
7		0	0			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met	0	\circ			
	Objective 2 met	0	0			
8			0			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met	0	\circ			
	Objective 2 met	0	0			
9			\circ			
Category	v					
	Objective 1 met	0	\circ			
	Objective 2 met	0	0			
10			0			
Category	(
	Objective 1 met	0	0			
	Objective 2 met	0	0			

	Page	3	of	22
--	------	---	----	----

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) Los Angeles Unified School District Student SHABTAI **THOMAS** Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 First MI Last **Section E: Present Level of Performance** Performance Area: Language Category: Language REEL-4, parent report, observation Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: N/A Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Tommy is a 2 year, 11 month old student transitioning from regional center services to an LAUSD preschool program if found eligible for special education services. Tommy has been a client of the regional center since the age of 3 months. He received child development 2x/week, speech therapy 1x/week, and occupational therapy 1x/week. He previously received physical therapy from 6-18 months. Tommy lives with his adopted father, and his primary and dominant language is Hebrew. He attends daycare at Magie Lang Childcare from 8:30-4:30 pm 5days/week. Hebrew is Tommy's primary and dominant language, but he receives his therapies in English. Father reports concerns regarding expressive language, and states that Tommy 'does not speak as well as his peers.' Tommy an average standard score on both the receptive and expressive subtests on the REEL-4. Strengths: Tommy demonstrates joint attention for preferred activities and communicative intent. He follows commands and simple novel directions on his own terms and gives items upon request on his own terms. He identifies body parts, clothing items, size concepts, shapes, and colors. Parent reports Tommy identifies a variety of objects in pictures, action words, object function, and spatial concepts, but these were not observed. Expressively, Tommy reportedly has hundreds of words in his vocabulary and was observed to use 5-7 word utterances. He used language to label spontaneously and upon request, request for desired items, protest/reject, comment on his immediate environment, respond to yes/no questions regarding if he wanted or liked sometimes, obtain one's attention, ask questions, and sometimes respond to simple questions. He exhibited codeswitching (i.e., switching between Hebrew and English depending on the listener) and codemixing (using both languages within the same utterance). However, these are typical processes of bilingual language development, not a disorder. Tommy demonstrates functional play and cause-effect play. cont... Performance Area: Language (cont) Category: Language Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: N/A State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): He brought items to show, and exhibited social smiles to share his enjoyment. He engaged in a turn taking game with adult support. At this time, articulation appears within functional limits and is not an area of concern but should continue to be monitored. Tommy was judged to be 85% intelligible to this assessor in known and unknown contexts. Areas of Need: Tommy exhibits inconsistent joint attention, and has difficulty modulating his eye contact, especially with highly preferred toys. He demonstrated difficulty comprehending some structured task expectations in both Hebrew and English, despite several prompts and models given, and followed directions on his own terms. Although Tommy uses 5-7 word utterances, his language lacked semantic and syntactic variety. He was not observed to use verbs in either language consistently respond to a variety of questions. Tommy pointed to things in his environment to request but had difficulty providing additional information to clarify what he wanted. His play appeared rigid and limited and he does not yet demonstrated pretend play. He had difficulty allowing the assessors to join him in his play and he did not initiate play. He does not yet engage in pretend play. It should be noted at times. Tommy appeared to exhibit moments of disfluency, which impacted his intelligibility. However, this may

develop.

Impact of Disability on Educational Performance: Tommy's delays in the areas of receptive language, expressive language, and pragmatics affect his ability to carry out requests, express his wants, needs, and ideas, and successfully interact with peers. This impacts his process and involvement in the educational curriculum.

be due to word finding as Tommy is learning two languages simultaneously. Fluency should continue to be monitored as Tommy's language skills

Danna Bornstein, MS CCC-SLP

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) Los Angeles Unified School District Student SHABTAI **THOMAS** Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 First ΜI Last **Section E: Present Level of Performance** Performance Area: Sensory Processing Category: Sensory Processing standardized testing, structured observations, parent interview, record review Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Student's areas of strengths: Tommy demonstrates functional ability to perform all movements necessary for the classroom without assistance. He demonstrates adequate upper extremity range of motion to reach above his head for desired items or raise his hand in a classroom environment. He demonstrates functional neuromuscular skills to maintain an upright seated posture in a standard classroom chair. He transitions from sit to stand on the carpet independently. He independently demonstrates a right-hand grasp to pick up coins and deposit into a coin box using an intact pincer grasp. Tommy independently demonstrates translation from fingers to palm. He independently matches pictures demonstrating good visual skills, and independently matches shapes. He independently identifies when objects are smaller or bigger. He independently towers ten blocks and completes the train and bridge forms using blocks. He independently completed the nut and bolts on the MSEL as administered by the school psychologist demonstrating intact visual motor skills, bilateral coordination and motor planning skills. He demonstrates adequate hand strength to disconnect and reconnect legos, and demonstrates a functional grasp on pegs to insert them into a foam board. He independently opens containers. He demonstrates a functional right hand tripod grasp on a crayon to complete basic pre writing shapes such as a vertical line, horizontal line and circular shape independently. He follows one step directions independently. No concerns are noted on the DP-3 and parents express that Tommy has demonstrated good progress related to occupational therapy skills. Performance Area: Sensory Processing Sensory Processing Category: Assessment/Monitoring Process State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Student's areas of need: Tommy demonstrates functional neuromuscular, visual perceptual, visual motor and fine motor skills to access an educational curriculum. He demonstrates appropriate activity level and engagement to participate in over sixty minutes of testing independently. He was observed to demonstrate age appropriate skills related to fine motor tasks. He was not observed to become dysregulated during the assessment, and did not require sensory input in order to participate in testing activities. No areas of need beyond continued enrichment are noted at this time. Impact of student's disability on academic and overall performance: None in relation to school based occupational therapy. Reported by:

