Service Delivery models


**Reaction Questions:**

1. How does the history in this document compare to practice in our community today?

2. From your experience, how would you describe IEP goal-setting? What evidence have you seen regarding team based goals in our school/district/state?

3. In your opinion, what is the benefit or value of SISP services in your district/state?

4. From your experience, in what ways are services provided by physical therapists and other specialized instructional support personnel meeting the needs of students? Please give examples.

5. In your opinion, how do you rate the level of implementation or the success of SISP services to students in our school/district/state?
   a. Why do you think your rating is accurate?
   b. For those who have had experience with physical therapy, what have you experienced that supports the precept that PT services enhance student performance in schools?

6. What elements should the IEP team consider as the members determine what service delivery model in our community best meets the needs of a particular student? What should we as a community consider as we develop a service
delivery system that is responsive to the specialized instructional needs of students?

7. In your opinion, what impact can interventions provided by SISP have on teachers, parents, and community stakeholders? Please provide examples of the possibilities.

**Application Questions:**

1. Currently, how do our SISP utilize current research and/or best practices to determine most effective service delivery models? What are other resources are available to assist teachers, families and other school staff to understand the important roles of SISP in school settings, and the role that SISP play in our school/district?

2. If we do not know, how can we find out this information? Who might be able to provide us with this information?

3. What processes can we put into place that will ensure services are matched to the individualized needs of the student and are then delivered as identified?

4. In what ways can we ensure that the most appropriate service delivery model/approach is selected based on student need?

5. How can we cultivate/encourage/impact provider availability to meet the service needs of our children and youth in this school/district/community/state?
   a. If we have a personnel shortage, in what ways can we be creative in finding solutions to address service delivery issues?
   b. What is the potential for distance or virtual learning, etc., in our school/district/community/state?
   c. What types of professional development will address recruitment and retention issues related to SISP, and lead to better student outcomes?

6. What processes can we put in place to provide knowledge and skills for parents and caregivers to be equal partners with SISP and to reinforce strategies outside the school/therapy setting to ensure better student outcomes?
   a. What are the key knowledge and skill components that are essential to include in learning opportunities for parents and caregivers?
   b. Who can provide this information in our school/district/community/state?
c. What are the best avenues (personal, workshop, print) to utilize to provide information?

7. What steps will help to build a stronger collaborative school team that includes SISP and families?

8. What steps will we put in place in our school/district/state to ensure that families and SISP are included in relevant decisions and policies concerning students with disabilities?
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