SCHOOL PROFILE OF ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

Components of Effective AT Service Delivery	Highly Satisfactory (5)	Variations		Needs Improvement (1)
		(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
1. Referral **A.** School district provides training about AT, legal mandate, and what AT can do for students with disabilities.	All staff including regular educators are aware of AT and have received inservice training.	Most special and regular education staff members are aware of AT and have received inservice training.	Some special and regular education staff members are aware of AT and have received inservice training.	A few special education staff members are aware of AT and have received some inservice training.	Staff members have not received training about AT.
B. School district special education procedure manual or teacher handbook includes AT services and devices.	Procedure manual has clear, specific directions and procedures for providing AT services and devices.	Procedure manual has directions for providing AT services and devices.	Procedure manual has a few directions, but not sufficient.	Procedure manual mentions AT, but lacks directions.	There is no procedure manual, or it does not mention AT.
C. School district forms/reports include places to request and describe AT.	All appropriate forms include clearly identifiable places to indicate and describe AT devices and/or services.	District forms include the words AT, but do not include space to describe AT devices and services.	Forms do not encourage mention of AT, but reports sometimes describe it.	School district forms do not mention AT and reports do not address AT.	Staff are not encouraged or directed to consider AT.
D. District promotes parent input and inquires about AT and its use.	District uses procedures to respond in ways that value parental input and promote active parental participation.	District uses procedures which value parental inquiries and input, but does not encourage active participation in decision making activities.	Parent inquiries routed to staff members who send list of resources and suggestions governing further involvement.	Parent inquiries handled on a case-by-case basis at the discretion of staff member receiving call.	Parent inquiries, requests and input are not sought or acted upon.
2. Evaluation **A.** Staff who provide evaluations are knowledgeable about the operation and application of a variety of AT devices.	Evaluation staff are trained on a variety of AT hardware and software, and the district provides for ongoing skill development.	Evaluation staff are trained on some aspects of AT and the district provides for some updates/skill training.	Evaluation staff have some training in AT and how to utilize it in evaluations.	Evaluation staff are not knowledgeable about AT.	Evaluation staff are not encouraged or directed to learn about AT.

B. Evaluation staff utilize accommodations during evaluations.	AT and other accommodations are routinely utilized as part of the evaluation process.	AT and other accommodations are sometimes utilized as a part of evaluations.	Evaluation staff have occasionally used AT as an accommodation.	AT and other accommodations are not utilized during evaluations.	Evaluation staff are opposed to using AT during evaluations.
C. Evaluation staff know when and where to refer a student for additional evaluation from persons with expertise in AT.	Referrals are used to supplement information gathered by staff. Referrals are timely and tailored to specific needs of the student.	Referrals are used to replace local evaluation in areas where evaluation staff have identified weaknesses.	Referrals are used inconsistently.	Referrals are occasionally made, but not tailored to individual needs.	Referrals are never made.
3. Extended Assessment **A.** School district has an effective system to borrow AT for trial use.	District staff routinely obtain AT for trial use from loan libraries or other sources.	District staff often obtain AT for trial use from loan libraries or other sources.	District staff occasionally arrange AT trials.	District staff have arranged an AT trial in the past.	District staff do not obtain AT for trial use with students.
B. School district staff making decisions about AT use a clearly defined decision making process.	Team members are trained in, and effectively use, a clearly defined decision making process.	Team members are trained and are making progress in using a clearly defined process.	Most team members are trained and team sometimes uses organized process.	Some team members are trained, but team rarely uses an organized process.	Team members are not trained in, and do not use, a decision making process.
C. Parents are equal, valued participants in all aspects of AT decision making.	Parents are routinely included in information gathering, decision making, and planning for AT trials and use.	Parents are usually part of the AT decision making process.	Parents are sometimes part of the decision making process.	Parents are informed about decisions after they are made or are minimally involved.	Parents are not included in AT decision making.
D. District teams match student needs, abilities, environments, and tasks to appropriate, cost-effective tools.	District consistently provides funding, time, resources, and personnel to match student's needs and technology.	Teams have limited equipment resources to meet student needs, but provide services which support best possible use of time and equipment.	District supports teams with some AT equipment, resources, and training, but limits equipment and restricts time available for team activities.	District maintains an equipment/resource bank, but time limits team support leading to appropriate use.	District does not provide time and resource support to teams. No equipment bank.
E. When addressing AT needs, staff utilize a transdisciplinary assessment of student's need.	Pertinent personnel conduct assessments jointly in natural environments. Discipline boundaries minimized. Recommendations are collaborative and comprehensive.	Pertinent personnel conduct joint assessments. Comprehensive report(s) with recommendations limited to what is available in districts.	Interdisciplinary team assessment conducted by separate disciplines with reports and recommendation.	Assessment conducted by separate discipline(s) in pull out model. Separate report(s) and recommendations made.	District does not conduct assessment of AT need.

