



***The Van Buren
Intermediate
School District***

***Policy and
Guidelines for the
Evaluation of
Specific Learning
Disabilities***

February 2013

Acknowledgements

This policy was adapted from *Specific Learning Disabilities Evaluation Procedures* (September 2009) developed by Kalamazoo Regional Educational Service Agency.

The following documents were also helpful in writing this Van Buren Intermediate School District Policy and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Specific Learning Disabilities:

- MAASE. (2006). *Response to Intervention: Enhancing the Learning of All Children*. Lansing, MI: Author.
- Michigan Department of Education. (October 2011). *Michigan Administrative Rules for Special Education*. Lansing, MI: Author.
- Michigan Department of Education. (May 2010). *Michigan Criteria for Determining the Existence of a Specific Learning Disability*. Lansing, MI: Author
- National Reading Panel (2000). *National Reading Panel Report*. Washington DC: Author.
- National Reading Panel (2000). *Teaching Children to Read*. Washington DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA)*. Retrieved April 14, 2008 from www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html.

The following VBISD staff participated in the writing, editing and reviewing of this document:

Roger Coates, School Psychologist
Georgette Ellegood, School Psychologist
Katy Holverstott, Supervisor of Special Education
Cleveton Jack, School Psychologist
Dave Manson, Director of Special Education
Judi Rohl, Special Education Secretary

VBISD School Psychology Department:
Jane Ammeson, School Psychologist
Carlisle Applewaite, School Psychologist
Kim Booko, School Psychologist
Liz DeBoer, School Psychologist
Sarah Gray, School Psychologist
Cathy Jarvie, School Psychologist
Judy Jogerst, School Psychologist
Ruth Koenes, School Psychologist
Wendy Minor, Planner/Monitor
Lissa Perkins, School Psychologist
Cheri Reeves, School Psychologist
Bruce Williams, School Psychologist

Table of Contents

Page	
4	Legal Foundation
6	Definition of Specific Learning Disability
6	I. Establish Lack of Achievement Relative to Age or State Approved Grade Level Standards
6	II. Demonstrate Insufficient Progress to Meet Age or Grade Level Standards
7	III. Exclusionary Factors
7	A. Visual, Hearing, or Motor Disability
7	B. Cognitive Impairment
7	C. Emotional Impairment
8	D. Cultural, Environmental or Economic Disadvantage
8	E. Limited English Proficiency
8	F. Lack of Appropriate Instruction
10	Related Terms and Guidelines
10	I. Response to Scientific, Research-based Intervention (RtI) Process
10	II. Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses
10	III. Comprehensive Evaluation
11	A. Evaluation Plan
11	B. Initiation of Evaluation and Timelines
11	C. Observation
12	D. Documentation
Appendix A: Student Data Review (SDR)	

POLICY AND GUIDELINES FOR THE EVALUATION OF SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

Legal Foundation

Recent changes in federal special education rules and regulations indicate that states may consider the use of a Response to Intervention (RtI) model for identifying students with specific learning disabilities as an alternative to the discrepancy model. Language from IDEA-2004, §300.307, states, in part:

- (a) A State must adopt ... criteria for determining whether a child has a specific learning disability . . . In addition, the criteria adopted by the State –*
 - (1) Must not require the use of severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement for determining whether a child has a specific learning disability . . .*
 - (2) Must permit the use of a process based on the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention; . . .*

Language from IDEA implementing regulation 34 CFR 300.309 *Determining the existence of a specific learning disability*, states, in part:

- (a) The group described in...300.306 may determine that a child has a specific learning disability...if*
 - (1) The child does not achieve adequately for the child'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 child's age or State-approved grade-level standards...*
 - (2)(i) The child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or State-approved grade-level standards in one or more of the areas...when using a process based on the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention; or*
 - (2)(ii) The child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, State-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development determined by the group to be relevant to the identification of a specific learning disability...*

In September, 2008, Michigan finalized rules to address the requirement that states adopt criteria for determining specific learning disability. Language mirrors federal language in §300.8(b)(10):

- R 340.1713 Specific learning disability defined; determination.*
- Rule 13. (1) "Specific learning disability" means a disorder in 1 or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell, or to do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia, and developmental aphasia. Specific learning disability does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities, of cognitive impairment, of emotional impairment, of autism spectrum disorder, or of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage.*
- (2) In determining whether a student has a learning disability, the state shall:*
- (a) Not require the use of a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement.*

(b) Permit the use of a process based on the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention.