Stacey Trost, MA, OTR/L

LAUSD School Occupational Therapist

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) Los Angeles Unified School District Student SHABTAI **THOMAS** Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 First MI Last **Section E: Present Level of Performance** Performance Area: Cognitive Ability Category: General Ability Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Due to inconsistent joint attention and self-directed and task refusal behaviors, it is difficult to provide and accurate estimate of Thomas's cognitive functioning at this time. Basal and ceiling levels on each scale of the MSEL could not be established; thus no standard scores were obtained. Based on parent information gathered on the DP3, Thomas's cognitive functioning falls in the superior range. Relative strengths: In terms of visual reception tasks, Thomas sorted objects, matched by shape, color, and size, discriminated spatial details in one picture, and exhibited memory for one picture. Regarding fine motor tasks, Thomas inserted pennies in a slot bank oriented vertically and horizontally, stacked nine blocks vertically, imitated a four block train and a four block tower. Regarding receptive language skills, Thomas identified eight colors. In terms of expressive language skills, Thomas spoke short phrases/sentences. On the Developmental Profile 3 (DP 3) parent reports that Thomas uses size words, understands prepositional concepts, knows the difference between living and non-living things, and understands number concepts to six. Areas of relative weakness: Thomas's performance on all the scales of the MSEL was impacted his self-directed and task refusal behaviors. Thomas did not attend to pictures. He was challenged in answering questions. He did not use a wide variety of word combinations. Educational Impact: A general ability/cognition impact was not identified at this time. Performance Area: School Readiness Category: Cognitive Development Assessment/Monitoring Process Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas's current functioning in school readiness is developing as expected given the student's chronological age and early intervention services to date, based on performance on the Mullen Scales of Early Learning (MSEL) and information gathered via observation and interview on the Developmental Profile 3rd Edition (DP3). Thomas demonstrates relative strengths in general fund of knowledge, pre-mathematics, pre-reading, and pre-writing skills. Thomas demonstrates relative challenges in answering general knowledge questions and consistently attending to pictures in a book and describing pictures in a book across settings. Due to inconsistent joint attention and self-directed behaviors skills reported in the home setting were not observed during the assessment session. Educational Impact: An academic performance/school readiness impact was not identified at this time. Thomas's school readiness skills are developing as expected given his chronological age and exposure to pre-academic skills.

Page	6	of	22
1 agc	v	OI	~~

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) Los Angeles Unified School District Student SHABTAI **THOMAS** Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 First MI Last **Section E: Present Level of Performance** Performance Area: Communication Category: Communication Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Thomas's home language is Hebrew. This assessment was completed in Hebrew and English with the assistance of a district interpreter. Thomas's language classification will be determined in kindergarten with appropriate measures. Parent reports that Thomas has hundreds of words. He asks questions. Familiar and unfamiliar listeners understand approximately 60 percent of his speech. Overall, Thomas's language skills are found to be in the below average to average range. Based on the parent's responses on the Developmental Profile 3, Thomas evidences the following strengths: following two verbal step instructions, putting two or more words together, and singing two songs. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, following directions, using a wide variety of word combinations, and answering a variety of questions across settings. Results from the language and speech assessment results indicate that Thomas exhibits delays in the areas of receptive language, expressive language, and pragmatics which affect his ability to carry out requests, express his wants, needs, and ideas, and successfully interact with peers. Educational Impact: A communication impact was identified at this time. Performance Area: Motor Category: Motor Abilities Assessment/Monitoring Process Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas's motor abilities are found to be in the superior range. Based on the parent's responses on the Developmental Profile 3, Thomas evidences strengths in gross motor skills including the movement and coordination of the arms, legs, and other large body parts and movement (e.g., walking, climbing, and jumping) and fine motor skills, including the movement and coordination of small body parts such as the wrists, hands, and fingers (e.g., writing and drawing). On the MSEL, Thomas inserted pennies in a slot oriented horizontally and vertically, stacked nine blocks, and imitated a four block train and a four block tower. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: none were identified at this time. Thomas's performance on the Fine Motor scale of the MSEL was impacted by inconsistent joint attention and self-directed behaviors. Refer to the occupational therapy assessment report for further information regarding Thomas's motor functioning. Educational Impact: A motor impact was not identified at this time.

D	7	- C	22
Page	/	OI	22

Performance Area: Social Emotional Category: Social Emotional Assessment/Monitoring Process Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Ihomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment secsion continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Per	Los Angeles Unified Sahaal Dietri	Page INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)
Category: Social Emotional Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between object-salctivities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Assessment/Monitoring Process Preschool Psycho-	Student SHABTAI THOM	Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 MI
Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent Iromas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits afety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Social Emotional Preschool Psycho-Educati	Performance Area:	Social Emotional
Used: Current Performance/Assessment Results: Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Performance/Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was chall	Category:	Social Emotional
Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Social Emotional Persechool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accep		Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report
Overall, Thomas' demonstrates a scatter of skills ranging in the below average range to the average range. Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Social Emotional Y Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the exam	State/District Assessment Results:	
Based on observations, informal interviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: exploring new places, staying engaged in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not result in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of others, is very social with his peers, and exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint attention and appropriately modulated his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed appropriately, and shared his enjoyment. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. Thomas evidences the following needs/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, adaptability, and play skills across settings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has difficulty tolerating changes in routine, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session continued. He demonstrated refusal and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a cupcake toy with various cupcakes arranged in a tin. He became dysregulated when his play was disrupted. Performance Area: Social Emotional Category: Social Emotional Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report Used: State/District Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play	Current Performance/Assessment Sum	mary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance):
Category: Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.	Based on observations, informal interexploring new places, staying engage on the BASC-3 and ASRS did not resothers, is very social with his peers, a attention and appropriately modulated appropriately, and shared his enjoymed. Thomas evidences the following need adaptability, and play skills across set Parent's responses on the ASRS reflect difficulty tolerating changes in routing continued. He demonstrated refusal as	rviews and the raters' responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: d in a preferred activity for at least 15 minutes, and playing with other children. Daycare provider's ratings ult in scale elevations. Parent reports that Thomas demonstrates awareness of the psychological feelings of nd exhibits safety awareness. At the assessment session, during preferred activities, Thomas exhibited joint l his eye contact between objects/activities and the examiners. He exhibited social smiles, laughed ent. He demonstrated functional and cause and effect play. ds/challenges: demonstrating consistent joint attention, social awareness, engagement, and reciprocity, tings. Parent's ratings on the BASC-3 indicate at-risk concerns in the areas of aggression and anxiety. et that Thomas he uses language in an atypical manner, engages in unusual stereotypical behaviors, has e, and overreacts to sensory stimulation. Thomas became increasingly self-directed as the assessment session and task avoidance behaviors. Tommy exhibited a perseverative interest in spinning light up toys and a
Assessment/Monitoring Process Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.	Performance Area:	Social Emotional
Used: State/District Assessment Results: Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.	Category:	Social Emotional 🔻
Current Performance/Assessment Summary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance): Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.		Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report
Continued: His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.	State/District Assessment Results:	
His play was mostly self-directed and rigid. He was challenged in accepting the examiners' ideas in play. Thomas did not initiate play or engage the adults in his play. He was observed to jump up and down and flap his arms on several occasions.	Current Performance/Assessment Sum	nary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance):
	His play was mostly self-directed and	
Educational Impact: A social emotional impact was identified at this time, which affects Thomas's ability to access the preschool curriculum.	Educational Impact: A social emotion	nal impact was identified at this time, which affects Thomas's ability to access the preschool curriculum.