Components of Effective AT Service Delivery	Highly Satisfactory (5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	Needs Improvement (1)
4. Plan Development **A.** District's IEPs, when appropriate, include AT devices and services as part of specially design-ed instruction, related services, or supplementary aids and services.	IEPs clearly include AT in ways that reflect its use. Consideration of AT is always evident.	IEPs usually include AT and/or reflect that AT was considered.	IEP includes place for AT consideration.	AT is sometimes written in, but no places clearly require it or indicate that AT was considered.	AT is not considered in development of IEPs.
B. School district assures staff are trained in how to effectively write AT into IEPs when needed.	All staff have received training in writing AT into IEPs.	Most staff have received training in writing AT into IEPs.	Some staff have been trained writing AT into IEPs.	No specific training has been provided.	Staff do not appropriately include AT in IEPs.
C. IEP teams design and write integrated, transdisciplinary IEPs that incorporate AT in appropriate tasks.	Collaborative teams develop single IEP which is continually implemented by team members with shared and well-defined responsibilities.	Parents and staff send objectives, staff cooperatively writes child-centered IEPs. IEPs are implemented collaboratively.	Individual disciplines write IEP objectives then implement cooperatively as time permits.	Staff involved write IEP objectives as a team, but implement individually.	Individual staff members write IEP objectives based on what they see within their respective disciplines.
D. Planning for transition includes specific consideration of AT needs.	Effective, systematic transition planning is conducted which consistently includes AT when appropriate.	AT is frequently considered in transition planning.	AT is not generally included or considered in transition planning.	AT is rarely included or considered in transition planning.	AT is not part of it, nor considered in transition planning.
5. Implementation A. Clear responsibility for training, equipment maintenance, and operation assigned to specific service providers.	Staff members know their responsibilities and work effectively together to train others, keep equipment working, and insure its appropriate utilization across environments.	Staff generally know their responsibilities. Equipment is operating and in use in most cases, and some training is provided.	One or two staff members are always viewed as being responsible for AT and little training of others is provided.	Some equipment is not working appropriately. Responsibility is vague and no training of others is provided.	Equipment is typically unused, underused, or not working due to confusion about roles and responsibilities.

B. School district budgets for the purchase of AT.	Assistive technology is a line item in the district budget with sufficient funding to acquire and maintain an array of devices for staff training and trial use, as well as use by specific students.	AT is a line item in the district budget that generally meets the need for items for specific students.	AT is a line item in the district budget, but does not meet the identified student's needs.	AT is not in the budget, but items are sometimes purchased when needed.	AT is never purchased by the district.
C. Staff involved in the provision of AT services have time to meet together.	Regular meeting times are scheduled for teams to discuss AT implementation.	Team members have some scheduled times to discuss AT.	Some team members meet, but not all can attend meetings.	Occasional meetings to discuss AT have occurred.	Staff do not have time or opportunity to talk to each other about AT.
D. Identified consult-ant(s) in district or other source help personnel working with students using AT.	Uniformly understood district procedures support AT consultant or team, which provides training, resources and troubleshooting.	Consultant or team is available on a regularly scheduled basis for AT activities: screening, evaluations, consulta-tions, training and follow-up.	Consultant or team has regular schedule for AT duties. Part time AT members called on as time permits.	AT consultant or team has limited time and administrative support for follow-up and dissemination of information to other district personnel.	District does not support training of AT consultant or team, or provide time for AT activities.
E. Service providers and parents monitor and adjust implementation to correspond to changing student needs and abilities.	All students followed closely by team (including parent) with AT support on a consistent basis.	Monitoring by team (including parent) on a consistent basis. AT consultant on-site visits as needed.	Monitoring and adjusting done by team, but parent is not normally involved.	Teacher monitors and adjusts without team support. No formal input from parent.	AT monitoring addressed annually at IEP review.
6. Periodic Review					
A. AT is part of the district's over all technology plan.	Assistive technology is always included in technology planning across the district.	Assistive technology is usually included in technology plans.	Assistive technology is included only in some buildings.	Assistive technology is only included in grants where its consideration is required.	Assistive technology is never included in planning for district technology needs.
B. Continuing education needs of staff are assessed and responded to by the district or other agency.	Need for new training in AT is regularly assessed and access to information arranged.	Need for training is assessed.	Need for training is responded to and supported when requested by staff.	Need for training is sometimes recognized.	Staff need for continued training in AT is not met.

Reed (2000) Wisconsin Assistive Technology Initiative. Revised 5/30/00
References: Bowser, G., & Reed, P., (1995) Education Tech Points, *Journal of Special Education Technology,* 7, 4, 325-338
Carl, D., Mataya, C., & Zabala, J., (1994) Assistive Technology Innovation Configuration Matrix
Hall, G.E., & Hord, S.M., (1987) *Change in Schools: Facilitating the Process.* Ithaca State University of New York Press