

**Instructional Intervention /
Progress Monitoring (IIPM) Model**

**Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses
Methodology**

for

**Identification of Students with Suspected
Specific Learning Disabilities**

March 30, 2009

Table of Contents

Instructional Intervention/Progress Monitoring (IIPM) Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process	1 – 3
Introduction	1
Overview of IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process	1
Tier I – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction	1
Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation	2
Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with Progress Monitoring	2
Considerations for the Use of IIPM Pre/Referral Process and RtInst Methodology	3
Checklist: IIPM Pre/Referral Process	4 - 5
Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses Methodology	6 - 10
Overview	6
SPED Comprehensive Evaluation: Basic Psychological Processes	6
Evaluation Planning	7
Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses Methodology – Initial Evaluation	8 - 10
Data Analysis	8
PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules – Initial Evaluation	8 - 9
Data Measures Guidance	8
Decision Rules	9
PSW Methodology Assumptions – Initial Evaluation	9
Chart: Data/Measures Guidance	10
Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses Methodology – Reevaluation	11-13
Data Analysis	11
PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules – Reevaluation	11-13
Data Measures Guidance	11
Decision Rules	12
PSW Methodology Assumptions – Reevaluation	12
Chart: Data/Measures Guidance	13
Eligibility Determination	14

Appendices:

- Appendix A: Definitions – Basic Psychological Processes
- Appendix B: Basic Psychological Processes – Specific Learning Disabilities
- Appendix C: Evaluation Planning – Development of Working Hypotheses (SLD)
- Appendix D: PSW Methodology – Sample Reports

Note: Oregon Administrative Rules for Special Education Updated 2008, Oregon Department of Education, may be found at the District's website: <http://www.4j.lane.edu/adminrules> and at the website of the Oregon Department of Education: <http://www.ode.state.or.us>

Instructional Intervention/Progress Monitoring (IIPM) Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process

Introduction

Emerging practices suggest any referral for special education evaluation and services for students experiencing academic difficulties, including Culturally and Linguistically Diverse (CLD/ELL) students, should occur only after the student participates in a pre/referral process that includes instructional intervention and progress monitoring in the general education. The District's IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process provides all students with high quality instruction in the core curriculum and uses a tiered intervention process that monitors student performance on scientific, research-based (SBR) and culturally/linguistically responsive instructional interventions that are implemented within the general education classroom.

The IIPM Model and the IIPM Pre/Referral Process are essential procedural components of the District's SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Model. These components provide instructional interventions, progress monitoring, and cultural and linguistic information to rule out exclusionary factors, i.e., inadequate instruction, linguistic/cultural, socioeconomic and/or ecological/environmental differences, as the primary reasons for a student's academic failure. The IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process provides a thorough investigation of a student's academic performance in response to receiving instruction in a comprehensive core reading or mathematics curriculum as well as an analysis of the effectiveness of instructional interventions. Research continues to support the effectiveness of pre/referral procedures, including instructional interventions and RTI methodology, that may resolve 70% or more of the special education referrals of CLD students (Collier, 1998; Ortiz, 1999) and reduce the number of students inappropriately considered for special education eligibility and services (Fuchs, 2008).

The District implemented a major initiative for language arts instruction in the 2007-2008 school year with the adoption of a new language arts curriculum (K-8) and a tiered instructional delivery model referred to as the Instructional Intervention/Progress Monitoring (IIPM) Model. This initiative provides the guidelines and necessary supports to ensure that all students receive quality reading instruction and interventions with progress monitoring of academic growth in the general education classroom. The District plans to follow the same process for the implementation of the mathematics curriculum in the 2008-2009 school year. A standards-based comprehensive core mathematics curriculum, SBR instructional interventions, and progress monitoring assessments (e.g., EasyCBM) will be incorporated into the District's IIPM Model.

Overview of the IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process

The District's IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process incorporates an instructional intervention and progress monitoring framework derived from behaviorist learning theory and a Response to Intervention (RTI) methodology. The IIPM Model is a formal, structured approach to the provision of high-quality instruction and intervention matched to students' academic and learning needs. The approach requires frequent progress monitoring to assess student academic performance and learning rate to guide instruction, and is conceptualized in the District's IIPM Model as a Response to Instruction (RtInst) methodology. The IIPM Pre/Referral Process provides extensive pre/referral information necessary for non-discriminatory and fair assessments of all students, including CLD students. The IIPM Pre/Referral Process and incorporated RtInst methodology effectively address early identification and intervention of any academic difficulties within the general education environment.