Los Angeles Unified School Dist	Page INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) rict
Student SHABTAI THO	DMAS Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022
Last	First MI Section E: Present Level of Performance
Performance Area:	Adaptive Behavior
Category:	Activities of Daily Living
Assessment/Monitoring Process Used:	Preschool Psycho-Educational Assessment Report
State/District Assessment Results:	
Current Performance/Assessment Sur	mmary (include student strengths, student needs and impact of disability on student performance):
Overall, Thomas's self-help/adaptive Based on observations, informal int	e behaviors are found to be in the low average range to the average range. terviews and the rater's responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths:
Overall, Thomas's self-help/adaptive Based on observations, informal int removing his shoes, drinking from a BASC-3 reflects average activity of Thomas evidences relative challeng	terviews and the rater's responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: a child size cup, using utensils to feed himself, and performing basic hygiene tasks. Parent's ratings on the
Overall, Thomas's self-help/adaptive Based on observations, informal int removing his shoes, drinking from a BASC-3 reflects average activity of Thomas evidences relative challeng Educational Impact: A self-help/ada	terviews and the rater's responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: a child size cup, using utensils to feed himself, and performing basic hygiene tasks. Parent's ratings on the 'daily living skills.
Overall, Thomas's self-help/adaptive Based on observations, informal int removing his shoes, drinking from a BASC-3 reflects average activity of Thomas evidences relative challeng Educational Impact: A self-help/ada Performance Area:	terviews and the rater's responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: a child size cup, using utensils to feed himself, and performing basic hygiene tasks. Parent's ratings on the 'daily living skills.
Overall, Thomas's self-help/adaptive Based on observations, informal int removing his shoes, drinking from a BASC-3 reflects average activity of Thomas evidences relative challeng	terviews and the rater's responses on formal rating scales, Thomas evidences the following strengths: a child size cup, using utensils to feed himself, and performing basic hygiene tasks. Parent's ratings on the daily living skills. ges in dressing/undressing and toileting. aptive behavior impact was not identified at this time.

Student	SHABTAI	THOMAS			Date of Birth 17-A	AUG-2019	Me	eting Date 2	29-AUG-2022
	Last	First	MI						
£1:1.1	4:4	1_4_3 4_ 3!1.:1!4	1		Eligibility				
	e, areas discussed re eral ability, academi			·	social/emotional, self-ho	eln adantive			
neurin, gen	erar aemity, academi	e ranction, mote	or donity, lange	auge und speech,	social cinotional, sen in	orp udupirve			
For Initial II Per parent	EP, interventions att	empted prior to	determining eli	igibility:					
-	elopmental Services	(CDS) - twice p	er week						
	and Speech Services								
-	nal Therapy (OT) - o	nce per week							
-	herapy 1/20-1/21								
	a student with the di								
Code:	SLI		h Or Language						
	Not Applicable			OPartially	•				
	Low Incidence Eligi	bility (only for V	VI, DBL, DEA,	, HOH, or severe	OI):				
Code:									
	ONot Applicable	, OBlin	ıd or	OPartially	Sighted				
Does no	t meet eligibility cri	teria for Special	Education Ser	vices (Initial IEP)	1				
	8)	1		,					
or									
	ger Eligible for Spec	ial Education Se	ervices (Reviev	v IEP)					
○ No Long	ger Eligible for Spec ger Eligible (Effectiv		ervices (Reviev	v IEP).					
	ger Eligible for Spec ger Eligible (Effectiv		ervices (Reviev	v IEP).					
No Long No Long Date):	ger Eligible (Effectiv	re			es until the Effective D	ate below			
No Long No Long Date): This is a	ger Eligible (Effective) Final IEP, the stude	re			es until the Effective D Final IEP Effective				
No Long No Long Date): This is a Final IEP R	ger Eligible (Effective per El	ent remains eligi	ble for Special	Education Service	Final IEP Effective	Date:			
No Long No Long Date): This is a Final IEP R	ger Eligible (Effectiv a Final IEP, the stude eason: eam has considered	ent remains eligi	ble for Special	Education Servic	Final IEP Effective	Date:			
No Long No Long Date): This is a Final IEP R Fhe IEP Te	ger Eligible (Effective properties) Final IEP, the stude eason: Eam has considered al Maladjustment	ent remains eligible and agrees that	ble for Special t the educatio	Education Service nal needs of the Temporary Physic	Final IEP Effective student are not primal al Disability	Date: rily due to:	Lack of instr	ruction in read	ding
No Long No Long Date): This is a Final IEP R The IEP Te	ger Eligible (Effectiv a Final IEP, the stude eason: eam has considered	ent remains eligible and agrees that	ble for Special t the educatio	Education Servic	Final IEP Effective student are not primal al Disability	Date: rily due to:			ding Economic Fac