(c) Permit the use of other alternative research-based procedures.

R 340.1713 also adds the following language that mirrors federal language in §300.309:

(3) A determination of learning disability shall be based upon a comprehensive evaluation by a multidisciplinary evaluation team, which shall include at least both of the following:

(a) The student's general education teacher or, if the student does not have a general education teacher, a general education teacher qualified to teach a student of his or her age or, for a child of less than school age, an individual qualified by the state educational agency to teach a child of his or her age.

(b) At least 1 person qualified to conduct individual diagnostic examinations of children, such as a school psychologist, an authorized provider of speech and language under R 340.1745(d), or a teacher consultant.

In a letter of clarification to the field, dated January 22, 2009, Dr. Jacquelyn Thompson, Michigan Director of the Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services, indicated three processes that may be used by the field in the evaluation of Specific Learning Disabilities including the following: (a) consideration of a severe discrepancy as a part of a full and individual evaluation, (b) response to scientific, research based intervention, and (c) pattern of strengths and weaknesses.

In May 2010, the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) provided further clarification in the document entitled, *Michigan Criteria for Determining the Existence of a Specific Learning Disability*. This document, consistent with IDEA federal regulations at 34 CFR §300.309 and the MARSE at R340.1713, allows only two processes for determining the existence of SLD: (a) response to scientific, research-based intervention and (b) pattern of strengths and weaknesses. This document explicitly discourages the use of severe discrepancy. This document also requires school districts to determine which process, or combination of processes, it will use to determine SLD eligibility. Further, it requires that such decisions be communicated to the education community and parents.

The VBISD recommends that each school district, in compliance with MDE recommendations stated above, should annually determine which process, or combination of processes, will be used to determine SLD eligibility. For grade levels within a district that are not yet fully implementing RtI, a pattern of strengths and weaknesses process will be used. It is recommended that data collected from partially implemented RtI efforts should be considered when identifying patterns of strengths and weaknesses. For grade levels fully implementing RtI, the school district is responsible for using a response to scientific, research-based intervention process.

Definition of Determining Specific Learning Disability

IDEA 2004 Regulation, §300.309 serves as the key regulation in the framework of determining SLD eligibility and defines elements of the evaluation process.

I. Establish Lack of Achievement Relative to Age or State Approved Grade Level Standards

Evaluation of current data and further evaluation must establish and document: (a) inadequate achievement relative either to age level or grade level standards, and (b) appropriate instruction.

Federal rule specifies that eligibility evaluation must address the age appropriate instruction that the student has received and the achievement of the student related to grade level standards. Although age is one variable, the emphasis on state approved grade level standards reflects the priority that all instruction for students addresses grade level content standards.

§ 300.309 Determining the existence of a specific learning disability.

(a) The group described in § 300.306 may determine that a child has a specific learning disability, as defined in § 300.8(c)(10), if—

(1) The child does not achieve adequately for the child'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 child's age or State-approved grade-level standards:

(i) Oral expression.

(ii) Listening comprehension.

(iii) Written expression.

(iv) Basic reading skill.

(v) Reading fluency skills.

(vi) Reading comprehension.

(vii) Mathematics calculation.

(viii) Mathematics problem solving.

The VBISD considers inadequate achievement as student performance below the tenth percentile. Further, to document age-appropriate instruction and student response relative to age and grade, a cumulative record such as the Student Data Review (see Appendix A) is recommended to be initiated by the general educational intervention team.

II. Demonstrate Insufficient Progress to Meet Age or Grade Level Standards

Documentation that the student is not making adequate progress, subsections 2(i) and (ii), may be completed in one of two ways: (a) determine that the student has not responded, despite the provision of high quality, individualized general education instructional interventions, or (b) demonstrate a pattern of strengths and weaknesses, given appropriate instruction.

(2)(i) The child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or State approved grade-level standards in one or more of the areas identified in paragraph (a)(1) of this section

when using a process based on the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention; or

(ii) The child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, State-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development, that is determined by the group to be relevant to the identification of a specific learning disability, using appropriate assessments, consistent with §§ 300.304 and 300.305.

The VBISD recommends that in addition to 90 minutes per day of the core curriculum (i.e., Tier I), progressive interventions (i.e., Tiers II and III) be implemented over approximately 12 to 20 weeks. Student progress must be monitored and documented at least bi-weekly to demonstrate student response or a pattern of strengths and/or weaknesses.