All students receive instruction in the comprehensive core reading and mathematics programs. The District's IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process, includes procedures and guidance for instruction, instructional interventions, progress monitoring, and supports for all students. The following explanation of the IIPM Model Tiers I-III describes the model for reading. A similar process with variation for instructional time is utilized for a student receiving instruction in mathematics. For culturally and linguistically diverse students (CLD), review the District's guidelines and resources document (Appendix A).

Tier I – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction

All students receive instruction in the comprehensive core reading curriculum (Tier I and II) for a minimum of 40-90 minutes daily. Tier I instruction focuses on the five essential components of reading. Students are assessed periodically using the District's Reading Assessments and other CBM measures (EasyCBM or DIBELS). If a student scores below the 20th percentile s/he may be recommended by the IIPM Team for Tier II - Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring.

Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation

All students receive instruction in the Tier II Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation. Tier II instruction is more differentiated and skill focused than in Tier I and allows the general education teacher, with collaborative support from Title 1, reading specialist, facilitating teacher, and/or special education teacher, to address the instructional, learning, and cultural/linguistic needs of individuals and/or group of students (on, below, language support, or challenge level) in the core curriculum. Teachers may also use supplemental instructional materials.

Only students recommended from Tier I for progress monitoring receive a minimum of six weeks of differentiated instruction with three progress monitoring data measures in Tier II. The District's IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process (including RtInst methodology) begins with the student's recommendation for Tier II – Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring. The IIPM Pre/Referral Process may continue through Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions. Written Parent Notification is required for progress monitoring in Tier II and Tier III as part of the IIPM Pre/Referral Process and RtInst methodology.

A student may be recommended by the IIPM Team for Tier III – Targeted Instructional Intervention:

1. After receiving a minimum of six weeks of Tier II – Instructional Differentiation with progress monitoring;
2. After collection of three sets of data; and
3. If measured achievement falls below the projected aim line or produces a flat progress trend.

The IIPM Team may discontinue or extend Tier II progress monitoring if interventions are successful based on progress monitoring and RtInst methodology data.

Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with Progress Monitoring

A student receiving instruction in Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring will have a minimum of an additional 60 minutes per week of small group instruction using targeted, direct and explicit instructional interventions that are matched to the student's academic, learning, and cultural/linguistics needs. These interventions may be provided by the general education teacher, Title 1, reading specialist, ELD curriculum teacher, facilitating teacher, and/or SPED teacher depending on the resources available at each building. Students in Tier III will receive a minimum of six weeks of targeted instructional interventions and additional progress monitoring assessments every two weeks. The District's IIPM Pre/Referral Process and RtInst methodology continue through Tier III. Written Parent Notification is required for progress monitoring in Tiers II and III as part of the IIPM Model and IIPM Pre/Referral Process.

The decision rules for the IIPM Pre/Referral Process and RInst methodology in Tier III require the IIPM Team review and analyze the six – twelve weeks of Tier II and Tier III instructional interventions progress monitoring data points, as well as other assessment or background information, i.e., classroom performance, exclusionary factors, and other/CLD information. The IIPM Team may discontinue Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring if the student's data suggests interventions have been effective. The team may also determine the need for additional data and extend the Tier III interventions for an additional six weeks. If the student is not making adequate progress, i.e., continues to perform at a level below the academic aim line or measurements of progress produce a flat trend line and the IIPM Team suspects the student may have a disability, the team will refer the student for a SPED Comprehensive Evaluation.

If a student is referred for a SPED Comprehensive Evaluation, Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions will be reviewed (evaluation planning meeting) and continued through the evaluation period with progress monitoring weekly.

Considerations for the Use of the IIPM Pre/Referral Process and RtInst Methodology

The appropriate use of the IIPM Model Pre/Referral Process and RtInst methodology requires an understanding of and ability to implement high quality instruction in the core curriculum with differentiation, and when needed, targeted interventions and progress monitoring to meet diverse learner needs. Some additional considerations include the need to:

- Understand that standardized procedures for instructional interventions and progress monitoring assessments (CBMs) attempts to maximize the external validity and measurement reliability in determining RtInst methodology;
- Utilize a pre/referral process and progress monitoring measures that account for the differential rate of development between native language acquisition, second language acquisition, and acculturation (Ortiz, 2006);
- Recognize there is more instability in progress monitoring which affects data outcomes and, therefore, the progress monitoring may consequently underestimate student performance levels or skills knowledge particularly when students have received limited or inconsistent instruction and, particularly for ELL students, have a low proficiency in oral English (Gerber, 2004); and
- Recognize there is considerably more to learn about the RtInst (RTI) methodology. Specifically:
 1. What effective SBR instruction looks like in both the core reading program and as implemented in Tier II – Instructional Differentiation and Tier III – Targeted instructional interventions;
 2. How research can guide the instruction and intervention process; and
 3. What are the essential components required for the implementation of a pre/referral process and RtInst methodology?

