

Comprehensive Evaluation and Assessment Protocols

Description and Rationale

In many schools Special Educators are required to conduct comprehensive evaluations to determine eligibility for special education. This includes both initial and re-evaluations and is comprised of the steps of planning an evaluation, conducting assessments, analyzing assessment results, holding an eligibility determination meeting and completing necessary paperwork at each of the steps. Even if special educators are not the person responsible for conducting assessments, it is important that special educators understand the full evaluation process. Students will assist their mentor teacher or another designated professional in co-facilitation of one comprehensive initial or re-evaluation. As part of this process, students will conduct norm-referenced assessments and/or assessments related to progress monitoring. Interns may conduct all or part of an assessment. (i.e., 2 sub-tests of the WJ-III, or an entire Test of Reading Comprehension (TORC). Ideally, test administration will be 45 – 60 minutes in duration. In addition they will assist in planning the eligibility meeting, co-facilitating the meeting and writing a draft of the eligibility report. We also highly encourage student interns to attend as many meetings as they can access related to evaluation planning, eligibility as well as seek opportunities to observe administration of a variety of standardized norm-referenced assessments. Students must submit the following components to their University Supervisor for evaluation:

- A. **Pre-planning:** Describe what steps were taken to plan the evaluation. Who was involved? How was the evaluation plan developed (meeting, phone call, email?). How did the team determine which assessments to conduct? **How have you co-facilitated the pre-planning meeting?**

The evaluation plan was made in the beginning of school on September 17th. I helped to co-facilitate the comprehensive evaluation meeting in the Fairbanks conference room for the student. I took notes for my mentor teacher on Docusped. The student, the student's mom, the special educator and the humanities teacher were also there. The special educator was the facilitator while the humanities teacher was there as a resource to offer observations of the student's progress, behavior and work in Humanities class. Beyond taking meeting minute notes, I also did introductions and announced the purpose of the meeting.

- B. **Summary of testing and assessment:** Choose one of the tests you administered and comment on the following:

1. Assessment Name:

Woodcock Johnson IV Test of Academic Achievement

2. Test Assessment review: What is the purpose of the assessment? Review the test manual. Why was the test selected? How will results be used to eligibility?

The assessment was one of the measures used to identify whether the student has an SLD, and the only place where it showed adverse effect was in basic reading. The student was suspected of having ED and needed to be re-evaluated for SLD, ED, and Other Health Impairment (ADHD).

With regards to adverse effect, the scores must indicate that XXXXX's performance falls within the lowest 15th % compared to same-aged peers. In order to meet the second eligibility gate, there must be three measures in a basic skill area indicating adverse effect. The results of this testing would be one of the three required measures. This testing shows one measure of adverse effect in the area of basic reading.

3. Conducting the assessment: Comment on how the experience of conducting the assessment went. What are your observations about the student responses and affect during testing? Describe the testing environment—what would you change for future testing situations? What new insights do you have about your own ability to conduct assessments for progress monitoring or eligibility purposes?

I conducted some subtests of the Woodcock Johnson IV Test of Achievement. I did this for 30 minutes. The WJ IV Test of Achievement includes 20 tests for measuring four broad academic areas: reading, written language, mathematics, and academic knowledge. The WJ has a helpful online scoring guide that will create a score report that outlines the student's strengths and weaknesses. Comparison of achievement scores to academic knowledge can provide additional information to help determine if a more comprehensive evaluation is necessary.

Eleven of the most frequently used achievement tests are included in the Standard Battery, which has three parallel forms, which is helpful in the case that a student needs to test in the same subtest or area, again. There is a single form of the Extended Battery containing nine additional diagnostic measures that can be used with any form of the Standard Battery. I did not administer the extended battery. I conducted the administration of subtests (Math Calculation, Math Fluency, Applied Problems, Writing Samples, Sentence Writing Fluency, Letter-Word ID, Word Attack, Passage Comprehension, Reading Recall, Oral Reading, Sentence Reading Fluency) within the Standard Battery.

The student and I had a healthy relationship before testing. I started the testing off by explaining what the testing was for and the student responded that he knew why it was happening. I then asked the student if he had ever seen a test like this and he said that he had. Before starting, I told the student that it's OK not to finish all the answers on a subtest. They aren't designed to be finished, they are designed to help us know where he's at so that his teachers can be better teachers for him.

