|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | [Insert District Name Here] | [Insert District Logo] |

**Specific Learning Disabilities**

Assessment Documentation Form

Initial  Reevaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Name:** Ken Dean (example for RTI spring case study) | **DOB:** 01/03/2003 | **Age:** 11 |
| **School:** 123 Elementary | **Grade:** 5th | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Instructions** | | | |
| When considering if a student may be eligible for special education and related services as a student with a Specific Learning Disability, the IEP team must respond to each item below. The IEP team must answer “yes” to each yes/no statement to appropriately conclude a student is a student with a Specific Learning Disability. **A narrative for each section must also be completed where indicated.** | | | |
| **Definition** | | | |
| The term *Specific Learning Disability* means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations, and that adversely affects a child’s educational performance. Such term includes conditions such as perceptual disabilities (e.g., visual processing), brain injury that is not caused by an external physical force, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Specific Learning Disability does not include a learning problem that is primarily the result of Visual Impairment; Hearing Impairment; Orthopedic Impairment; Intellectual Disability; Emotional Disturbance; Limited English Proficiency; or, Environmental or Cultural Disadvantage. | | | |
| **Reason for Referral** | |  |  |
| Documentation of the Problem(i.e., classroom-based performance assessments, standardized testing results, and other relevant assessment data) | |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken is performing significantly below grade level expectations in math. State mandated assessment indicates Below Basic performances in math (5th and 6th percentile) and science (7th and 1st percentiles) for the 2012 and 2013 assessments, respectively. Standards-based benchmarks (Learning Links) are consistent with state testing, with performance in math falling at the 310 and 255 quantiles, respectively (GLE 680-820 with 75+ expected growth mid-year). In addition to benchmark assessments, a grade level Easy CBM prompt was administered and Ken's performance was ranked at the 3rd percentile. Performances in reading, although also below grade level expectations, show expected improvement from BOY to MOY (655-770 lexile; GLE 895-1210 with 75+ expected growth mid-year). | | | |
| **Parent/Teacher Input** | |  |  |
| Parent Input(i.e., any pertinent familial information, student/family medical history, and etc.) | |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Developmental history is negative for childhood illness and serious injury. All milestones were met WNL, although speech was a concern in second grade. Ken appears to like school and is motivated to perform; however, he does become "easily frustrated" with assignments, especially homework. | | | |
| Teacher Input(i.e., indirect observation, work samples, documentation of differentiated instruction, and etc.) | |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken has participated in Tier III math instruction for 11 weeks and is slowly progressing in math skill development. He continues to struggle with math fact fluency, which significantly slows his processing time. Multiplication has been a difficult concept for Ken to grasp, although he is beginning to understand the conceptual underpinnings. Almost all tasks require 1:1 assistance, use of concrete manipulatives and guided practice. | | | |
| **Tier I—Common Core Instruction/Differentiation** |  | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| To ensure that underachievement in a student suspected of having a Specific Learning Disability is not due to a lack of appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous, systematic, and peer-reviewed) in the student’s State approved grade level standards, the following must be obtained: | | |
| 1. Data that demonstrate that prior to, or as a part of, the referral process, the student was provided appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous and systematic throughout Tier I instruction/intervention) in regular education settings, delivered by qualified and appropriately trained personnel. |  |  |
| 1. Fidelity monitoring: (i.e., review of weekly lesson plans, scope and sequence guides, etc. by an administrator; review of teacher-submitted daily schedule to administrator; or, observations of teachers during the TEAM or other evaluation process). |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Student schedule evidences participation in Tier I reading and math blocks. Administration reviews instructional materials weekly and official teacher rating 1x/semester at a minimum. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier II Intervention** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| To ensure that underachievement in a student suspected of having a Specific Learning Disability is not due to a lack of appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous, systematic, and peer-reviewed) in the student’s State approved grade level standards, the following must be obtained **(Note: include and interpret progress monitoring results/graph for Tier II)**: | | |
| 1. Data that demonstrate that prior to, or as a part of, the referral process, the student was provided appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous and systematic throughout Tier II intervention in regular education settings, delivered by qualified and appropriately trained personnel. |  |  |
| 1. Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement (8-10 data points if monitoring every other week, or 10-15 data points if monitoring weekly), reflecting formative assessment of student progress during intervention, which was provided to the student’s parents at a minimum of once every four and one-half (4.5) weeks. |  |  |
| 1. Fidelity monitoring: 3 checks in Tier II where 2 must be a direct observation. Implementation integrity was found to occur at 80%. |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Student participated in 12 weeks of Tier II intervention that was monitored with fidelity checklists (90%). Data was attached to the Progress Monitoring Letter and sent to parents every 4 weeks. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Tier III Intervention** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| To ensure that underachievement in a student suspected of having a Specific Learning Disability is not due to a lack of appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous, systematic, and peer-reviewed) in the student’s State approved grade level standards, the following must be obtained **(Note: include and interpret progress monitoring results/graph for Tier III)**: | | |
| 1. Data that demonstrate that prior to, or as a part of, the referral process, the student was provided appropriate instruction (i.e., empirically research-based instruction that is rigorous and systematic throughout Tier III intervention in regular education settings, delivered by qualified and appropriately trained personnel. |  |  |
| 1. Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement (8-10 data points if monitoring every other week, or 10-15 data points if monitoring weekly), reflecting formative assessment of student progress during intervention, which was provided to the student’s parents at a minimum of once every four and one-half (4.5) weeks. |  |  |