The Oregon Department of Education, Office of Student Learning and Partnerships has a number of valuable links discussing the use of pre/referral procedures and RtInst (RTI) methodology for students who are struggling to learn and may be eligible for special education services. The link below provides pertinent information and is frequently updated as pre/referral and RtInst (RTI) information becomes available.

<http://www.ode.state.or.us/search/page/?id=315>

Checklist: IIPM Pre/Referral Process

The IIPM Pre/Referral Process Checklist provides the IIPM Team with a format to ensure the appropriate steps are followed and information is collected.

Tier I – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction

- ___ Review District Reading Assessment (or CBM measures) scores for all students;
- ___ Identify student with scores below the 20th percentile;
- ___ Consider recommending the student for Tier II – Differentiated Instruction with progress monitoring;
- ___ Initiate (start) the building's data form for the student; and
- ___ Determine if the student is a CLD or CLD/English Language Learner. (Check Program page on ESIS to determine if the student is in the ELD program, on monitoring status or has been reclassified as FEP). Consult with the CLD/SPED Team.

Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instructional Differentiation with Progress Monitoring

- ___ Provide appropriate instructional differentiation for the referred student for at least six weeks;
- ___ Consult (when appropriate) with the District CLD/SPED Team to design instructional differentiation;
- ___ Assess the student using progress monitoring measures a minimum of every two weeks;
- ___ Document three progress monitoring data points;
- ___ Review the student's progress after six weeks of instructional differentiation and progress monitoring;
- ___ Apply decision rules; and
- ___ Continue (extend) Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates the student is making adequate progress;
- ___ Discontinue Tier II – Comprehensive Core Reading Instruction with Differentiation and progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that the instructional differentiation is successful; or
- ___ Move to Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if the student is not making adequate progress.

Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions with Progress Monitoring

- ___ Provide targeted instructional interventions for at least six weeks;
- ___ Provide a minimum of 60 minutes per/week of small group instruction;
- ___ Consult (if appropriate) with the District CLD/SPED Team when designing targeted interventions;
- ___ Assess the student using progress monitoring measures a minimum of every two weeks;
- ___ Document three progress monitoring data points;

- ___ Review the student's progress after six weeks of targeted instructional intervention and progress monitoring;
- ___ Apply decision rules, and determine the next step;
- ___ Continue (extend) Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that the student is making adequate progress;
- ___ Discontinue Tier III - Targeted Instructional Interventions with progress monitoring, if progress monitoring data indicates that targeted instructional intervention is successful;
- ___ Consider any apparent exclusionary factors and/or factors that must be further explored; or
- ___ If the student is not making adequate progress and the IIPM Team suspects the student has a disability, the team will refer the student for a SPED Comprehensive Evaluation; and
- ___ Develop a working hypothesis to guide the IEP – Evaluation Planning; and
- ___ Review and continue the Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions through the evaluation period with progress monitoring weekly.

Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses Methodology

Overview

The District's SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Model was developed to evaluate students for special education eligibility and services. The SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Model includes two components and incorporates evaluation procedures with accompanying assessment methodologies: 1) IIPM Pre/Referral Process; and 2) SPED Comprehensive Evaluation. The second component of the District's SPED Comprehensive Model includes both Evaluation Planning and the completion of the SPED Comprehensive Evaluation. This component also adds Step 4: Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses (PSW) Assessment Methodology and Step 5: Interpretation of Evaluation Data.

The SPED Comprehensive Evaluation utilizes the Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses (PSW) Assessment Methodology. The District developed the PSW assessment methodology to provide a framework to organize, review and evaluate assessment data in terms of the student's patterns of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement and intellectual development/basic psychological processes, as related to the specific areas of disability(s) and the educational needs of the student.

SPED Comprehensive Evaluation: Basic Psychological Processes

Following the IIPM Pre/Referral Process, the SPED Comprehensive Evaluation requires that basic psychological processes be considered. The IEP Team must consider and gather data on as many as 9 basic processes: memory, processing, attention, visual, auditory, sensori-motor, mental control, problem-solving, and language use.