I started the student at the same starting point for each subtest (grade 8 or 9 to adult sections). I did not have to step back on any subtests. I also marked only with dashes in the scoring booklet. Sometimes a student can hear the difference between a line and a 0. I marked the scoring booklet with vertical lines for correct responses and horizontal lines for incorrect responses. I also kept the scoring booklet behind the test, which was between me

and the student, so that it did not become a distraction. While the student worked on timed tests, I would look back at the scoring booklet to quickly check that I didn't need to test back and to see with the convenient guide on the booklet, where the student was at on an average grade based level. Most of the raw scores were calculated after the test was administered. My feedback to the student was overall neutral with correct and incorrect responses. I did encourage the student when he seemed to be getting annoyed. I also asked the student at one point if he would like to get up and take a bathroom break. The student was responsive to my encouragement during the test and did take a break when prompted to. The encouragement was never aimed toward the student regarding a response but more so that the student put in their best effort. There was one subtest that the student really did not want to do and my mentor teacher and I decided to skip it until the end of the testing period. I explained this to the student and he was accepting of it.

I believe the testing produced accurate results because the student as not distracted by anything during the time that I administered the test. The test was administered in a quiet conference room with no one but my mentor teacher, the student and I there.

4. Assessment Results: What were the assessment results? What implications do the results have for instruction, program planning and/or eligibility?

XXXXX is in the 9th grade at Champlain Valley Union High School. As part of his triennial special education evaluation, XXXXX was administered the following assessments:

Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement, Form B, on 10/10/2019

Observations:

XXXXX was on time to the testing sessions. He was engaged in the testing and appeared to put forth his best efforts. The results of the testing is considered to be an accurate estimate of his overall academic functioning.

Test Results and Analysis

Scores are reported by age and grade, respectively. Scores based on the student's age are used to determine discrepancy for the purposes of diagnosing a specific learning disability; scores based on the student's grade are used for determining adverse effect. Scores that are at or below the 15th percentile are

bolded and are considered evidence of adverse effect.

Math

Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement

Cluster	Standard Score (age/grade)	Percentile Rank (age/grade)
Math Calculation	92/91	37/27
Math Problem Solving	95/94	37/35

Cluster scores are derived from subtest scores. The Math Calculation cluster is composed of the Calculation subtest and Math Facts Fluency subtests. The Math Problem Solving cluster is composed of Applied Problems and Number Matrices.

The calculation subtest measures the ability to perform mathematical computations that are not set in any context. Students are asked to perform addition, subtraction, multiplication, division and combinations of those operations. The calculations involve negative numbers, percentages, decimals, fractions and whole numbers. XXXXX performed in the average range on this subtest (Standard score 91). He worked quickly and accurately.

The fluency subtest measures speed of computation or the ability to solve simple addition, subtraction and multiplication facts quickly, which requires both quantitative knowledge and cognitive processing speed abilities. XXXXX's performance on this subtest was in the average range

(standard score 93). He completed 85 problems with only one error in the given three minutes.

The applied problems subtest requires the student to analyze and solve math problems. To solve the problems, the student must listen to the problem, recognize the procedure to be followed, and then perform relatively simple calculations. Unlike the calculation subtest, the student does need to make the decision as to which operation to perform to solve the problem. XXXXX's performance on this subtest was in the average range (standard score 97).

The final subtest score is for number matrices, where students are given a set of numbers and need to determine the rule to find the missing number. XXXXX earned a standard score of 94 on this subtest.

Writing

Woodcock-Johnson IV Tests of Achievement

Cluster	Standard Score (age/grade)	Percentile Rank (age/grade)
Written Expression	94/93	33/32

The Written Expression cluster is comprised of the Writing Samples and Sentence Writing Fluency subtests. The Sentence Writing Fluency subtest measures an individual's skill in formulating and writing simple sentences quickly. The Writing Samples subtest measures the examinee's skill in writing responses to a variety of demands. Sentences are evaluated for quality of expression, and item difficulty

increases by increasing passage length, level of vocabulary, and sophistication of content. Students are not penalized for errors in basic writing skills.

XXXXX's performance on the sentence writing fluency subtest was in the average range (standard score 91). He wrote 17 sentences and received credit for 16. His performance on the writing samples subtest was also in the average range (standard score 96), indicating average skill in his ability to express himself in writing.

Reading

WJ-IV Tests of Achievement

Cluster	Standard Score (age/grade)	Percentile Rank (age/grade)
Basic Reading Skills	85/84	16/14
Reading Comprehension	88/89	22/23
Reading Fluency	95/94	36/28

The Basic Reading Skills subtest is comprised of the Letter-Word Identification subtest and Word Attack subtest. Letter-Word Identification measures the examinee's ability to identify words, but they are not required to know the meaning of the words. The Word Attack subtest measures a person's ability to apply phonic and structural analysis skills to the pronunciation of unfamiliar printed words. These subtests were both an area of relative weakness for XXXXX. He earned a standard score of 86 on both subtests (low average range).

The Reading Comprehension subtest includes the Passage Comprehension and Reading Recall subtest. The Passage Comprehension subtest requires an examinee to use syntactic and semantic cues to identify a missing word in a text, and the Reading Recall requires an examinee to read a short story silently and retell as much of the story as they can recall. XXXXX was stronger in the Passage Comprehension subtest (standard score 94, average) than the Reading Recall subtest (standard score 83, low average).

The Reading Fluency subtests are Oral Reading and Sentence Reading Fluency. Oral Reading is a measure of story reading accuracy and prosody, and Sentence Reading measures reading rate. The task involves reading simple sentences silently and quickly, deciding if the statement is true or false, and then circling *yes* or *no*. XXXXX's performance on both subtests was in the average range.

Conclusions/adverse effect statement

Overall, XXXXX's academic performance as measured by this battery of tests shows that his achievement falls in the average range. His basic reading scores are a relative weakness, falling in the low average range. When compared to his General Ability Index score of 98, there is no discrepancy between his actual and expected achievement.

Therefore XXXXX does not meet criteria as a student with a Specific Learning Disability.

(Special educator's name)

Special Educator - (school name)

(email)

(number)

C. Reflection on the Comprehensive Evaluation Eligibility Meeting:

1. Who were the participants in the meeting? Were all important stakeholders present? If not, describe who was missing and why their role is important.

The meeting included the student, his mom, my mentor teacher (the special educator), the Humanities (english) teacher, a school counselor, and I. Nobody was missing from this meeting.

2. Did participants at the meeting seem to feel valued? What is your evidence? Were all participants involved? What decisions were made by consensus?

One of the main issues that was covered in the meeting was the student's inability to engage in the classroom. Before going into this topic herself, the special educator asked the student how he thinks school is going. This was a good move because it allowed the student to speak for himself before we all added how we see his behavior in the classroom. The main decision that were made were that the student would continue to show up to homework club as he has been, but actually use that time to do homework, especially for science. He will use at least 20 minutes of homework club to do work for science. The concern is that the student will not be able to get credit for science by the end of the year. He needs to graduate with at least 3 credits in science (one class) and the science classes after this will be much harder than the one he's in. So, this is the time to get credit for science.

3. Do you believe that the team adhered to the legal and procedural requirements associated with the comprehensive evaluation process?

I believe the team adhered to the legal and procedural requirements associated with the comprehensive evaluation process. The parents were notified before and after each decision made and were involved in the decision making process. There were more than three assessments that were measured for adverse effect, as the law says that you should have at least 3. The team had meetings on time and with all attendees there and on time. The evaluation included classroom based measures, tests and other tests done by a licensed psychologist and by a doctor. Cognitive and achievement tests were done by the special educator. Parents were aware of and offered a copy of their parental right at each meeting.

4. What are the next steps to finalize the evaluation process? Who is responsible for implementing the next steps? What timelines were designated?

The team met after the evaluation was conducted to look over the student's scores and performance in all the measures taken into account for the eval. The team decided that the student still qualifies for an IEP so, the next step is to write a new IEP that is up to date and to send that IEP to the parents and the team members of teachers.

5. What are your suggestions for improving future team interactions?

My mentor teacher kept in contact with the parents on the phone and by email. This was great. She also keeps a Positive Parent Contact Log where she documents all interactions she has with parents of student on her caseload. This is something she has to do as a CYA (cover your a**) and because it is required by law that she keeps track of it. The team members were notified of the eval meetings a couple days before they happened. During the eval report meeting after the eval, the student was involved. The special educator who sees the student on a daily basis and did the WJ Cognitive test with the student asked the students how they thought school was going before talking about her observations. The parent was a teacher and was therefore very involved in getting the student to talk about what he could commit to, to better succeed in the classroom.

D. Reflection on your involvement in the meeting:

1. Describe your involvement in co-facilitating the comprehensive evaluation process and developing the eligibility determination report. Co-facilitation may include activities such as: co-planning the meeting agenda, introducing the meeting agenda, working with your mentor to send out meeting notices, describing the eligibility determination process, collecting and/or sharing data to be presented during the meeting, summarizing comprehensive evaluation data to assist in the final determination of eligibility, etc.

For this evaluation I was involved from the start and until the end. I went to the evaluation planning meeting where the special educator and I discussed what would be looked at in this triennial eval. The student was there and the parent was there.

I co-planned the meeting agenda. It is attached below:

Evaluation Planning Meeting Minutes

Student Name:XXXXX

Meeting Date: 9/17/2019

Invited/Attending			

___ Review parental rights

1.) DISABILITY DETERMINATION:

Background information:

XXXXX was most recently evaluated in the winter of 2017, as a sixth grader at Hinesburg Community School. At that time, the team explored eligibility within the categories of Other Health Impairment and Specific Learning Disability. The team determined that XXXXX met the criteria for eligibility under the category of Other Health Impairment. Adverse effect was documented in the areas of reading comprehension and written expression. XXXXX was previously evaluated in the winter of 2014, as a third grader at Hinesburg Community School. At that time, he was found eligible as a student with an Other Health Impairment as well as a student with a Specific Learning Disability in Reading Fluency and Reading Comprehension.

