

# **Special Services Building Report**

**For: March, 2021**

## **Board Meeting**

Submitted by: Maureen Stott,  
Director of Special Services

### **Special Education Activities**

- SpEd referral hearing screenings were completed February 19, at the SpEd Office 13 students 3 year old and up were screened, 3 referrals out to an audiologist were made.
- February 9-12 I attended the virtual National ESEA convention and attended multiple trainings on Restorative Trauma Informed School Environments, and other trainings on Social Emotional Resilience~ How to Promote Healthy Minds and Climate, Social Emotional Learning~ Preparing Students During Times of Uncertainty, The Neuroscience of Reading, and Dyslexia in the Schools. I am working with a company called Brainspring to coordinate a training for Browning Public Schools on Dyslexia.
- As we continue the discussion of the Procedural Safeguard as the guiding principles and rights for parents with students that have been identified as SpEd eligible, and the different categories of qualification, the next areas of identification under IDEA I would like to discuss this month is Learning Disabled.

A Learning Disability is a condition causing difficulties in acquiring knowledge and skills to the level expected of those of the same age, especially when not associated with a physical disability.

There are two methods to identify a learner with a Specific Learning Disability, the Response to Scientific, Research-Based Intervention,

otherwise known as the RTI model, and the Severe Discrepancy model. Browning Public Schools utilizes the RTI method at the PK-1 grade levels, a hybrid method at the 3-5 grade levels and the Severe Discrepancy model at the 6-12 grade levels.

The RTI model focuses on keeping data on instruction and interventions introduced to a struggling learner, documented, assessed, and revisited to see if there is an improvement. It's kind of like going to the Dr. and trying an antibiotic for a set period of time, and then going back to see if there is an improvement. If there is improvement to the academic learning, keep giving the intervention, if there is not improvement, or there is stagnation, introduce another research-based intervention. After a set time frame, if no interventions are showing improved results, a referral is made to begin assessment for a possible SpEd identification.

The Severe Discrepancy model is based on a two standard deviations between cognitive ability and achievement in 2 or more assessment areas.

## 10.16.3019(a) CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY

### **RESPONSE TO SCIENTIFIC, RESEARCH-BASED INTERVENTION** **(Rti)**

Yes No The student has been provided learning experiences appropriate to the student's age or grade-level based on state-approved K-12 content standards.

Yes No The student did not make sufficient progress to meet age or grade level based on state-approved K-12 content standards in one or more of the following areas. (check each area in which the student did not make sufficient progress):

<input type="checkbox"/> basic reading skills	<input type="checkbox"/> oral expression
<input type="checkbox"/> reading comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> written expression
<input type="checkbox"/> reading fluency skills	<input type="checkbox"/> mathematics calculation
<input type="checkbox"/> listening comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> mathematics problem solving

Yes No The student was determined to have a specific learning disability based on an insufficient response to scientific, research-based interventions resulting in a low level of academic achievement.

Yes No Insufficient response to interventions occurred when, despite the implementation of the interventions over a sustained period of time, the student did not achieve adequately based on the student's age or grade level based on state-approved K-12 content standards.

#### **Scientific, research based interventions were:**

Yes No Matched to the specific needs of the student as identified through systematic, data-based processes for examining the presenting problem, including parental input, to identify instructional interventions that have a high likelihood of success;

Yes No Focused on changing the instructional strategies or techniques used with the student; and

Yes No Regularly monitored for student progress and correct implementation via regular and frequent data collection, and analyzed and modified as necessary based on data analysis.

In determining the response to scientific research-based interventions the evaluation team considered data:

Yes No regarding how appropriately the intervention was delivered by qualified personnel, and

Yes No comparing the student's rate of learning and current levels of performance with the student's initial levels of performance.

Yes No The student did not make sufficient response to scientific, research-based interventions, and

Yes No The level of intervention necessary to sustain the response can only be provided through special education services.

**Documentation also includes:**

Yes No The scientific, research based interventions and instructional strategies used; and

Yes No The student-centered data collected during the Implementation of at least two intensive individualized interventions implemented for a sustained period of time.

Yes No The evaluation team documented the student's academic performance in the regular classroom setting through observation.

Yes No Requirements for documentation of observation were met by observation of routine classroom instruction and monitoring of the student's performance that was done before the child was referred for an evaluation, or

Yes No at least one member of the evaluation team conducted an observation of the child's academic performance in the regular classroom after the child has been referred for an evaluation and parental consent was obtained.