The District makes distinctions between three concepts:

1. Intellectual development

Intellectual development is used in the following manner on the Oregon Department of Education SLD eligibility form:

“Exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to age, Oregon grade-level standards, or intellectual development, that is determined to be relevant to the identification of a specific learning disability”

Intellectual development is defined to include broad measures of cognitive ability such as Full Scale IQ, General Intellectual Ability, or Broad Cognitive Ability. A broad measure of intellectual development is not always necessary for the IEP Team to obtain. However, if as part of the evaluation planning process the team determines some measure of intellectual development is relevant to the working hypothesis, obtaining it may be included in the planning and evaluation process (Component 2: SPED Comprehensive Evaluation).

2. Cognitive processes

The term, cognitive processes, is not referenced in the language of the ODE SLD regulations. However, the term has been used interchangeably with mental processes and information processing. Cognitive processes refers to specific, and sometimes narrow, factors as measured by an individual assessment instrument (e.g. WJ-III Working Memory).

3. Basic psychological processes

The concept of basic psychological processes is referenced in the definition of specific learning disability (see above). It is also referenced in the eligibility statement, *“that is determined to be relevant to the identification of a specific learning disability.”* Basic psychological processes refer to the 9 global processes referenced in the previous section. Because the definition of specific learning disability includes a “disorder in one or more” of these basic psychological processes, the IEP Team must consider data associated with these processes as part of the SPED Comprehensive Evaluation and when determining eligibility for specific learning disabilities.

Evaluation Planning

Evaluation Planning (OAR 581-015-2115) requires the IEP Team, including the parents, meet to review the existing evaluation data, student performance and observation data, information from parents and, for the CLD student, cultural and linguistic background information which is collected from Tier III of the District's IIPM Pre/Referral Process. The IEP Team determines if any other evaluation procedures and assessment methods/materials are required to ensure the evaluation plan is individualized to assess the specific area of suspected disability(s) and areas of educational need. The SPED Comprehensive Evaluation follows the Evaluation Planning and includes procedures and assessments methods/materials that are sufficiently comprehensive to meet the criteria outlined in Section 300.34 – Evaluation Procedures (IDEIA 04) and OAR 581-015-2160 – Evaluation and Reevaluation Requirements and the District's non-discriminatory assessment guidelines.

Evaluation Planning (Component 2: Step 1)

- **Review** with the parents and members of the IEP Team the following information:
 - a. Existing evaluation data;
 - b. Evaluation and information provided by the parents of the child;
 - c. Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments, and classroom-based observations;
 - d. Observations by teachers and related services providers; and
 - e. Exclusionary factors, including the appropriate consideration of cultural and linguistic background information.
- **Determine** based on the above review and input from the student's parents, if any other evaluation procedures and assessment methods/materials are required to determine whether the student is, or continues to be, a student with a disability (OAR 581-015-2130 through 581-015-218). Also complete the following:
 - a. Review and continue Tier III – Targeted Instructional Interventions through the evaluation period with progress monitoring weekly;
 - b. Assess relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the student; and
 - c. Identify information related to enabling the student to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum (OAR 581—105-2110).
- **Develop** an individualized evaluation plan designed to assess the specific disability(s) and areas of educational needs, including a working hypothesis about specific barriers to student learning and/or other referral concerns or questions;
- **Develop** a working hypothesis about a weakness in a basic psychological process.
- **Elicit** parent concerns regarding the evaluation plan.

Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses (PSW) Methodology – Initial Evaluation

The purposes of the initial evaluation include:

- 1 To determine if the student meets eligibility criteria for specific learning disability and the educational needs of the student if appropriate;
- 2 To develop a statement of the student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) and a statement of annual IEP goals (OAR 581-015-2200 – Content of IEP);
- 3 To plan and review instructional interventions and develop Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) to meet learner needs and characteristics (e.g., language and cultural background); and
- 4 To provide a description of how the student's progress towards meeting the IEP goals will be measured and reported.

Data Analysis

- **Organize** data gathered across IIPM Pre/Referral and evaluation procedures, conduct a thorough review of the data and identify if there are any patterns of strengths and weaknesses in a student's performance, achievement or intellectual development / basic psychological processes;
- **Review** the PSW Methodology as an approach to address any relevant exclusionary factors and measure outcomes from the working hypothesis as developed during evaluation planning; and
- **Utilize** PSW Data/Measures Guidance and decision rules to help determine the Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses relevant in determining any suspected disability(ies).

PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules – Initial Evaluation

Data/Measures Guidance

- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) and decision rules are applied through the IIPM Pre/referral process (criterion referenced assessments) and the eligibility determination (criterion referenced assessments, curriculum based or grade level assessments, norm referenced assessments, anecdotal information and consideration of basic psychological processes);
- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) used in assessment are for determining statistical (not occurring by chance) and normative (unusual in the population) occurrences of the obtained scores;
- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) for determining weaknesses and strengths may be specific for the instrument used. For standardized measures with a 100 mean/15 standard deviation, the District has determined a weakness as the 10th percentile (SS=80) or below and a strength as the 25th percentile (SS=90) or above.
- Statistically significant differences along with unusual prevalence rates could be used when a weakness in a basic process is somewhat high (e.g., near SS=90) and the strength is well above (e.g., near SS=120+). Similarly, it could be used when strengths are near average (e.g., near SS=90) and weaknesses are substantially below (e.g., SS<70).

Decision Rules

The SLD eligibility statement criteria (B)(2), “The child: Exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to...” is met when the IEP Team identifies:

- Three points of evidence of specific performance or achievement strengths; and
- Three points of evidence of specific performance or achievement weakness.

In addition, the District’s PSW Methodology requires the IEP Team to review and/or identify:

- A weakness in one or more of the basic psychological processes related to the specific performance/achievement weakness; and
- A measured/observed strength in one or more of the unrelated or minimally related processes.

PSW Methodology Assumptions – Initial Evaluation

The IEP Team may identify a pattern of strengths and weaknesses when the majority of evaluation data (including standardized assessments and professional observations) supports the minimum eligibility requirements, and when exclusionary factors can be rejected by the data.

Hypotheses developed during evaluation planning must be confirmed by the assessment, refuted by the assessment, or found to be inconclusive. Acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis by the team following evaluation, however, is only one factor to be considered when determining eligibility.

If the evaluation data do not support the identification of a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in basic psychological processes, the IEP Team must consider and document if there were any areas not evaluated or considered in the course of assessment. If there were other assessment concerns (such as inadequate assessment instruments, poor testing conditions and/or other factors), the IEP Team must either address the concerns with documentation or conduct additional assessment.

Chart: Data/Measures Guidance

The following chart lists the areas of assessment, anecdotal information and consideration of basic psychological processes. Examples of assessments and cut-off scores are included.

<p>Criterion-referenced Assessments <i>Investigating students' academic achievement with respect to grade-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: <i>EasyCBM (Reading)</i> <i>EasyCBM (Math)</i> <i>DIBELS</i></p>	<p><i>Strength ≥ 30th percentile</i> <i>Weakness ≤ 20th percentile</i></p>
<p>Curriculum-based or Grade-level Assessments <i>Investigating student's classroom performance with respect to grade-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: <i>Oregon Statewide Assessment Tests</i></p>	<p><i>Strength = meets/exceeds</i> <i>Weakness = does not meet</i></p>
<p>Example: <i>Chapter assessments from adopted curricula</i> <i>Informal Reading Inventories</i> <i>Writing Prompts</i></p>	<p><i>Strength = average or above</i> <i>Weakness = below average</i></p>
<p>Norm-referenced Standardized Academic Assessments <i>Investigating student's academic achievement with respect to age-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: <i>Wechsler Individual Achievement Test</i> <i>Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement</i> <i>Kaufman Tests of Educational Achievement</i> <i>Oral and Written Language Scales</i></p>	<p><i>Strength ≥ 25th percentile</i> <i>Weakness ≤ 10th percentile</i></p>
<p style="text-align: right;"><i>*Using age-norms to score</i></p>	
<p>Anecdotal Information <i>Investigating student's classroom performance with respect to age-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: <i>Anecdotal/observation information of a student's classroom performance compared to age-peers</i></p>	<p><i>Strength = professional judgment</i> <i>Weakness = professional judgment</i></p>
<p>Consideration of Basic Psychological Processes <i>Investigating student's academic achievement and classroom performance with respect to his/her intellectual development</i></p>	
<p>Example: <i>Norm-referenced intellectual assessments</i> <i>(i.e. WISCIV/WAISIII, WJ-III, CAS, KABC-II, DAS)</i></p>	<p><i>Strength ≥ 25th percentile</i> <i>Weakness ≤ 10th percentile</i></p>
<p>And/or <i>Rating Scales</i> <i>(i.e. BRIEF, Conners-3, BASC-2, PPC-R)</i></p>	<p><i>Strength = non-clinical range</i> <i>Weakness = clinical or at-risk ranges</i></p>
<p>And/or <i>Structured observational data</i></p>	<p><i>Strength = professional judgment</i> <i>Weakness = professional judgment</i></p>
<p><i>*Basic Psychological Processes include Memory, Attention, Processing, Problem-solving /judgment, Visual, Auditory, Sensory-motor, Language Use and/or Mental Control (Exec funct)</i></p>	

Patterns of Strengths and Weaknesses Methodology – Reevaluation

The purposes of the reevaluation include:

- 1 To determine if the student continues to meet eligibility criteria for specific learning disability and the educational needs of the student if appropriate;
- 2 To develop a statement of the student's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP) and a statement of annual IEP goals (OAR 581-015-2200 – Content of IEP);
- 3 To plan and review instructional interventions and develop/revise Specially Designed Instruction (SDI) to meet learner needs and characteristics (e.g., language and cultural background); and
- 4 To provide a description of how the student's continued progress towards meeting the IEP goals will be measured and reported.

