



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

ELIGIBILITY WORKSHEET - SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY

Student:	Student UID#:	DOB:
School:	Grade:	Age:

The required screenings and formal evaluations required to determine eligibility are as follows:

Date	Evaluation/Screening	EXAMPLE Summary of Evaluations/Screening	Source of Data
	Hearing Screening	☐ Pass ☐ Fail _____ dB _____ Hz Comment: _____	Tier 3 Documentation Referral for Vision Screening (date must be within last 12 months)
	Vision Screening	☐ Pass ☐ Fail Far: R 20/____ L 20/____ Near: R 20/____ L 20/____ Comment: _____	Tier 3 Documentation Referral for Hearing Screening (date must be within last 12 months)
	Speech/Language Screening Motor Screening	Date: 04/30/2018 Assessment Area: Speech-Language Screening Assessment: Speech Language -Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals IV Screening Test SubjectArea: Overall Language Narrative: Screening results and observation data suggest age appropriate language skills. Date: 04/30/2018 Assessment Area: Speech-Language Screening Assessment: Speech Language - Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS) Subject Area: Expressive Language Narrative: SS=98, average range Date: 04/30/2018 Assessment Area: Speech-Language Screening Assessment: Speech Language -Oral and Written Language Scales (OWLS) Subject Area: Receptive Language Narrative: SS=92, average range Date: 04/30/2018 Assessment Area: Motor Screening Assessment: UCPS Motor Screening Checklist	Tier 3 Documentation Parental Consent for Screening Parental Consent for Screening (Spanish) Speech/Language Pathologist Report MTSS Team Problem-Solving Understanding WIDA Scores Example ELL Guiding Questions Motor Screening Observation Form



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

Progress Monitoring: Documentation of the results of evidence-based intervention(s) which align to the academic area(s) of concern (e.g. critical components of reading, math, writing, listening comprehension, oral expression, etc.) including progress monitoring data.		Evidence-based math intervention description: systematic instructional routine targeting number sense and addition using manipulatives, number lines, counters, and base ten blocks to visually represent numbers and how we combine them to add. August 2017: <u>Baseline:</u> 3 digits correct in 3 minutes <u>Goal:</u> 10 digits correct within 3 minutes was set for the 10-week intervention cycle <u>Results:</u> At the end of the 10-week intervention cycle, STUDENT's median score of 4 digits correct in 3 minutes continued to fall significantly below the expected middle of the year (MOY) 25th percentile score of 18 digits correct. As a result, an intervention change was made on 12/8/17. <u>12/18/17:</u> The intervention was intensified to receiving instruction for an additional 15 minutes (group of 2) with the Title I interventionist. At the end of the 10-week intervention cycle (2/23/18), STUDENT's 2nd grade addition probe median score of 6 digits correct in 3 minutes continued to fall significantly below the middle-of-year (MOY) 25th percentile score of 18 digits correct. Rate of improvement suggested that STUDENT would not reach the 25th%ile for 161 weeks. <u>2/23/18:</u> Continue intervention; Intensification to 4x/week for 35 minutes. Intervention group size decreased to 2 students. STUDENT referred for consideration of special education evaluation.	Tier 2 & Tier 3 Documentation -Student Intervention Plan -Progress Monitoring Data -Progress Monitoring Graphs -Aim Line (Expected ROI) -Trend Line (Attained ROI) Must include comparisons to age/grade level/peers.
Parent Conference(s)		9/22/2017: On the beginning of the year benchmark, STUDENT was performing at the 10th percentile for math computation (addition of double digits without regrouping). Teacher shared recommended intervention for STUDENT (4 times per week for 20 minutes). 12/02/2017: After 10 weeks of intervention, STUDENT made some progress but still performing below the 10th percentile. Therefore, the problem solving team shared with the parent an increase in intervention intensity (4 times per week for 35 minutes).	Tier 2 & Tier 3 Documentation Parent Letter - English - Notification Parent Letter - Spanish - Notification Parent Letter - English - Invitation Parent Letter - Spanish - Invitation Parent/Teacher Conference Notes Meeting Minutes



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

Review of existing data for RtI-documentation of problem-solving process: Review of existing data to include documentation of the systematic problem- solving process (which would include formal and/or informal diagnostic assessments) and observation data of core instruction	Date: 09/15/2017 Assessment Area:* Review of existing data Assessment: Universal Screening SubjectArea: Reading Narrative: Nonsense Word Fluency: above 25th percentile Nonsense Word Fluency: above 25th percentile Blend Identification: above 25th percentile Oral Reading Fluency: above 25th percentile Date: 12/01/2017 Assessment Area:* Review of existing data Assessment: Universal Screening SubjectArea: Reading Narrative: Oral Reading Fluency: above 25th percentile Blend Identification: above 25th percentile Date: 09/15/2017 Assessment Area:* Review of existing data Assessment: Universal Screening SubjectArea: Math Narrative: Overall, student scored significantly below average across math skills. Addition (double digit without regrouping): 10th percentile Subtraction (double digit without regrouping): 10th percentile Math Applications: 10th percentile Date: 12/01/2017 Assessment Area:* Review of existing data Assessment: Universal Screening SubjectArea: Math Narrative: Overall, while student had growth, scores continue to be significantly below average across math skills. Addition (double digit without regrouping): 10th percentile Subtraction (double digit without regrouping: below 10th percentile Math Applications: below 10th percentile STUDENT's grades for the past two academic year are reported in the table below: <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <tr> <th></th> <th>Lang Arts</th> <th>Science</th> <th>S. Studies</th> <th>Math</th> </tr> <tr> <td>1st Grade</td> <td>78 (C)</td> <td>90 (A)</td> <td>92 (A)</td> <td>75(C)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2nd Grade</td> <td>80 (B)</td> <td>95 (A)</td> <td>93 (A)</td> <td>67 (D)</td> </tr> </table>		Lang Arts	Science	S. Studies	Math	1st Grade	78 (C)	90 (A)	92 (A)	75(C)	2nd Grade	80 (B)	95 (A)	93 (A)	67 (D)	Tier 1, Tier 2, & Tier 3 Documentation Answers the question: "What led to the decision to place the student in intervention?" i.e. screening data, diagnostic data, assessment data (both formative and summative), grades
	Lang Arts	Science	S. Studies	Math													
1st Grade	78 (C)	90 (A)	92 (A)	75(C)													
2nd Grade	80 (B)	95 (A)	93 (A)	67 (D)													