Los Angeles Unified S Student SHABTAI	THOMA	\overline{S}		Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019	Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022
Last	First		MI		Marting Date 27 AOG-2022
				al Goals and Objectives	
ormance Area:	Language			Language – Expressiv ✔ Annua g structured language activities and play ac	l Goal #:
given 1-2 prompts/mode	ls per trial				
Progress on annual goals will be provided at either	to be reported to Progress Report	parents by or Report (Card periods.	eport of Progress and Achievement from	Current IEP" form(s) which
	,			of Evaluation	
State Assessments Observation Other		Norm Portfo		Criterion Referenced Work Samples	☐ Curriculum Based ☐ Informal
Tommy will use a varie structured language acti prompts/models per tria	vities and play ac		-	-	ord utterances to respond to questions dur play activities in 7/10 opportunities given
Date to be achieved:	December •	2022	MO/YR	Date to be achieved: April	∨ 2023 ∨ MO/YR
	IE	P REPORT		D ACHIEVEMENT FROM CURREN	T IEP
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED	3 SUBSTA) met)	NTIAL PRO	EXPLANA OGRESS (50-99% of goa	ATION OF MARKS al 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49%)	of goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS
1st Reporting Period	2nd Reportin	ng Period	3rd Reporting Perio	od 4th Reporting Period (Secondary	Goal Achievement
Date:	Date:		Date:	Only) Date:	
Progress Mark:	Progress Mar	k:	Progress Mark:	Progress Mark:	Objective 1 Met: O Yes O No
Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to review/revise Goal Other	meet annual g Yes If "No" please comment:	yoal? No e fore Time ly ents Not	Is progress sufficient meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments No Completed Need to review/revise Goal Other	goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to review/revise Goal	Objective 2 Met: Yes No If "No" please explain:

Student SHABTAI	THOMAS		Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019	Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022
Last	First	MI	Date of Birth 17 Acc 2017	Witting Date 25 Hoo 2022
		Section G: Annual G	oals and Objectives	
formance Area:	Cognitive	Category: Cog	gnitive Developme	Goal #: 3
Thomas will use real ob	jects in pretend play on 4 occa	asions during a school week.		
	s to be reported to parents by r Progress Report or Report (Card periods.	t of Progress and Achievement from Cu	rrrent IEP" form(s) which
		Methods of 1	Evaluation	
State Assessments		Referenced	Criterion Referenced	Curriculum Based
✓ Observation	Portfo	olio	Work Samples	Informal
Other				
Incremental objective	#1 related to the goal:		Incremental objective #2 related to	the goal:
Thomas will imitate sin	nple actions (e.g., picks up pl	hone, rocks baby) on 4	Thomas will imitate routines (e.g. pre	
occasions during a scho	ool week		adult/peer support on 4 occasions dur	ring a school week.
Date to be achieved:	December > 2022	o → MO/YR	Date to be achieved: April	→ 2023 → MO/Y.
Date to be achieved:	December 2022 IEP REPORT	T OF PROGRESS AND A	Date to be achieved: April CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ION OF MARKS	¥ 2023 ¥
Date to be achieved: 4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED	IEP REPORT	T OF PROGRESS AND A	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT	IEP
4 GOAL MET OR	IEP REPORT	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary)	IEP
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet)	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ION OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only)	IEP (goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary)	IEP (goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date:	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period Date:	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date:	IEP (goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ION OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only)	IEP I goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met:
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date:	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period Date:	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date:	IEP goal met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal) 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual	IEP I goal met) 1 NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met:
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATIO OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark:	IEP goal met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal) 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual	Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met:
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No	3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal?	TOF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal) 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal?	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PROmet) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal?	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal) 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRES. Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: O Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? O Yes O No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time	Progress Mark: By progress Mark: Progress Mark: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	T OF PROGRESS AND A EXPLANATION OGRESS (50-99% of goal) 3rd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment:	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRES. Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not	Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to review/revise Goal	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
### A GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark:	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to	Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to review/revise Goal	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No
4 GOAL MET OR EXCEEDED 1st Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	JEP REPORT 3 SUBSTANTIAL PRO met) 2nd Reporting Period Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed	CHIEVEMENT FROM CURRENT ON OF MARKS 2 PARTIAL PROGRESS (1-49% of 4th Reporting Period (Secondary Only) Date: Progress Mark: Is progress sufficient to meet annual goal? Yes No If "No" please comment: Needs More Time Excess Absence/Tardy Assignments Not Completed Need to review/revise Goal	IEP Goal Met) I NO PROGRESS Goal Achievement Objective 1 Met: Yes No Objective 2 Met: Yes No

	INDIVIDUALIZE	ED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)	Page 14 of
Los Angeles Unified School District			
Student SHABTAI THOMAS		Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019	Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022
Last First	MI	i C4-4 I Di-4i-4 i-l A	
		n in State and District-wide Assessments d for each grade by the California Department of School District.	
DRDP-A - (Adaptations identified below are ap	plicable)		

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUC	ATION PROC	СКАМ (ТЕР)		Page 15 of 22
Los Angeles Unified School District	ATTO: (TRO			
Student SHABTAI THOMAS Last First MI	Date of Birth	17-AUG-2019	Meeting	29-AUG-2022
			Date	
Section N: Procedural Safegu	ards and Fol	low-up Actions		
A Parent's Guide to Special Education Services including Procedural language.	Rights & Sat	feguards was provide	d to the parent in	his/her primary
✓ The IEP Team Meeting Introductory Statements were read aloud at the	e beginning of	the IEP Team meetin	σ.	
✓ The parent/guardian was informed of his/her right to a written translati			C	
Is the parent/guardian requesting informal translation? Yes No		eferred Language:	~	
Is the parent/guardian requesting official translation? • Yes No	Select Pres	ferred Language: He	orew	~
Specify the Individual Pages to be translated:				
Specify the manifestation of the same and				
Special Requests:				
For students who are 17 years old, the student and parent(s)/guardian(transfer to the student at 18 years of age, unless the court has determine		nformed that the educ	ational decision-	making rights will
Pandemic Learning Loss Consideration of C	Compensator	y and/or Recoupmen	t Services	
Compensatory Education Consideration:	Recoupme	nt Services Consider	ration:	
The IEP team has reviewed and discussed whether compensatory education is required due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The IEP team has determined:	progres student	's learning during the	nsidered factors school facility cl	that may have impacted osures as a result of the
 Student received all of their special education and related aids and services required by their IEP. Compensatory education is not required. Student did not receive all of their special education and related aids and services required by their IEP. Compensatory education 	COVID-19 pandemic. The IEP team has determined: Student has made expected progress toward IEP goals and/or progress is in alignment with expectations of progress/goal achievement. No recoupment services are recommended. Student experienced learning loss as a result of the school			
offer details are documented in FAPE 2- Summary of Services. Student did not receive all of the special education and related aids and services required by their IEP. However, no compensatory education was warranted for the reasons documented by the IEP team in FAPE Part 2 Part 4. Compensatory education consideration was documented on IEP dated	recou recou servic IEP (ty closures caused by pment services are ne pment services to address offer details are in including completion upment services constitutions.	cessary. The IEP lress past learnin cluded in FAPE of a service grid deration was doo	team discussed g loss. Recoupment Part 2, Part 4 of the as necessary).
•			~	
 Preschool Only Consideration (Transition IEP) 30-Day IEP Consideration (Out-of-District) Student attends private school within district boundaries and resides o 	utside of distr	ict boundaries (Eligib	ility Determinati	on Only)
THIS SPACE DELIBER	ATELY LE	FT BLANK.		