Yes No Not Applicable

If the student was younger than school age or out of school, an evaluation team member observed the student in an environment appropriate for a student of that age.

Yes No Educationally relevant medical findings, if any, were considered; and

Yes No Two or more interventions specific to the individual student were implemented.

Yes No Interventions did not unnecessarily delay appropriate identification.

#### **EXCLUSIONARY FACTORS:**

The student may not be identified as having a specific learning disability if the student's significantly low rate of progress in meeting age or grade level based on state approved K-12 content standards is primarily the result of a visual, hearing, or motor impairment; cognitive delay; emotional disturbance; environmental or economic disadvantage; cultural factors; or a lack of appropriate instruction.

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Evaluation Meeting Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

#### **ADDITIONAL REQUIRED TEAM MEMBERS:**

Required team members for the determination of specific learning disability must be a school psychologist, a speech-language pathologist, or a remedial reading teacher, each of whom is qualified to conduct individual diagnostic examinations of children.

**Psychologist Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **or;**

**Speech-Language Pathologist Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **or;**

**Remedial Reading Teacher Name:** \_\_\_\_\_



## 10.16.3019(b) CRITERIA FOR SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY

### SEVERE DISCREPANCY

Yes No The student has been provided learning experiences appropriate to the student's age or grade-level based on state approved K-12 content standards.

Yes No The student did not make sufficient progress to meet age or grade level based on state-approved K-12 content standards in one or more of the following areas (check each area in which the student did not make sufficient progress):

<input type="checkbox"/> basic reading skills	<input type="checkbox"/> oral expression
<input type="checkbox"/> reading comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> written expression
<input type="checkbox"/> reading fluency skills	<input type="checkbox"/> mathematics calculation
<input type="checkbox"/> listening comprehension	<input type="checkbox"/> mathematics problem solving

Yes No The student was determined to have a specific learning disability based on a severe discrepancy between the student's intellectual ability and achievement in one or more of the areas listed in ARM 10.16.3019.

#### **Documentation also includes:**

Yes No The evaluation team documented the student's academic performance in the regular classroom setting through observation.

Yes No Requirements for documentation of observation were met by observation of routine classroom instruction and monitoring of the student's performance that was done before the child was referred for an evaluation, or

Yes No At least one member of the evaluation team conducted an observation of the child's academic performance in the regular classroom after the child has been referred for an evaluation and parental consent was obtained.

Yes No Not Applicable

If the student was younger than school age or out of school, an evaluation team member observed the student in an environment appropriate for a student of that age.

Yes No Educationally relevant medical findings, if any, were considered; **and**

Yes No Two or more interventions specific to the individual student were implemented.

Yes No Interventions did not unnecessarily delay appropriate identification.

#### **EXCLUSIONARY FACTORS:**

The student may not be identified as having a specific learning disability if the student's significantly low rate of progress in meeting age or grade level based on state-approved K-12 content standards is primarily the result of a visual, hearing, or motor impairment; cognitive delay; emotional disturbance; environmental or economic disadvantage; cultural factors; or a lack of appropriate instruction.

#### **DEFINITIONS:**

(a) A severe discrepancy is defined as a 50 percent or higher probability of a two standard deviation discrepancy between general cognitive ability and achievement in one or more of the areas identified in ARM 10.16.3019 when adjusted for regression to the population mean. (b) Error in test measurement requires judgment for students who score near two standard deviations below the population mean. When exercising this judgment, consideration of additional information, such as classroom performance relative to the student's performance on norm-referenced tests, shall be used as the basis for determining the severe discrepancy. (c) Alternatives to norm-referenced tests, such as curriculum-based assessments, shall be utilized to determine severe discrepancy whenever cultural factors, test conditions, size of test item sampling for the student's age, or other factors render standardized assessment results invalid. When utilizing alternative assessment procedures, a determination must still be made that a discrepancy between ability and achievement exists at a level of severity similar in size to the discrepancy that would have otherwise been found as described in (a) above.

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Evaluation Meeting Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**ADDITIONAL REQUIRED TEAM MEMBERS:**

Required team members for the determination of specific learning disability must be a school psychologist, a speech-language pathologist, or a remedial reading teacher, each of whom is qualified to conduct individual diagnostic examinations of children.

**Psychologist Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **or;**

**Speech-Language Pathologist Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ **or;**

**Remedial Reading Teacher Name:** \_\_\_\_\_