III. Exclusionary Factors

The evaluation team must address and rule out other factors as the primary cause of the child's learning difficulties, including: (a) inadequate achievement due to other disabilities/factors, (b) inadequate achievement due to lack of appropriate instruction, or (c) presence of other disabilities or factors.

(3) The group determines that its findings under paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section are not primarily the result of—

- (i) A visual, hearing, or motor disability;*
- (ii) Mental retardation;*
- (iii) Emotional disturbance;*
- (iv) Cultural factors;*
- (v) Environmental or economic disadvantage; or*
- (vi) Limited English proficiency.*

A. Visual, Hearing or Motor Disability. Ruling out a visual, hearing or motor disability as the primary cause of underachievement may involve: district screening; teacher and/or parent input; consultation with OT/PT or other evaluation staff; or, evaluation by a family physician, ophthalmologist, optometrist, audiologist, otolaryngologist, or neurologist.

B. Cognitive Impairment (Mental Retardation). The evaluation must include data that would allow the IEP Team to determine whether cognitive impairment was the primary cause of the underachievement and either lack of progress or pattern of weakness. This could be done by assessing for cognitive impairment or by record review of information that would be contraindicative of such impairment.

C. Emotional Impairment (Emotional Disturbance). The evaluation must include data that would allow the IEP Team to determine whether an emotional impairment is the primary cause of the student's learning problems. This could be done by assessing for emotional impairment or by record review information that would be contraindicative of such an impairment or primary role.

D. Cultural, Environmental or Economic Disadvantage. The evaluation must establish the primary cause of the disability and must rule out causative factors not related to disability, such as: (a) poor school attendance or frequent school changes causing lack of appropriate instruction due to inconsistent instruction or gaps in learning, (b) family stressors, including pressures from family situations or poverty should be eliminated as factors causing interruption or interference in learning, (c) cultural or ethnic background different from the norm or majority group should be considered both as a factor which may cause interference in approaching learning or as a factor in the perceptions of those who work with the child.

The VBISD cannot rule out attendance as a primary factor for students who are absent 10 percent or more of an academic period. A lack of attendance may not be considered an exclusionary factor if arrangements are made to allow for approximately 30 to 60 days of continuous attendance with appropriate instruction at the student's instructional level. In addition, family stressors may be the primary cause when acute family crisis or situational trauma has occurred within approximately the past six months. Further, culturally and ethnically fair assessments require sensitivity to students' diverse backgrounds and will inform the choice of specific assessments. Attempts must be made to enlist support by the cultural or ethnic community to help in the interpretation of evaluation results.

E. Limited English Proficiency. English language learners who do not achieve commensurate with other children their age, despite research based interventions may be referred for special education evaluation and services. However, assessment must consider the child's cultural and language differences:

- Selection must be non-discriminatory with respect to race and culture.
- Administration must be in the child's native language or in a form that will best estimate the child's abilities.

F. Lack of Appropriate Instruction. Federal guidance indicates that "children should not be identified as having a disability before concluding that their performance deficits are not the result of a lack of appropriate instruction." Therefore, the evaluation team must be able to conclude that lack of appropriate instruction is not the determinant factor in the child's underachievement.

(b) To ensure that under achievement in a child suspected of having a specific learning disability is not due to lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math, the group must consider, as part of the evaluation described in §§ 300.304 through 300.306—

(1) Data that demonstrate that prior to, or as a part of, the referral process, the child was provided appropriate instruction in regular education settings, delivered by qualified personnel; and

(2) Data-based documentation of repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals, reflecting formal assessment of student progress during instruction, which was provided to the child's parents.

The federal regulations do not define standards for “appropriate instruction,” however; the USDOE does note that such instruction has the following characteristics: (a) scientifically research based, (b) provided by qualified personnel, and (c) student progress data systematically collected and analyzed.

Additionally, MDE (May 2010) includes in the definition of a lack of appropriate instruction as including (as defined in section 1208(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) explicit and systematic instruction in (a) phonemic awareness, (b) phonics, (c) vocabulary development, (d) reading fluency, (e) oral reading skills, and (f) reading comprehension strategies.

The VBISD recommends programs supported by scientifically based research and those that provide instruction that is: (a) well sequenced, (b) differentiated, (c) taught to mastery, (c) explicit, including specific error correction routines, and (d) engaging with frequent and overt student responding.

Related Terms and Guidelines

I. Response to Scientific, Research-based Intervention (Rtl) Process

The Rtl process as defined by the MDE (May 2010) is as follows:

1. *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 areas identified at 34 CFR §300.309(a)(1)(i) when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the student's age or State-approved grade-level standards; and*
2. *The student does not make sufficient progress to meet age or State-approved grade-level standards in one or more of the areas identified at 34 CFR §300.309(a)(1)(i) when using a process based on the student's response to scientific, research-based intervention.*

II. Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses

Determining a pattern of strengths and weaknesses is the second option described by federal regulations. This option may be used in districts when an Rtl option is not fully implemented. This process was defined by the MDE (May 2010), and is as follows:

1. *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 areas identified at 34 CFR §300.309(a)(1)(i) when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the student's age or State-approved grade-level standards; and*
2. *The student exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, State-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development, that is determined by the MET to be relevant to the identification of a SLD, using appropriate assessments, consistent with the IDEA Evaluation Procedures and Additional Requirements for Evaluations and Reevaluations.*

III. Comprehensive Evaluation

Federal commentary makes it clear that Rtl may be only one component of the evaluation. "Determining why a child has not responded to research-based interventions requires a comprehensive evaluation," and cites §300.304(b), which requires that a special education evaluation include a variety of assessments.

An RTI process does not replace the need for a comprehensive evaluation. A public agency must use a variety of data gathering tools and strategies even if an RTI process is used. The results of an RTI process may be one component of the information reviewed as part of the evaluation procedures required under §§ 300.304 and 300.305. As required in § 300.304(b), consistent with section 614(b)(2) of the Act, an evaluation must include a variety of assessment tools and strategies and cannot rely on any single procedure as the sole criterion for determining eligibility for special education and related services. 71 Fed Reg. 46,648

Comprehensive assessment is defined as the following:

- *“a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent,” §300.304(b)(1);*
- *“assess[ment] in all areas related to suspected disability, including, if appropriate, health, vision, hearing, social/emotional status; general intelligence; academic performance; communicative status; motor abilities” §300.304(c)(4);*
- *“assessment sufficiently comprehensive to identify all of the child’s special education and related services needs, whether or not commonly linked to the disability category in which the child has been classified.”§300.304(c)(6);*
- *“information from a variety of sources, including aptitude and achievement tests, parent input and teacher recommendations, as well as information about the child’s physical condition, social or cultural background, and adaptive behavior” §300.306(c)(1)*

The evaluation for SLD eligibility is completed for two purposes: to clarify eligibility and to define the starting point for further interventions. Language in the federal regulations includes the terms “relevant,” and “if appropriate,” indicating the need for evaluation planning to determine the scope of an evaluation.

A. Evaluation Plan. The Review of Existing Evaluation Data (REED) document provides the framework for the development of initial evaluations and reevaluations. This document can be used with both the patterns of strengths and weaknesses process or Rtl and the data used will be dependent upon the process used.

B. Initiation of Evaluations and Timelines. According to IDEA (2004):

(c) The public agency must promptly request parental consent to evaluate the child to determine if the child needs special education and related services, and must adhere to the timeframes described in §§ 300.301 and 300.303, unless extended by mutual written agreement of the child’s parents and a group of qualified professionals, as described in § 300.306(a)(1)—

(1) If, prior to a referral, a child has not made adequate progress after an appropriate period of time when provided instruction, as described in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section; and (2) Whenever a child is referred for an evaluation.

Michigan rules, which specify no more than 30 school days from consent to IEP meeting, must be followed unless the parent and district mutually agree to extend the timeline.

Further, the district is required to address the question of disability if a student has not made progress after an appropriate period of time with appropriate intervention. The length of time may vary, depending on the circumstances, but the district should not delay unnecessarily once a disability is suspected.