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUC	CATION PROGRAM (IE	P)	Page 16 of 22
Los Angeles Unified School District Student SHABTAI THOMAS	Date of Birth 17-AUG	Meet Meet	ing Date 29-AUG-2022
Student SHABTAI THOMAS Last First MI	Date of Birth 17-AUC	3-2019	29-AUG-2022
Section Q: Parent Par	ticination and Consen	 t	
Parent Participation		Parent Notificatio	n
	Method	Whom	When
Parent/Student (18-21) has participated in the IEP meeting. Parent/Student (18-21) indicated before the meeting that they would not be able to attend. Parent/Student (18-21) was notified 3 times of the meeting time and place. Parent/Student (18-21) did not respond to any of the meeting notifications and the meeting was held without the Parent/Student (18-21) present Parent/Student (18-21) did not attend and gave permission to proceed	Other	Jodi Brown	17-AUG-2022
without them if they did not attend.	I (PARENT) acknowledge is request. (Pasthe IEP meeting be resched	rent initials here ONLY	s rescheduled to this date at my if the PARENT requested that
Parent/Student (18-21) Agreement	0		
A Parent/Student (18-21) may agree to all or some of the components of a implement those portions of the IEP to which the parent/student (18-21) a			nd services.
Parent/Student (18-21) AGREES to all components of the IEP.	<u> </u>		
O Parent/Student (18-21) AGREES to all components of the proposed IEP W	ITH THE SPECIFIC EXC	CEPTION(S) stated bel	low:
Assessment Specify			
☐ Eligibility Specify			
☐ Instructional SettingSpecify			
Services Specify			
The Parent/Student (18-21) DOES NOT AGREE with any of the component	nts of the proposed IEP		
A Parent/Student (18-21) is not required to initiate any form of dispute resonot agree. If a parent/student (18-21) does wish to initiate a form of disputinformation on dispute resolution processes in the District's publication, A Rights and Safeguards).	te resolution as to the con	nponents of the propos	sed IEP, the parent can find
Parent Concerns	s and Comments		
Signature(s,		Date	30-AUG-2022
O Guardian O Student age 18-21 years age 18-21 years 21 years	O Surrogate Parent	© Emancipated Minor	O Foster Parent
Did the school district facilitate parent involvement as a means of improving server I certify that I have received a copy of the Parent Input Survey regard voluntary and can be done at anytime after the IEP meeting			
Signature(s)		Date	29-AUG-2022

PARENT INPUT SURVEY

Would you please take a moment to complete the survey below.

The information you provide will help us improve the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process. Thank you in advance for your time and interest.

ALL INFORMATION IS CONFIDENTIAL

Does Not

Apply

Yes No

DIRECTIONS: After each statement, please place an X on the line that describes your experience with your child's IEP.

A. Regarding your child's current IEP:

1.	I am satisfied with the IEP meeting.		
2.	I feel that the IEP accurately reflects the decisions made at the IEP meeting.		
3.	I received notice of the IEP meeting.		
4.	I received "The IEP and You" handbook with the notice of the IEP meeting.		
5.	During the IEP process I received "A Parent's Guide to Special Education Services (Including Procedural Rights and Safeguards)" explaining my rights as a parent.		
6.	The IEP meeting was held in an appropriate setting.		
7.	I feel I was treated as an equal and important part of the IEP team.		
8.	The participants at the IEP meeting were prepared and informed.		
9.	Placements for my child, including the general education setting, were discussed and decided upon.		
10.	Related services were discussed and decided upon, if relevant.		
11.	If my child is 14 years old or older, an Individualized Transition Plan (ITP) was developed with my child's and my concerns in mind.		
12.	At the end of the IEP meeting the decisions were summarized.		
13.	If I needed an oral interpretation of the IEP team meeting an interpreter was provided.		
14.	The interpretation of the IEP team meeting enabled me to participate and make an informed decision regarding my child's IEP during the IEP meeting.		
15.	The interpreter stayed for the duration of the IEP team meeting.		
16.	If the interpreter left the IEP meeting before it was over, another staff member served as the interpreter and the interpretation was adequate.		
17.	I am aware that, if I am dissatisfied with the adequacy of the oral interpretation at the IEP team meeting, I can file a complaint with the Educational Equity Compliance Office at (213) 241-7682.		
18.	If I needed a written translation of the IEP, translation services were offered.		
19.	I am aware that, if I do not receive a copy of the translated IEP, I can contact the site administrator or call the Division of Special Education at (213) 241-6701.		
si	any of the answers to items 13–16 or 18–19 was No, please discuss your concern(s) with the te administrator or call the Division of Special Education at (213) 241-6701.		
8000	Regarding your child's previous IEP (if relevant):		
20.	I am satisfied that my child received the services described on the previous IEP. (If your answer to this question is "No", please write concerns below.)		
		Additiona	l Comments

s Angeles Unified School District	INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP)	Page 17
•		Reconvened Meeting Date
Student SHABTAI THOMAS	Date of Birth 17-AUG-20	
Last First	MI	
	Section R: Names and Signatures (Signatures on File)	
Team Member	Print Name	Signature
arent/Guardian	Arnon Shabtai via zoom	
arent/Guardian		
tudent Age 18 - 21 years		
tudent Under Age 18 years		
urrogate Parent		
oster Parent		
amily Foster Home Provider		
dministrator		
dministrative Designee	Jodi Brown	Jodephi
pecial Education Teacher	Cindy Kwan	(b)
eneral Education Teacher	Cecilia Ortiz	Ceclia ortiz
chool Psychologist	Sofia Klotzman	St Kley
chool Nurse		
elated Service Staff LAS	Danna Bornstein	determatement
elated Service Staff OT	Tali Cohen	Talia Cohen
elated Service Staff		
nterpreter	Lazer Mishulovin via zoom	
ign Language Interpreter		
gency Representative		
gency Representative		
gency Representative		
other		