Team Input:

Strengths	Challenges

Other questions to consider:

Are there any anxieties centered around school that should be shared with the team?

Is (student) taking any medication that should be shared with the team?

Additional Comments:

Which of the following questions are we interested in answering?

	Does the student have an emotional disorder?
--	--

	Does the student have an anxiety disorder?
	Does the student have attention deficit disorder? <i>Is student currently under treatment with pediatrician?</i>
	What are the student's executive functioning skills?
	What is the student's cognitive ability?
	Does the student have a specific learning disability in one or more of the basic skill areas? <input type="checkbox"/> Oral Expression <input type="checkbox"/> Listening Comprehension <input type="checkbox"/> Written Expression <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Reading Fluency <input type="checkbox"/> Reading Comprehension <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics Calculation <input type="checkbox"/> Mathematics Reasoning
	If there is a significant discrepancy, is it primarily the result of a visual, hearing, or motor disability; learning impairment; emotional disturbance; cultural factors; environmental or economic disadvantage; or, limited English proficiency?

Methods we will use to determine the answers:

- ☐ Cognitive Testing (School Psychologist, Special Educator, Review of Records)
- ☐ Achievement Tests (Special Educator)
- ☐ Behavior Checklists (Classroom Teachers, Parents, Student, District Psychologist)
- ☐ Diagnosis Confirmation from Pediatrician/Review of Records by School Psychologist
- ☐ Interviews (School Psychologist)
- ☐ Classroom Observation (Special Educator)
- ☐ Speech and Language Testing (Speech and Language Pathologist)

2.) POSSIBLE ADVERSE EFFECT:

Is the student functioning in the lowest 15th percentile compared to peers in at least 1 basic skill area in at least 3 of the 6 measures identified below?

Basic Skill Areas to be evaluated for adverse effect: (are these known areas of concern?)

- ☐ Written Expression
- ☐ Math Calculation
- ☐ Math Reasoning
- ☐ Basic Reading Skills
- ☐ Reading Comprehension

- ___ Reading Fluency
- ___ Oral Expression
- ___ Listening Comprehension

Measures of Adverse Effect to be collected:

	Person Responsible for collecting information
Individually Administered Normed Achievement Tests	Special educator
Group Administered Normed Achievement Tests	Special educator
Grades	Special Educator/Teachers
Criterion Referenced Assessments	Special Educator
Curriculum Based Measures	Teachers
Other Measures (work samples, etc.)	Teachers

3.) POSSIBLE NEED FOR SPECIALIZED INSTRUCTION

What types of specialized instruction does the student need to access the curriculum and that cannot be provided within the regular education classroom?

What types of accommodations and modification does the student need that cannot be provided for all students within the regular classroom?

Next steps:

2. The special educator and intern will type up Eval Plan and send home.

3. Cognitive testing will be scheduled with _____
4. The special educator will schedule achievement testing with (student)
5. Teachers should collect evidence of adverse effect if appropriate
6. Team will schedule evaluation results meeting: ____

7. Describe your rapport with other team members.

I had met the student's mom two times before; once at parent teacher conferences, and once at the eligibility planning meeting. I had been working with the student in Skill Building/Literacy and had been supporting this student in other classes as well along with my mentor teacher.

8. What were your strengths as a co-facilitator?

I was able to help the meeting go smoothly with time checks and introductions. My supervisor and I made an agreement after the meeting that I could be omitted from this part of the assignment as she was not able to come to observe me co-facilitating it.

9. What are your suggestions for improving your involvement?

I would like to improve my voice and explanations of materials for future meetings. When I get nervous I tend to have short responses to questions and may not give the best explanations of certain pieces of the meeting.

E. Additional Paperwork:

1. Copy of the agenda for the meeting

Evaluation Results Meeting and IEP Meeting - XXXXX

November 19th, 2019

Agenda- Evaluation Results Meeting

- 1. Introductions and Agenda Review (3 mins)**
- 2. Parental Rights**
- 3. Disability Determination**
- 4. Adverse effect**
- 5. Need for Specialized Instruction**
- 6. Next steps**

Agenda- IEP Meeting

- 7. Review Present Levels/classroom updates (20 mins)**
- 8. Annual Goals (15 mins)**
- 9. Services (10 mins)**

2. Draft of the comprehensive evaluation report that intern co-writes with mentor teacher-Supervisor **checked this in our final meeting.**