The reevaluation process is similar to the initial evaluation. The Data Analysis and PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules for reevaluation process include a determination of the student's progress toward achieving IEP goals – i.e., age and grade level academic expectations.

Data Analysis

- **Organize** data gathered across evaluation procedures, including data required for reevaluations, conduct a thorough review of the data and identify if there are patterns of strengths and weaknesses in a student's performance, achievement or intellectual development /basic psychological processes.
- **Review** the PSW Methodology as an approach to address any relevant exclusionary factors and measure outcomes from the working hypothesis as developed during evaluation planning; and
- **Utilize** the reevaluation PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules to help determine the Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses relevant in determining if a student continues to meet eligibility for Specific Learning Disability (ies).

PSW Data/Measures Guidance and Decision Rules – Reevaluation

Data/Measures Guidance

- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) and decision rules are applied through the reevaluation process and the eligibility determination (criterion referenced assessments, curriculum based or grade level assessments, norm referenced assessments, anecdotal information and consideration of basic psychological processes);
- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) used in assessment are for determining statistical (not occurring by chance) and normative (unusual in the population) occurrences of the obtained scores;
- Data/Measures Guidance (Cut-off scores) for determining weaknesses and strengths may be specific for the instrument used. For standardized measures with a 100 mean/15 standard deviation, the District has determined a weakness as the 10th percentile (SS=80) or below and a strength as the 25th percentile (SS=90) or above.
- Statistically significant differences along with unusual prevalence rates could be used when a weakness in a basic process is somewhat high (e.g., near SS=90) and the strength is well above (e.g., near SS=120+). Similarly, it could be used when strengths are near average (e.g., near SS=90) and weaknesses are substantially below (e.g., SS<70).

- Reevaluation: Specific Data/Measures Guidance
 - 1 The reevaluation process determines a student's progress toward age and grade level academic expectations.

A student may demonstrate adequate progress (strength) when s/he is:

 - a. Meeting IEP goal criteria when the goal is aligned near or at grade level standards; and
 - b. Performing within or above the average range on academic assessments.

A student may demonstrate lack of progress (weakness) when s/he is:

 - a. Not meeting the IEP goal criteria when the goal is aligned at or below grade level performance standards; and
 - b. Performing below the average range on academic assessments.
 - 2 The reevaluation process continues to review and/or identify strengths and weaknesses in the student's basic psychological processes.

Decision Rules

The SLD eligibility statement criteria (B)(2), "The child: Exhibits a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both, relative to..." is met when the IEP Team identifies:

- Three points of evidence of specific performance or achievement strengths; and
- Three points of evidence of specific performance or achievement weakness.

In addition, the District's PSW Methodology requires the IEP Team to review and/or identify:

- A weakness in one or more of the basic psychological processes related to the specific performance/achievement weakness; and
- A measured/observed strength in one or more of the unrelated or minimally related processes.

PSW Methodology Assumptions – Reevaluation

The IEP Team may identify a pattern of strengths and weaknesses when the majority of reevaluation data (including standardized assessments and professional observations) supports the minimum eligibility requirements, and when exclusionary factors can be rejected by the data.

Hypotheses developed during reevaluation planning must be confirmed by the assessment, refuted by the assessment, or found to be inconclusive. Acceptance or rejection of the hypothesis by the team following reevaluation, however, is only one factor to be considered when determining continuing eligibility.

If the reevaluation data do not support the identification of a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in basic psychological processes, the IEP Team must consider and document if there were any areas not evaluated or considered in the course of assessment. If there were other assessment concerns (such as inadequate assessment instruments, poor testing conditions and/or other factors), the IEP Team must either address the concerns with documentation or conduct additional assessment.

The reevaluation process specifically reviews the student's response to specifically designed instruction (SDI) in the IEP goals and other academic areas when compared to age and grade level academic expectations. A student may demonstrate adequate progress (strength) when s/he meets IEP goal criteria when the goal is aligned near or at grade level standards and/or performs within or above the average range on academic assessments.