Other

Other

Page 18 of 22	
-2022	

LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT ANALYSIS To Be Completed By the IEP Team at the IEP Team Meeting Student's Current Placement Type: General Education Class/General Education Site Special Day Program/Special Education Center Ononpublic School Home/Hospital or Residential Care Facility DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less restrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's required supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting unless there is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the shild or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in the box below. Then go to Step B.	_				INDIVIDUALI	ZED EDUC	ATION PRO	GRAM (IEP)		Page 18 of 2
Last First MI Birth Date LEAST RESTRICTIVE ENVIRONMENT ANALYSIS To Be Completed By the IEP Team at the IEP Team Meeting Student's Current Placement Type: General Education Class/General Education Site Special Day Program/General Education Site Special Day Program/General Education Site Nonpublic School Home/Hospital or Residential Care Facility DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less restrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's required supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting; unless there is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the shild or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No No If the answer is YES, then a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is analysing and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is analysing and/	Student			rict						
To Be Completed By the IEP Team at the IEP Team Meeting Student's Current Placement Type: General Education Class/General Education Site Special Day Program/Special Education Site Nonpublic School DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less restrictive string with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactory. The lack of current availability of a student's required supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless there is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No No, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications and provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO,					MI			17-AUG-2019	O	29-AUG-2022
To Be Completed By the IEP Team at the IEP Team Meeting Student's Current Placement Type: General Education Class/General Education Site Special Day Program/Special Education Site Nonpublic School DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactly. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No No, go to the question below. If the answer is YES, then a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why i										
Special Day Program/Special Education Site Special Day Program/Special Education Center Nonpublic School DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the hidled or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No No If the answer is YES, then a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why i				LEAST	RESTRIC	ΓIVE EN	VIRONM	ENT ANALYSI	S	
General Education Class/General Education Site Special Day Program/Special Education Center Nonpublic School DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less setrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the shild or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why is a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications				То Е						
Special Day Program/Special Education Center Nonpublic School Home/Hospital or Residential Care Facility DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the shild or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. Yes No If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in the provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in the provided within a reasonable timeline.					Stude	nt's Current	Placement Ty	<u>ype:</u>		
DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's required supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in the student's interpretation of the complex of the supports of the supports of the complex of the supports of the supports of the supports of the support of the supp	O Genera	l Education (Class/Gene	eral Educatio	on Site		O Special	Day Program/Genera	l Education Site	
DIRECTIONS: Complete the information below as part of the IEP team discussion regarding placement from the beginning at Step A until the team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting? Yes No If the answer is YES, then a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in a reasonable timeline.	O Special	l Day Prograr	n/Special	Education C	Center		O Nonpul	olic School		
team reaches the Step that indicates YES. After reaching the Step that indicates YES, it is also required to complete Step F. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that students with disabilities be educated in the least restrictive environment. Placement in a more restrictive setting should only occur if the nature or severity of the student's disability is such that placement in a less estrictive setting with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. The lack of current availability of a student's equired supports, services, accommodations and modifications is not the sole justification for placement in a more restrictive setting, unless here is a compelling reason why they cannot be provided. In selecting the LRE, consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the shild or on the quality of services that he or she needs. Step A. Can the supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications in the student's IEP be made available in a general education classroom/setting is the appropriate placement. If the answer is NO, go to the question below. Yes No If not currently available, can the required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications be made available in a general education classroom/setting? If YES, all required supports, services, accommodations and/or modifications must be provided within a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in a reasonable timeline. If the answer is NO, please articulate why in a reasonable timeline.	O Home/	Hospital or R	esidential	Care Facilit	у					
	The Individual Placement restrictive sequired suthere is a cochild or on	duals with Di in a more res setting with the apports, service ompelling rea the quality o	sabilities I trictive set he use of s ces, accom ason why t f services	Education A ting should upplemental modations a hey cannot b that he or sh	ct (IDEA) requ only occur if the ry aids and servand modification be provided. In the needs.	ires that studene nature or svices cannot ons is not the selecting the	dents with disseverity of the achieved	sabilities be educated in a student's disability is satisfactorily. The lack ation for placement in	in the least restricts such that placer c of current availant a more restrictive	ctive environment. ment in a less ability of a student's e setting, unless

os Angolo	a Unified (School Dist	riot	INDIVIDUALIZED	EDUCATION PRO	GRAM (IEP)		
_	SHABTAI Last	THO	DMAS First	MI	Date of Birth	17-AUG-2019	Meeting Date	29-AUG-2022
	A	NNUAL				ENT ANALYSIS	(Continued))
			10	Be Completed By the	e IEP Team at the IE	P Team Meeting		
Step C.	Can the	supports, s				student's IEP be made		
	O Yes	○ No	If the ans question	-	ecial school setting i	s the appropriate place	ment. If the ansv	wer is NO, go to the
	O Yes	○ No	available modifica	in a special school set	tting? If YES, all rec	, services, accommoda uired supports, service timeline. If the answe	s, accommodati	ons and/or
Step D.	Can the	supports, s	ervices, ac	commodations and/or	modifications in the	student's IEP be made	available in a ho	ome/hospital setting?
	O Yes	○ No		swer is YES, then a ho swer is NO, go to the q		s the appropriate place	ment.	
	O Yes	○ No	If not cur available modifica	rrently available, can the in a home/hospital set	he required supports tting? If YES, all rec	, services, accommoda juired supports, service timeline. If the answe	s, accommodati	ons and/or
Step E.	Can the facility		ervices, ac	commodations and/or	modifications in the	student's IEP be made	available in a re	sidential care
	O Yes	○ No		rrently available, articulation articulation articulation available, articulation a	ulate in the IEP what	supports, accommoda	tions and/or mod	difications are required

rep 1.			MI RESTRICTIVI Be Completed By the	Birth E ENVIRONMI	FNT ANAI VSIS	Date	
rep 1.				E ENVIRONMI	FNT ANALVSIS		
rep 1.	The student'	To	Be Completed By th			(Continued))
rep 1.	The student!			e IEP Team at the IE	P Team Meeting		
			ed in the contents of the is time, including (che		ement being considered	l by the IEP team	n, outweigh any
		Missed genera Rate at which Lack of opport Lack of opport Amount of soc Limited access	cess to the full range all education instruction student may earn creciturity for social interatunities for age-approprialization opportunities to peers in student's ure to appropriate behavior	n taught by highly qualits for graduation action priate peer role mode es with typical peers home community	els		