C. Observation. According to IDEA 2004 Regulation, §300.310, when considering the presence of a Specific Learning Disability, the district must ensure that observations document the student’s academic performance and behavior in the area(s) of difficulty. Below is the full description of observation:

Observation. § 300.310

- (a) The public agency must ensure that the child is observed in the child's learning environment (including the regular classroom setting) to document the child's academic performance and behavior in the areas of difficulty.*
- (b) The group described in § 300.306(a)(1), in determining whether a child has a specific learning disability, must decide to—*
 - (1) Use information from an observation in routine classroom instruction and monitoring of the child's performance that was done before the child was referred for an evaluation;*
 - or*
 - (2) Have at least one member of the group described in § 300.306(a)(1) conduct an observation of the child's academic performance in the regular classroom after the child has been referred for an evaluation and parental consent, consistent with § 300.300(a), is obtained.*
- (c) In the case of a child of less than school age or out of school, a group member must observe the child in an environment appropriate for a child of that age.*

D. Documentation. § 300.311 provides a checklist for required elements of a written report documenting the evaluation team's decision regarding eligibility of SLD.

§ 300.311 Specific documentation for the eligibility determination.

- (a) For a child suspected of having a specific learning disability, the documentation of the determination of eligibility, as required in § 300.306(a)(2), must contain a statement of—*
 - (1) Whether the child has a specific learning disability;*
 - (2) The basis for making the determination, including an assurance that the determination has been made in accordance with § 300.306(c)(1);*
 - (3) The relevant behavior, if any, noted during the observation of the child and the relationship of that behavior to the child's academic functioning;*
 - (4) The educationally relevant medical findings, if any;*
 - (5) Whether—*
 - (i) The child does not achieve adequately for the child's age or to meet State-approved grade-level standards consistent with § 300.309(a)(1); and*
 - (ii)(A) The child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or State approved grade-level standards consistent with § 300.309(a)(2)(i); or*
 - (B) The child exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, State-approved grade level standards or intellectual development consistent with § 300.309(a)(2)(ii);*
 - (6) The determination of the group concerning the effects of a visual, hearing, or motor disability; mental retardation; emotional disturbance; cultural factors; environmental or economic disadvantage; or limited English proficiency on the child's achievement level; and*
 - (7) If the child has participated in a process that assesses the child's response to scientific, research-based intervention—*
 - (i) The instructional strategies used and the student-centered data collected; and*
 - (ii) The documentation that the child's parents were notified about—*
 - (A) The State's policies regarding the amount and nature of student performance data that would be collected and the general education services that would be provided;*
 - (B) Strategies for increasing the child's rate of learning; and*
 - (C) The parents' right to request an evaluation.*

(b) Each group member must certify in writing whether the report reflects the member's conclusion. If it does not reflect the member's conclusion, the group member must submit a separate statement presenting the member's conclusions.

The VBISD uses the Eligibility Recommendation (ER) form to document the MET recommendation. This ER in itself is sufficient to document all required components of a comprehensive evaluation; however, it is noted that in some cases this form may be accompanied by a report and/or additional attachments.

Appendix A: Student Data Review

A. Demographics			
Student:	DOB:	Age:	Gender:
Race/Ethnicity:	ELL:	Native Language:	
District:	School:	Grade:	Teacher:
Parent/Guardian:			
Address:	City:	State: MI	Zip Code:
Home Phone:	Work Phone:	Email:	
Student Data Review (SDR) Start Date:			

B. Area(s) of Concern					
<i>(Record date first noted in column to the left)</i>					
	Basic Reading		Listening Comprehension		Hearing
	Reading Fluency		Oral Expression		Vision
	Reading Comprehension		Communication/Language		Sensory
	Written Expression		Adaptive Functioning		Health / Medical
	Math Calculation		Social / Emotional		Motor Functioning
	Math Problem Solving		Behavior		Other:
Describe areas of concern (e.g. compared to GLCE, typical peer performance, etc.):					
List the student's strengths and interests:					

C. Parent Communication					
Date and school staff members who first notified parents/guardians of concern:					
Do the parents share the staff's concern?					
Communication Log					
Date	Staff	Type of Contact (e.g., email, phone, conference...)	Information Shared	Were repeated assessments shared?	Outcome of Contact

D. Intervention Log						
Intervention	Date Parents Notified	Start Date	End Date	Person Implementing	Days Per Week	Min. Per Day

E. Rate of Progress
<i>Attach charts/graphs comparing student progress monitoring data to the student's goal line, e.g., DIBELS, behavior plan charting, etc.</i>

F. Team Meeting Log & Action Plan

Record all meetings the school staff convened, to discuss the student's specific needs. Use the following rubric to indicate the outcome of the meeting (i.e., teams decision on next steps taken):

Date of Meeting	Team Participants	Action Plan	Due Date

G. Attendance and Discipline

School Year	Total number of:				Briefly describe or attach documentation:		
	Absent-Excused	Absent-Unexcused	Tardy	Office Referrals	OSS	Behavior	Type of instructional support

H. Achievement

Criteria: Data documenting achievement relative to age/state approved grade-level standards.