Chart: Data/Measures Guidance

The following chart lists the areas of assessment, anecdotal information and consideration of basic psychological processes. Examples of assessments and cut-off scores are included in the chart. In the reevaluation process, a student's strengths and weaknesses are determined by both percentile cut-off scores and IEP goal criteria related to age/grade level expectations or standards.

<p>Criterion-referenced Assessments <i>Investigating students' academic achievement with respect to grade-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: EasyCBM (Reading) EasyCBM (Math) DIBELS</p>	<p>Strength \geq 30th percentile Weakness \leq 20th percentile</p>
<p>Example: Response to Specially Designed Instruction IEP goals</p>	<p>Strength = Meets IEP criteria when goals are aligned near or at grade level standards. Weakness = Meets/Does not meet IEP criteria when goals are below grade level standards.</p>
<p>Curriculum-based or Grade-level Assessments <i>Investigating student's classroom performance with respect to grade-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: Oregon Statewide Assessment Tests</p>	<p>Strength = meets/exceeds Weakness = does not meet</p>
<p>Chapter assessments from adopted curricula Informal Reading Inventories Writing Prompts</p>	<p>Strength = average or above Weakness = below average</p>
<p>Example: Response to Specially Designed Instruction/IEP goals</p>	<p>Strength = Meets IEP criteria when goals are aligned near or at grade level standards. Weakness = Meets/Does not meet IEP criteria when goals are below grade level standards</p>
<p>Norm-referenced Standardized Academic Assessments <i>Investigating student's academic achievement with respect to age-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: Wechsler Individual Achievement Test Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Achievement Kaufman Tests of Educational Achievement Oral and Written Language Scales</p>	<p>Strength \geq 25th percentile Weakness \leq 20th percentile</p>
	<p>*Using age-norms to score</p>
<p>Anecdotal Information <i>Investigating student's classroom performance with respect to age-level expectations</i></p>	
<p>Example: Anecdotal/observation information of a student's classroom performance compared to age-peers</p>	<p>Strength = professional judgment Weakness = professional judgment</p>
<p>Example: Response to Specially Designed Instruction/IEP goals</p>	<p>Strength = Performing within or above the average range compared to peers. Weakness = Performing below the average range compared to peers academic assessments.</p>
<p>Consideration of Basic Psychological Processes <i>Investigating student's academic achievement and classroom performance with respect to his/her intellectual development</i></p>	
<p>Example: Norm-referenced intellectual assessments (i.e. WISCIV/WAISIII, WJ-III, CAS, KABC-II, DAS)</p>	<p>Strength \geq 25th percentile Weakness \leq 10th percentile</p>
<p>And/or Rating Scales (i.e. BRIEF, Connors-3, BASC-2, PPC-R)</p>	<p>Strength = non-clinical range Weakness = clinical or at-risk ranges</p>
<p>And/or Structured observational data</p>	<p>Strength = professional judgment Weakness = professional judgment</p>
<p>*Basic Psychological Processes include: Memory, Attention, Processing, Problem-solving/judgment, Visual, Auditory, Sensory-motor, Language Use and/or Mental Control (Exec funct)</p>	

Eligibility Determination

- **Provide** written Parental Notification in the parent's native language as specified under IDEIA 2004 and invited parents to attend the meeting, i.e., IEP notice for determining the student's eligibility for special education services;
- **Ensure** that the required members of the team attend the eligibility determination meeting, including the parents, and two or more qualified professionals in accordance with OAR 581-015-2190;
- **Include** an interpreter in the meeting to ensure the parents understand and can be fully involved in the process;
- **Review** all evaluation and assessment results including information from the IIPM Pre/Referral Process (RtInst information and progress monitoring data), additional information from Tier III - i.e., cultural, linguistic) - and information from the SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Procedure and Assessment Elements;
- **Review** all assessment data and background information from the SPED Comprehensive Evaluation Procedure and Assessment Elements (Component 2 Step 3).
- **Review** the *Comprehensive Framework for Nondiscriminatory Assessment* and apply the approaches and procedures that are designed to systematically reduce bias;
- **Apply** the PSW Methodology as an approach to organize, review, and evaluate assessment data;
- **Apply** PSW Data/Measures Guidance and decision rules to help determine a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses;
- **Review** exclusionary factors when considering the student's performance;
- **Elicit** parent input regarding eligibility. School personnel should assist parents in becoming familiar with the special education disability category(ies) being considered, so they can be active participants in the eligibility decision-making process. Parents should receive verbal and written notification in their native language of their right to agree or disagree with eligibility decisions and to receive appropriate eligibility documentation;
- **Follow** the procedures outlined in the Determination of Eligibility (OAR 581-015-2120);
- **Determine** student eligibility by following District procedures and the Oregon Administrative Rules for Special Education (2007);
- **Document** all assessment data and conclusions including a statement of eligibility for special education, noting any inconsistencies in data, and a record of the discussion regarding the significance of the significance of cultural, linguistic, socio-economic, environmental factors and the student behaviors and learning factors related to the assessment data; and
- **Refer** students who do not meet the Special Education eligibility requirements or who have learning difficulties that result from exclusionary factors, to the building's IIPM Team for continued instructional interventions and progress monitoring in the IIPM tiers.