Los Angeles Unified	School District	IEP FAPE Pa	rt 1 - Eligibility, Placements and Supports
Student SHABTAI	THOMAS	Date of Birth 17-AUG-	-2019 Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022
Last	First	MI	
		Effective With this IEP	Future Changes Related to this IEP
	As of Date:	30-AUG-2022	
Eligibility:		Eligible (SLI)	
(from Page 4)	Final IEP Reason	Englishe (GEI)	
	Final IEP Effective Date:		
Curriculum		General Education	
Placement	Type of School	Preschooler Non-LAUSD/Not Headstart	
	Name of School	SP ED INF/PRE (1989)	
Instructional Setting	Setting	DIS Only - Preschooler	
	Program	GE	
	Special Day		
	Special Day Minutes/Wk		
	Addresses Goals	1(Language),2(Social/Emotional),3(Cognitive),4(Social Emotional)	
Additional Factors	Low Incident Support	None	
	Assistive Technology	No	
	Support		
	Transportation	None	
	Extended School Year/Intersession	○ Yes ○ No	
	Parent Counseling and Training (PCT)	Yes No	
	ESY Transportation		
Accommodation, Modifications, Supports	Instructional Accommodations	visual and verbal prompts/cues, redirection, repetition of instructions, additional response time, modeling of language, check for understanding, and receive praise and encouragement	
	Instructional Modifications		
	Other Supports, including Non- Academic and Extra- curricular Activities		
Preparation for Three Year Review IEP (At the second Annual Review IEP Meeting, the team must discuss and document the decision to conduct or	Do the Parent and the District (local educational agency) agree that a reassessment is unnecessary?	● Yes ○ No	
not conduct or not conduct a three- year comprehensive reassessment.)	If the Parent does not agree, specify the area(s) to be reassessed.		
		Comments, as appropriate	
Low Incidence Equipment			

Assistive Technology Equipment	
Participation in General Education	

	INDIVIDUALIZED EDUC		Page 20 o		
Student SHABTAI THOM Last Fir	IAS	IEP FAPE Part 2 - Summary of Services Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Meeting Date 29-AU			
		Effective With This IEP	Future Changes Related To This IEP		
Service 1	Start Date:	Effective on Signature Date 30-AUG-2022			
26	End Date:				
Pre-Kdg. Itinerant	Service applies to:	Regular			
	Frequency:	1-5			
This service addresses the following goals:	Interval:	Monthly			
2(Social/Emotional)	Minutes/Interval:	180			
3(Cognitive)	Minutes/Interval (Pullout from Gen Ed):	0			
4(Social Emotional)	Service Delivery Model:	Indirect Service (Consultative) {n/a for RSP}*			
	Responsible Personnel:	Special Education Teacher			
	*				
Service 2	Start Date:	Effective on Signature Date 30-AUG-2022			
10	End Date:				
Language/Speech	Service applies to:	Regular			
	Frequency:	1-10			

	•	•	
	*		
Service 2	Start Date:	Effective on Signature Date 30-AUG-2022	
10	End Date:		
Language/Speech	Service applies to:	Regular	
	Frequency:	1-10	
This service addresses the following goals:	Interval:	Monthly	
1(Language)	Minutes/Interval:	120	
	Minutes/Interval (Pullout from Gen Ed):	0	
	Service Delivery Model:	Direct Service (Collaborative)*	
	Area:	School	-Based

	Responsible Personnel:	Licensed/Credentialed Provider	
		General Education Teacher	
*			

Notes

Parents of students who are Medi-Cal eligible authorize LAUSD to submit claims for reimbursement by Medi-Cal funded services unless parent(s) signs a Parent Medi-Cal Non-Authorization to Bill form. Please see Parent's Guide to Special Education Services (including Procedural Rights and Safeguards).

Part 3 - Percentage of Time Outside	of General Education	
	Effective With this IEP	Future Changes Related to this IEP
% of Time per Week outside of General Education	0	
Part 4 - Compensatory Education/R	ecoupment Services D	iscussion

Part 4 - Additional Discussion (This section is optional)

The IEP team discussed a range of programs and recommends PCC at Arminta EEC as the program appropriate to provide FAPE. Father stated that Thomas will be starting a new full-day private preschool/daycare program. Due to location of the private preschool/daycare, bus transportation services are not provided due to the distance between school and daycare. Father wishes Thomas to attend the private school/daycare: Gan Shelanu, 13625 Burbank Blvd., Sherman Oaks, 91401; (818) 909-7500 at his expense and receive related services at the school of residence, Oxnard St. Elementary. The district offers PKIT (Preschool Kindergarten Itinerant Teacher) for 180 minutes (monthly) see service grid at Gan Shelanu community preschool. PKIT services is a consultative service provided by a special education in collaboration with the preschool staff to support the implementation of the student's IEP in the general education preschool program. Related Services of language and speech will be provided at the child's school of residence.

		INDIV	'IDUALIZ	ZED EDUC	CATION PRO	OGRAM ((IEP)		C
Los Ange	eles Unified School	District			IEP FAPI	E Part 2 -	Summary of	f Services	
Student	SHABTAI TI	HOMAS			Date of Bi	rth 17-AU	G-2019	Meeting Date	29-AUG-2022
	Last	First	MI						
				FAPE Sum	ımary Grid				
Progran	m:	GE			Setting:		DIS Or	nly - Preschooler	
Eligibili	ity:	Eligible (SLI)			Curriculun	1:	Genera	l Education	
Transpo	ortation:	None			Low Incide	nt Suppo	rt: None		
	strict Received Signature:	30-At	ıg-2022						
Service Code	Service Desc	Start Date	Service Applies To	Interval	Frequency	Area	Total Minutes	Addresses Goal(s)	No Consent
10	Language/Speech	Effective on Signature Date	Regular	Monthly	1-10	School- Based	120	Language	

Alternative Remote/Distance Learning Services During Emergency Conditions

Monthly

1-5

180

Social/Emotional,

Cognitive, Social Emotional

26

Pre-Kdg.

Itinerant

Effective on

Signature Date

Regular

If instruction or services, or both, cannot be provided to the pupil either at the school or in person for more than 10 school days due to emergency conditions caused by fire, flood, impassable roads, epidemic, earthquake, imminent major safety hazard as determined by local law enforcement, a transportation services strike by nonschool entity, or other official order issued to meet a state of emergency or war, the IEP will be provided by one or more of the means stated below, to the greatest extent possible in light of the emergency circumstances and District policy.

Means of Delivery, to greatest	extent possible ("x"	all that could a	pply for student, de	pending on emergenc	y circumstanc	es):
	Teacher-posted lessons, asynchronous (online or other media)	Virtual class meetings, synchronous	Personalized learning tools (virtual or paper packets, as available)	Scheduled teacher appointments (virtual or in- person, as available)	Scheduled email check-ins (parent or student)	Virtual office hours (drop-in; parent or student)
Specialized Academic Instruction and Related Services	✓	✓		~	✓	~
Supplementary Aids and Services (provided in general education classes and other general ed environments)	✓	✓	✓	~	~	✓

As soon as practicable following the determination that instruction or services, or both, cannot be provided either at the school or in person for more than 10 days due to a qualifying state of emergency, the parent will be notified as to the specific means by which the student's IEP will be provided, in light of the emergency circumstances present at that time. The IEP will be provided by alternative means as necessitated during the period of emergency conditions, only.

Comments above do not constitute a change to the District's offer of FAPE or IEP. Because the nature of any future emergency cannot be known in advance, the specific means by which the IEP shall be provided in a future emergency will be determined at the time, in light of the circumstances.

For IEP Team Information

INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAM

SPEECH LANGUAGE IMPAIRMENT (SLI) ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION Los Angeles Unified School District ATTACHMENT A Date of Birth 17-AUG-2019 Student THOMAS SH Meeting Date 29-AUG-2022 This page is to be completed for initial IEPs, 3-year evaluations, or when a comprehensive speech-language evaluation has been conducted to determine whether SLI eligibility is appropriate. Complete Step 1a or 1b Step 1a. General Education Interventions - Check items as completed Intervention strategies implemented, including English Language Instruction or Rt12 prevention support (including but not limited to school staff development regarding language standards in the curriculum and referral for Special Education, consultation between the classroom teacher and school speech therapist for appropriate classroom accommodations, consultation with the SSPT that includes an EL expert if student is identified as an English Learner). Intervention support monitored over several weeks, and modified interventions as necessary based on student response. Interventions were not successful, student referred for special education assessment. Screening by a speech therapist or a student success team meeting (including a speech therapist) with the focus being speech and language concerns OR an appropriate screening for non-LAUSD enrolled preschoolers. **Step 1b. Interventions Not Applicable** Interventions not applicable for non-LAUSD enrolled preschoolers or when determined unnecessary by the speech therapist. Step 2. Review of Pre-referral Information - Check items as applicable The speech or language delay does not appear to be due to unfamiliarity with English. The delay does not appear to be due to a lack of instruction in English, dialectical factors or limited language experience. The delay does not appear to be due to environmental factors. The delay does not appear to be due to economic factors. The delay does not appear to be due to social or cultural factors. Step 3. Assessment - Check either A or B, and complete the remaining items A. Student has received an assessment by a school psychologist that gives an indication of where the student's general ability lies. (if a language impairment is suspected) OR **B.** A psychological assessment is not required if the suspected area of disability is voice, fluency or articulation. Student has received a health assessment that rules out whether an inability to communicate effectively is a result of a health or sensory condition. A credentialed or licensed speech therapist has conducted a comprehensive evaluation, including assessment in the student's primary language, that consists of multiple measures of assessment, including but not limited to standardized test instruments (or alternate forms of assessment if necessary), formal speech/language sample, parent interview or checklist, teacher interview or checklist, and observation in various communication settings. Complete Step 4 Step 4. Determination of Eligibility of Speech Language Impairment (as the only identified special education eligibility) **A.** Student meets one or more of the following criteria (check each disorder that applies): A language disorder, which has been identified in an assessment that includes use of two or more standardized tests in one or more of the following areas of language development: morphology, syntax, semantics, or pragmatics where the resulting scores are at least 1.5 S.D. below the mean or below the 7th percentile for the student's chronological age or developmental level and a 50-utterance representative spontaneous language sample where the student displays inappropriate or inadequate usage of receptive and/or expressive language. Note: When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for the specific student, the expected language performance level shall be determined by alternative means as specified on the assessment plan [5 CCR 3030 (c)(4)]. An articulation disorder (e.g., Pronunciation), which draws adverse attention, significantly interferes with communication and has been identified in an assessment that includes a conversational speech sample which reveals significant interference with communication and identifies single or multiple speech sound errors that are below the student's chronological age or developmental level. A fluency disorder (e.g., Stuttering), which has been identified in an assessment that demonstrates that the flow of verbal expression adversely affects communication between the student and the listener in multiple communication settings and the dysfluency has persisted over time. A voice disorder (e.g., Chronic Hoarseness, Pitch Variations), which has been identified in an assessment by a speech therapist after the etiology has been cleared by a Medical Doctor, in writing. **B.** The impairment has a significant adverse affect on the student's academic performance. C. The presenting Speech Language Impairment is not due to: social maladjustment, health factors, poor school attendance, environmental, economic, or social disadvantage, lack of instruction or the unfamiliarity with the English language. Complete Step 5 Step 5. Consideration for additional special education service(s): Complete A or B. A. In the event a student with eligibility of Speech Language Impairment is being considered for special education academic services and/or support, an updated District psychoeducational evaluation has been completed to determine that SLI is the overarching eligibility. **B.** Student is not being considered for additional special education academic services and/or support.

If the student is eligible, the IEP Team must consider service delivery models based on the student's identified needs and appropriate placement in the least restrictive environment. Additionally, the IEP team should also include teacher and parent participation in the implementation of goals and supports and accommodations to ensure achievement of goals and objectives in a time-efficient manner and carry-over to multiple communication contexts.