

APPENDIX, FORM 2

EBR PROCESS STEP 2: ANALYZING INFORMATION WITHIN EACH IEP

Instructions: Using shapes and lines within Word electronically, with markers on a wall chart, or with highlighters on hard copy pre-recorded IEP charts, the review team analyzes and records *relationships* between components from column to column for each IEP and then within each column across IEPs. The team considers the data in the chart and uses circles and lines to indicate relationships and boxes to indicate missing elements or alignment. *Ultimately, you are determining if there is alignment across components and across IEPs or are there gaps, missing information, broken chains of connection across elements or across IEPs?*

Column 1: Does the PLAAFP include good usable data (levels, scores, assessment results) for each area? Does the PLAAFP identify all the student's needs, including transition needs?

Column 2: What is the impact of the needs on the student's progress in the general curriculum? Are the prioritized needs that require specially designed instruction and/or accommodations and modifications all addressed?

Column 3: Do the goals (or other supports) align with the needs and impacts?

Column 4: Are these services selected to support progress toward the goals and progress in the general education curriculum standards as well as participation with non-disabled peers? Does the succession of the goals make sense over time as the student progresses (i.e., for students taking DLM, do goals move from distal to proximal as the student improves performance)?

Column 5: What do the data from IEP progress reports (PR) indicate? This area is key in determining if a student is receiving educational benefit. It should be noted that within a given year, some students will make progress on a goal, some will maintain or plateau, and others may even regress for various factors. The important issue is whether the IEP team took the status of progress into account for planning and responding, and then adjusted the IEP appropriately to develop a plan calculated to result in FAPE.

Assistance Network.

Additional Considerations: This is a place to add additional information the review team considered relevant in reviewing the IEP. For example, it may include notes regarding documentation of IEP team rationale regarding decisions made about IEP content found in the IEP, like the following:

- What does the reviewer observe about the amount of progress made within the IEP year, quality of goals and progress data provided, or other important observations?
- Sample note: *This is first of 3 IEPs reviewed – the student making minimal progress after 3 quarters. However, case notes indicate the student was in quarantine for 4 weeks over the course of first semester and received remote sped support. The student did not participate for 6 of 20 sessions in special education. Team notes show discussion and decision to maintain current level of support to be provided onsite (student transported to school) for 3rd 9 weeks.*

Present Levels of Educational Performance by Curriculum Area	Impact on Progress in the Curriculum Area	Annual Goals and Benchmarks/Objectives Including Accommodations	Service Delivery and Placement	Progress on Goals and Objectives
English/Language Arts: WI-IV: Word Attack SS=83 (12 th %tile); DRA level 18 (beginning 2 nd grade level). 21 CWPM (10 th %tile); fluency is mostly word by word. Retelling includes main idea or problem, most significant events, and some details; generally organized and sequenced. WI-IV: Spelling SS=81 (10 th %tile). Writing - frequent spelling errors	Weaknesses in decoding and spelling impact the student's ability to read grade-level texts and provide written responses in class	Goal: Using 3 rd grade level text, the student will apply phonics skills to accurately decode a passage. 1. Using 3 rd grade level text, the student will identify basic sight words with 95% accuracy 2. Using 3 rd grade level text, the student will identify consonant clusters with 95% accuracy 3. Using 3 rd grade level text, the student will retell a story with main idea or problem, all significant events, and many supporting details in proper sequence, achieving a DRA rubric score of 4 Accommodations: use 2 nd grade level texts in content areas; have peers read grade-level texts	Reading (GE) 90 minutes per day Reading (OS) 90 minutes per week Social studies and science (C)	DRA-level 28 (end of 2 nd grade); 50 CWPM (10 th %tile) 1. Reading probe-90% accuracy Reading probe-87% accuracy) 3. DRA Retelling Score = 4

Adapted from the California Department of Education and SERC of Connecticut

Assistance Network.

Present Levels of Educational Performance by Curriculum Area	Impact on Progress in the Curriculum Area	Annual Goals and Benchmarks/Objectives Including Accommodations	Service Delivery and Placement	Progress on Goals and Objectives
<p>English/Language Arts: WJ-IV: Word Attack SS=83 (12th %tile); DRA level 18 (beginning 2nd grade level). 21 CWPM (10th %tile); fluency is mostly word by word.</p> <p>Retelling includes main idea or problem, most significant events, and some details; generally organized and sequenced. WJ-IV: Spelling SS=82 (10th %tile). Writing - frequent spelling errors</p>	Weaknesses in decoding and spelling impact the student's ability to read grade-level texts and provide written responses in class	<p>Goal: Using 3rd grade level text, the student will apply phonics skills to accurately decode a passage.</p> <p>1. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will identify basic sight words with 95% accuracy</p> <p>2. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will identify consonant clusters with 95% accuracy</p> <p>3. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will retell a story with main idea or problem, all significant events, and many supporting details in proper sequence, achieving a DRA rubric score of 4</p> <p>Accommodations: use 2nd grade level texts in content areas; have peers read grade-level texts</p>	<p>Reading (OS) 90 minutes per day</p> <p>Reading (OS) 90 minutes per week</p> <p>Social studies and science (C)</p>	<p>DRA-level 28 (end of 2nd grade); 50 CWPM (10th %tile)</p> <p>1. Reading probe-90% accuracy</p> <p>2. Reading probe-87% accuracy)</p> <p>3. DRA Retelling Score 4</p>

Adapted from the California Department of Education and SERC of Connecticut

Lincoln, E., & Smith, V. (2021). *EBR process step 2: Analyzing information within each IEP*. Kansas Department of Education, Kansas Technical Assistance Network.

Present Levels of Educational Performance by Curriculum Area	Impact on Progress in the Curriculum Area	Annual Goals and Benchmarks/Objectives Including Accommodations	Service Delivery and Placement	Progress on Goals and Objectives
<p>English/Language Arts: WJ-IV: Word Attack SS=83 (12th %tile); DRA level 18 (beginning 2nd grade level). 21 CWPM (10th %tile); fluency is mostly word by word. Retelling includes main idea or problem, most significant events, and some details; generally organized and sequenced. WJ-IV: Spelling SS=81 (10th %tile). Writing - frequent spelling errors</p>	<p>Weaknesses in decoding and spelling impact the student's ability to read grade-level texts and provide written responses in class</p>	<p>Goal: Using 3rd grade level text, the student will apply phonics skills to accurately decode a passage.</p> <p>1. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will identify basic sight words with 95% accuracy</p> <p>2. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will identify consonant clusters with 95% accuracy</p> <p>3. Using 3rd grade level text, the student will retell a story with main idea or problem, all significant events, and many supporting details in proper sequence, achieving a DRA rubric score of 4</p> <p>Accommodations: use 2nd grade level texts in content areas; have peers read grade-level texts</p>	<p>Reading (GE) 90 minutes per day</p> <p>Reading (OS) 90 minutes per week</p> <p>Social studies and science (C)</p>	<p>DRA-level 28 (end of 2nd grade); 50 CWPM (10th %tile)</p> <p>1. Reading probe-90% accuracy</p> <p>2. Reading probe-87% accuracy)</p> <p>3. DRA Retelling Score = 4</p>

Adapted from the California Department of Education and SERC of Connecticut

Lincoln, E., & Smith, V. (2021). *EBR process step 2: Analyzing information within each IEP*. Kansas Department of Education, Kansas Technical Assistance Network.