Appendix A: Definitions - Basic Psychological Processes

Visual

The Visual Process is defined by cognitive mechanisms that are involved in the retention, processing, and organization of visual information so as to demonstrate accurate perception. For PSW, these should not be confused as a measure of the sensory mechanism of sight, but rather as indicators of the more complex underlying cognitive activities. Measures of the visual process may include factors such as spatial awareness, visual perceptual skills, perceptual organization, visual mental manipulation, and perceptual discrimination.

Auditory

The Auditory Process is not intended to be a measure of acuity of the sensory mechanism. Rather, it is intended to be the underlying cognitive mechanism involved in using auditory information for the purpose of learning. Measures of the auditory process may include phonemic awareness (including rhyming, segmentation, sound-symbol association, etc.), auditory perception, sound discrimination, and auditory mental manipulation.

Attention

The Attention Process involves the individual's ability to attend to, or to selectively attenuate, perceptual stimuli in a systematic and effective manner. This process includes measures of selective attention, sustained attention, response inhibition, attention shifting, and focus.

Memory

The Memory Process is a complex and multifaceted domain related to many areas of learning. Specific kinds of memory are utilized depending on task demands. The memory process involves the ability to store and retrieve information in a useful manner. Measures of this process include short term memory, working memory, associative memory and long term retrieval.

Processing

Processing can be globally defined as the ability to make efficient and rapid decisions or quickly perceive distinctions in stimuli. Processing involves input and output mechanisms, and frequently demonstrated under timed conditions. Measures of processing include processing speed, automaticity, and rapid decision-making. Processing may also include aspects of Rapid Automatic Naming facility, though this is an overlapping domain with memory.

Mental Control

The Mental Control Process may be thought of as an individual's ability to manage and prioritize perceptions to facilitate decision-making and problem solving. Mental control allows the individual to recognize the nature of a problem, plan a course of action, and sequence multiple actions to solve a problem. Mental Control abilities may be identified through measures of executive functioning, planning, organization, and self-regulation.

Problem-Solving/Judgment

Like memory, the Problem-Solving Process is a complex activity that involves multiple processes. The Problem-Solving Process is defined by an individual's skill at analysis and synthesis of multiple elements to resolve problems. The capability to engage in interpersonal interaction and social learning is involved. Measures of Problem-Solving and Judgment include social awareness, reasoning skills, decision-making, fluid reasoning and emotional control.

Language Use

The Language Use Process involves the individual's skill at using verbal information to define concepts and solve problems. Language Use includes both the understanding and production of meaningful speech and communication. Language Use may include measures of receptive language, expressive language, listening comprehension, vocabulary development, and general knowledge.

Sensori-Motor (Action/Output)

The Sensori-Motor Process involves integration of perceptual and cognitive skills to organize physical output. The Sensory-Motor Process can include all types of motor output including speech, gross motor, and fine motor skills. For the use as a basic psychological process involved in learning, Sensori-Motor primarily involves fine motor output. The Sensori-Motor Process may include measures of visual-motor integration, motor speed, and overall fine/gross motor skills.

Appendix B: Basic Psychological Processes – Specific Learning Disabilities

This chart provides the IEP Team with a starting point when considering academic skill weaknesses and associated basic psychological processes. It is important to note research suggests there is an overlap between basic psychological processes and across academic skill areas.

	Memory	Processing	Auditory	Mental Control	Problem-Solving	Language Use	Sensori-motor	Visual	Attention
Basic Reading Skills	*	*	*			*			
Reading Fluency	*	*		*					*
Reading Comprehension	*			*	*	*			
Math Calculation	*	*		*					*
Math Problem Solving	*			*		*		*	
Written Expression				*	*	*	*		
Oral Expression						*			
Listening Comprehension						*			

Appendix C: Evaluation Planning – Development of Working Hypotheses (SLD)

- Basic Reading Skills
- Reading Fluency
- Reading Comprehension
- Written Expression

To be developed:

- Math Calculation
- Math Problem Solving
- Oral Expression
- Listening Comprehension

Appendix D: PSW Methodology – Sample Reports