| 1. Fidelity monitoring: 5 checks in Tier III where 3 must be direct observations and 2 must be a review of implementation data (i.e., attendance, lesson plans, progress monitoring results). Implementation integrity was found to occur at 80%. |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Student participated in 11 weeks of Tier III intervention with highly-qualified math teacher within the general education setting. Weekly progress monitoring data was provided to parents via the Progress Monitoring Letter with student graph attached. All five fidelity monitoring checks occurred throughout the intervention period, with integrity to the intervention at 85% or higher. | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Special Education Evaluation Procedures** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The LEA must ensure that the child is observed in the student’s learning environment (including the regular classroom setting) to document the student’s academic performance and behavior in the areas of difficulty. A pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance shall be documented by two systematic observations in the area of suspected disability conducted by the certifying specialist: | | |
| 1. Systematic observation of routine classroom instruction, and |  |  |
| 1. Systematic observation during intensive, scientific research-based or evidence-based intervention. |  |  |
| **Narrative:** A systematic observation of routine instruction was completed by Mr. Goode, the academic coach, while a second observation of the intervention was completed by the school psychologist. Both observations document the student's difficulty with math calculation, specifically multiplication. | | |
| The student does not achieve adequately for the student’s age or to meet State-approved grade-level standards in one or more of the following areas, when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the student’s age or State-approved grade level standards **(Note: at least one disability area must be checked “yes” for a student to qualify for services. Achievement data must be collected through the use of a standardized achievement measure subsequent to intensive intervention)**. | | |
| 1. Basic Reading Skills |  |  |
| 1. Reading Fluency |  |  |
| 1. Reading Comprehension |  |  |
| 1. Written Expression |  |  |
| 1. Mathematics Calculation |  |  |
| 1. Mathematics Problem Solving |  |  |
| An evaluation of Oral Expression and Listening Comprehension shall be completed pursuant to the Speech or Language Impairment eligibility standards. If a student has been evaluated by a Speech Language Pathologist and does not qualify as Language Impaired, then the IEP team may consider a Specific Learning Disability in either Oral Expression or Listening Comprehension if either continues to be a suspected area of disability; however, the rigorous intervention and progress monitoring standards must be met. | | |
| 1. Oral Expression |  |  |
| 1. Listening Comprehension |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken's performance on standardized assessment (KTEA-II) indicated performance levels ranked below the 1st percentile in both math calculation and math reasoning. Score Summary Table attached. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The student does not make sufficient progress to meet age or State-approved grade-level standards in one or more areas (i.e., Basic Reading Skills, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Math Calculation, Mathematics Problem Solving) when using a process based on the student’s responsiveness to scientific, research-based intervention in each area of suspected delay. |  |  |
| A lack of sufficient progress will be established by examining the student’s Rate of Improvement (ROI) including a gap analysis and will be based on the following criteria: | | |
| 1. The rate of progress or improvement is less than that of his/her same-age peers, or |  |  |
| 1. The rate of progress is the same as or greater than that of his/her same age peers but will not result in reaching the average range of achievement within a reasonable period of time. |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken's ROI is 0.12 compared to typical ROI of 0.25. At his current ROI, it would take 300 instructional weeks to attain grade level skills. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| The team must determine that underachievement is not **primarily** due to the following **(Note: by checking “yes,” the team is indicating that the disability is NOT due to the exclusionary factor based on its review of applicable information)**. | | |
| 1. Visual, Motor, or Hearing Disability |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken passed vision and hearing screens at BOY and there are no concerns noted with motor skill development. | | |
| 1. Intellectual Disability |  |  |
| **Narrative:** No concerns noted with overall cognitive ability. | | |
| 1. Emotional Disturbance |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken has appropriate social relationships and history is negative for medical and/or mental health diagnoses. | | |
| 1. Cultural Factors |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken is a minority; however, cultural status is not the reason for underachievement in math. | | |
| 1. Environmental or Economic Factors |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Although low socio-economic status has been indicated in school records, this is not the primary reason for underachievement in math. Ken has exposure to appropriate learning and social activities. | | |
| 1. Excessive Absenteeism |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken has been present 92% of the days this year. | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Eligibility Determination** | | |  |  |
| A student whose characteristics meet the definition of a student having a Specific Learning Disability may be identified as a student eligible for special education services if: | | | | |
| 1. All of the aforementioned eligibility criteria are met, AND | | |  |  |
| 1. There is evidence, including observation and/or assessment, indicating how the Specific Learning Disabilities adversely impact the student’s performance in or access to the general education curriculum. | | |  |  |
| **Narrative:** Ken exhibits underachievement in the area of math calculation, even with the provision of intensive Tier II/III interventions. His rate of improvement, academic gap and current measured skill set are significantly below expectations and warrant specialized attention beyond that offerred through tiered interventions. All rule-out factors have been considered and were determined to not be a primary contributing factor to his underachievement. | | | | |
| **Signatures (Name/Title)** | | |  | |
| Each person involved in the assessment must certify in writing whether the report reflects the member’s conclusion. If the report and its determination do not, the team member must submit a separate statement presenting the member’s dissent. | | | Please indicate agreement. | |
| **Signature** | **Title** | **Date** | **Yes or No is required** | |
|  | Parent/Guardian |  |  |  |
|  | General Ed Teacher |  |  |  |
|  | Special Ed Teacher |  |  |  |
|  | School Psychologist |  |  |  |
|  | Interventionist |  |  |  |
|  | LEA Representative |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |