

Worksheet for Charting a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses

Academic Skill Areas	SECTION 1 Academic achievement with respect to grade-level expectations			SECTION 2 Academic achievement with respect to age-level expectations	SECTION 3 Classroom performance with respect to grade/age-level expectations				SECTION 4 Cognitive Processing
	CBM Universal Screener	Progress monitoring	MEAP/ MME	Norm-referenced achievement assessment	Criterion-referenced/ Curriculum assessments	Grades	Teacher report	Classroom observation	Norm-referenced Cognitive Processing
Basic Reading	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Reading Fluency	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Reading Comp.	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Math Calculation	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Math Problem Solving	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Written Expression	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Oral Expression	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W
Listening Comp.	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W	S N W

S = Strength Area(s) of Strength (at least 3 'S' checks in another academic skill area)

N = Neither

W = Weakness Area(s) of Weakness (at least 5 'W' checks in the area of suspected disability)

Suggested Guidelines for Determining Strengths and Weakness

Using the documents, data and information brought to the meeting by each team member (as identified in the **Eligibility Documentation Worksheet**), the team will consider **current and past data sources** contained within each section. The guiding questions are intended to guide the substantive conversation regarding the student's achievement, skills and performance. The **conversation and thinking** will help the team answer the questions, and identify whether the student presents a strength, a weakness or neither, on each type of evaluation in the area of suspected disability.

Each guiding question response must be **based on data and evidence, not opinion**. The following criteria may be used when determining the answer to the guiding questions for each type of evaluation:

All guiding questions for that evaluation type have been answered with a **YES** = **Weakness**

All guiding questions for that evaluation type have been answered with a **NO** = **Strength**

Guiding questions for that evaluation type have been answered with both **YES** and **NO** = **Neither**

Indicate whether a strength, a weakness or neither exists for each evaluation type. Transfer the result of each evaluation type to the chart above. Each evaluation type must be considered for each area of suspected disability. It is possible that teams will have more than one guiding questions document, one for each area being considered.

Strength	Weakness	Assessment Type	PSW
SECTION 1: Academic achievement with respect to grade-level expectations			
At 'benchmark' level or above grade-level median score if using local norms	At the 'at-risk' level or below 10 th percentile	<u>CBM (Benchmark) Screening</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the student identified as at risk, using a universal screener? NO YES Is the learning level of the student deficient when compared to other students in the classroom? NO YES Over time and in previous grades/years, has the student been identified as at risk, using a universal screener? NO YES 	S
			N
Meeting or exceeding aimline	Falling below aimline for at least 10 <u>consecutive</u> data points or 50% below expectancy	<u>Progress Monitoring</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the student given opportunities to acquire targeted skills using a process of strategic and intensive instructional interventions? NO YES Does the data show slow and insufficient progress? NO YES Is there evidence to substantiate that assessment data informed and altered instruction? NO YES 	S
			N
Level 1 or Level 2, Proficient	Level 3 or Level 4, Not Proficient, Apprentice	<u>MEAP/MME</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the student achieving below state grade level standards in the area of suspected disability? NO YES Has there been a pattern of low performance in MEAP/MME scores from the previous year(s) in the area of suspected disability? NO YES Is there a difference between content area scores/levels? NO YES 	S
			N
			W

SECTION 2: Academic achievement with respect to age-level expectations			
Standard score of ≥ 90 , a percentile rank ≥ 25 , or a RPI $\geq 70/90$	Standard score of ≤ 80 , a percentile rank ≤ 10 , or a RPI of $\leq 67/90$	<u>Norm-referenced Achievement Tests</u>	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the child perform at a standard score of ≤ 80, \leq the 10th percentile, or an RPI of $\leq 67/90$ with age norms on a minimum of two tests or the cluster related to the area of disability? NO YES Is the area of weakness consistent with teacher/parent concerns? NO YES Does the data indicate strengths in at least one other academic area? NO YES 	S
			N
			W