Assessment Type	Date	Existing data				
Grades						
Teacher reports						
Student input						
Benchmark screening (DIBELS)						
Progress monitoring (daily, weekly or bi-weekly intervals)						
Criterion referenced assessments						
Norm-referenced achievement tests						
MEAP	Year	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Social St.

I. Additional Data		
Assessment Type	Date	Existing Data
Cognitive assessment		
Adaptive behavior		
Social/emotional/behavior scales		
Speech and lang. assessments		
Functional behavior assessment data		
Developmental and family history		
Outside evaluations/reports		

J. Other Factors That May Affect Performance (Check each area with sufficient data and specify)			
Criteria: Data on other factors that may affect performance on appropriate age/grade-level standards or activities.			
Vision:	Cognitive:	Environmental, Economic Disadvantage:	
Hearing:	Social/Emotional:	English As Second Language:	
Health:	Cultural:	Autism Spectrum Disorder:	
Motor Functioning:	<i>List data needed for any unchecked area(s):</i>		

K. Problem Specification and Validation			
Rate each main category below according to grade level expectations 1-4 (check one)			
1. Significantly below avg. 2. Below avg. 3. Average 4. Above avg.			
Following each main category, check the specific sub skills of concern.			
Reading <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Math <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Phonemic awareness <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Number sense <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Phonics <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Computational & procedural fluency <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fluency <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Concepts & reasoning/problem solving <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehension <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Algebra <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Vocabulary <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Geometry & measurement <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
Written Expression <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Communication/Lang. <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Legibility <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Articulation <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fluency <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Pragmatics <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Conventions <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Oral expression <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Syntactic <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Listening comprehension <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Semantic <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4			
<input type="checkbox"/> Content <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4			
<input type="checkbox"/> Writing process <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4			
Social/Emotional <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Behavior <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Adult relations <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Attends to instruction <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer relations <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Motivation and effort <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Even temperament <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Work completion <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive to social cues <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Low frustration tolerance <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Follows directions/rules/routines <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
Adaptive Functioning <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	Health/Medical <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Age appropriate self-help skills <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Energy level <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Functions independently <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> Sleep patterns <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Chronic illness <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Gross motor <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fine motor <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4		

Documentation of Evidence		
List evidence confirming the extent of the student's areas of deficit in the section below. May cite data within this document (e.g., assessment results, progress monitoring, observation data, etc...)		
Concern	Date	Evidence

L. Observation Data	
<p>Criteria: Summarize observations of the student in the learning environment (including general education setting) to document academic performance and behavior in the area(s) of difficulty noted above. Observations must specifically note the following: Date and Time of observation; Observer Name and Title; Instructional Activities (i.e. individual seatwork, small group cooperative work, etc.); Instructional Materials (i.e. worksheets, computers, overhead projector, etc.); Manner of Presentation (i.e. teacher-directed, small group, whole group, etc.); and Comparison to Peers' performance in the classroom.</p>	
Date/Time	
Observer Name/Title	
Instructional Activities	
Instructional Materials	
Manner of Presentation	
Peer Comparison	

M. Appropriate Instruction					
<p>Criteria: Data demonstrating appropriate instruction in one or more of the first eight SLD areas from section B- Area/s of Concern (Basic Reading, Reading Fluency, Reading Comprehension, Written Expression, Math Calculation, Math Problem Solving, Listening Comprehension, Oral Expression).</p> <p>Note: Consider the following only with respect to appropriate instruction in the student's area(s) of concern. Answer questions below with a checkmark in the appropriate box.</p> <p>When answering "Yes" list data or cite documents that provide evidence each standard has been met.</p> <p>* When answering "No" complete the last section of this table below.</p>					
Area(s) of concern	Do the teachers meet NCLB "highly qualified" standards?	Are the district curriculum materials research-based and aligned to the state GLCEs?	Have the teachers received training in curriculum materials?	Has the curriculum been implemented with fidelity?	Has the student attended at least 85% of instructional days?
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
<p>* If no data is available to document appropriate instruction (i.e., any boxes checked "No"), describe what will be done to document and/or provide appropriate instruction in space provided here. Make brief note in the "next steps" column of the Team Meetings Log.</p>					