SECTION 3: Classroom performance with respect to grade/age-level expectations

Skills at or above grade level or Scores ≥ 80%		Skills at or below 70% of grade-level expectancy	Criterion-referenced/Curriculum Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none">Does the child score at or below 70% on curriculum/criterion referenced assessments related to the area of suspected disability? NO YESIn the area of suspected disability, does assessment data provide evidence of the student’s inability to demonstrate understanding of grade level standards, even with accommodations? NO YESIn the area of suspected disability, is there a difference in test scores in other content areas? NO YES	S N W
A / B Proficient Meets or exceeds expectations	C / D Neither	E Not Proficient Does not meet expectations	Grades <ul style="list-style-type: none">In the area of suspected disability, does the grade reflect the work completed or attempted by the student, rather than missing assignments and/or attendance? NO YESIn the area of suspected disability, do work samples provide evidence of the student’s inability to demonstrate understanding of grade level standards, even with accommodations? NO YESIn the area of suspected disability, are the grades inconsistent with grades in other content areas cross academic years? NO YES	S N W
Based upon professional judgment			Teacher Observation Record and Teacher Report <ul style="list-style-type: none">In the area of suspected disability, do the Teacher Observation Report and Teacher Report Checklist provide evidence that the student is performing below grade level, as compared to others in the classroom? NO YESIs there evidence of a difference in how the student performs in the area of suspected disability and in other academic areas including: approach to the task, the level of engagement, the thought process utilized, and/or managing the demands of tasks? NO YESIs there evidence that the student was provided with differentiated strategies, accommodations and additional learning opportunities? NO YES	S N W
Student demonstrates average understanding of academic content in comparison to other students in classroom	Student demonstrates that s/he does not understand the academic content		Observations in the area(s) of suspected disability <ul style="list-style-type: none">In the area of suspected disability, does the Classroom Observation Report provide evidence that the student is unable to perform the tasks expected, as compared to average peers in the classroom? NO YESIs the data and information provided in the Classroom Observation Record consistent with other observations, parent concerns and academic performance? NO YESDid the evidence collected during the observation suggest that the student’s low achievement is related to the suspected SLD, rather than other factors or other possible disabilities? NO YES ****If the observation indicates that other areas of concern may be affecting the student’s academic performance, the team should consider other areas of eligibility.	S N W

SECTION 4: Cognitive Processing

Cognitive Processing Deficit

Standard score ≤ 85 , $\leq 15^{\text{th}}$ percentile, or a RPI $\leq 67/90$ in a cognitive process that is link by research to the academic skill area and presumed to cause the skill deficit.

- Based on the norm-referenced assessment, is there a cognitive process that has been identified with a standard score of ≤ 85 , $\leq 15^{\text{th}}$ percentile, or a RPI $\leq 67/90$ and is linked by research to the area of suspected disability?
NO YES
- Does the data and information provide evidence of cognitive weaknesses that are aligned to achievement weaknesses?
NO YES
- Does the data and information provide evidence of cognitive processing strengths as identified by a standard score of ≥ 85 , $\geq 15^{\text{th}}$ percentile or an RPI $\geq 70/90$ linked by research to other areas of achievement?
NO YES

S
N
W

Verifying a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses

If not already completed, transfer the outcome for each evaluation type to the Worksheet for Charting a Pattern of Strength and Weakness (strength, weakness or neither).

- Were there at least **3 strengths** identified across at least one academic area?
NO YES
- Were there at least **5 weaknesses** identified for each skill area of suspected disability?
NO YES
- Has the **Worksheet for Charting a Pattern of Strengths and Weaknesses** documented a pattern of strengths and weaknesses in performance, achievement, or both with respect to age, state-approved grade-level standards, or intellectual development?
NO YES

If YES, continue on to the Exclusionary Factors Worksheet

If NO, a pattern of strengths and weaknesses does not exist and the existence of SLD cannot be verified using this method. The MET will recommend that the student is ineligible for SLD at this time and will complete the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Summary Report, and the Specific Learning Disability Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Form.

Exclusionary Factors

- Did the evaluations, data and information **rule out** each factor as the **primary factor** for the student's academic skill deficit or inability to progress in the general education curriculum?
NO YES
- The evaluations, data and information indicate that the student's inadequate achievement is not due to one of the exclusionary factors?
NO YES

If YES, the MET will make a recommendation that the student is eligible under SLD and will complete the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Summary Report, and the Specific Learning Disability Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Form.

If NO, the existence of SLD cannot be verified due to presence of an exclusionary factor(s). The MET will recommend that the student is ineligible for SLD at this time and will complete the Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Summary Report, and the Specific Learning Disability Multidisciplinary Evaluation Team Form.