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

		Documentation of Problem-Solving Process: Based on STUDENT'S math performance from the previous year and beginning of the year benchmark assessments, she began receiving intensive math interventions (skipped supplemental level of support based on her beginning of the year scores). These interventions were consistently provided, with both group and student response monitored. Based on academic performance data and PM data, intervention intensity was increased by reducing the group size and increasing the amount of time in intervention. Despite these supports and adjustments to instruction/intervention, STUDENT's performance and progress remains below standard.	
	Social/Developmental History (Including any educationally relevant medical findings, review of disciplinary removals, transiency and attendance/tardy rates.)	According to STUDENT's records, her vision/hearing are within normal limits and overall motor skills are described within developmental expectancies by both parents and her current teacher. STUDENT reportedly and observably demonstrates age appropriate social and adaptive skills in comparison to other second grade students. STUDENT was born at 41 weeks gestation and experienced a birth defect, which required reconstructive surgery. STUDENT met all developmental milestones within age-appropriate limits. Parent reported that STUDENT has a diagnosis of Congenital Adrenal Hyperplasia and takes hydrocortisone and Florine/ daily, with no reported side effects. The family has had to move around after losing their home in a fire during the 2017-2018 school year; however, these transitions are not reported to have had a substantial impact on STUDENT's overall well-being. Parent describes STUDENT'S strengths to include that she is caring/kind, athletic, respectful, creative, honest, a good leader, and that she enjoys reading. Parent did not indicate any behavioral or emotional concerns within the home environment.	Tier 3 Documentation Social-Developmental-Health History - parent fills out Social-Developmental-Health History Spanish - parent fills out
	Observation(s) Across Settings (Must include core instruction and the setting in which intervention is delivered, to assess academic and functional skills.)	Date: 09/17/2017 Assessment Area: Observation #1 Assessment: Fidelity of Core instruction SubjectArea: Broad Math Narrative: A locally designed classroom observation form was used to determine high leverage teaching practices. Lesson completed on double digit addition, then students completed a worksheet one problem at a time and then reviewed the problem as a group after allowing the students to work independently. The elements of effective instruction observed were scaffolding, questioning, and gradual release of responsibility (I do/we do/you do). Date: 11/17/2017 Assessment Area: Observation #2 Assessment: Fidelity of Intervention Instruction SubjectArea: Math Computation Narrative: Using structured observation designed to determine adherence to intervention protocol, the lesson was focused on based	Tier 3 Documentation Classroom Observation Form During the MTSS process: -Observation of student during intervention by subject expert and if the student is EL, an EL expert -Observation of student during classroom instruction by subject expert and if the student is EL, an EL expert After Consent to Evaluate: -Observation of student in the specific area of need.



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

		ten knowledge and using manipulatives to visually represent numbers. interventionist followed the intervention protocol and corrective feedback was provided in a timely manner. Date: 05/01/2018 Assessment Area: Observation #3 Assessment: Systematic Classroom Observation SubjectArea: Math Computation Narrative: Routine math instruction (whole group) with an instructional focus on building fluency with addition and subtraction. STUDENT was observed sitting towards the back of the room. Although she appeared generally attentive during the lesson, she did not volunteer responses during instruction. During math fluency practice, STUDENT worked slowly and laboriously. She occasionally looked at peers' answers if she seemed to not know the answer to a math problem. She occasionally chatted quietly with the student sitting next to her, however, did not do so in a manner that was not disruptive to the class or lesson. A momentary time sampling was taken every 10 seconds over a 15-minute time period. The information below summarizes the systematic observation data collected comparing STUDENT's observed classroom behavior during whole group math instruction to that of a randomly selected peer. Based on the data collected, STUDENT was on-task during core math instruction 70% of the time, while her comparison peer was observed to be on-task 85% of time. Within five opportunities to respond to teacher directed questions regarding concepts being taught, STUDENT provided one response to her comparison peer's 4 responses.	
	Educational Evaluation: Multiple sources of educational assessment data, which must include diagnostic and/or standardized norm-referenced measures of achievement (related to the area(s) of concern) and data from progress monitoring. These measures must include relevant comparisons to state and/or national norms, age/grade level peers, and appropriate	Date: 05/20/2018 Assessment Area: Educational Evaluation Assessment: Educational -Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ IV ACH) SubjectArea: Math Reasoning Narrative: This test measures understanding of quantitative concepts and ability to problem solve numerically. Overall, STUDENT performed in the average range on measures of math reasoning skills. Applied Problems: 55=90, 25th percentile Number Matrices: 55=85, 16th percentile Date: 05/20/2018 Assessment Area: Educational Evaluation Assessment: Educational -Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement (WJ IV ACH)	School Psychologist Report and/or Educational Diagnostician Report Must include comparisons to age/grade level/peers.



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

	intervention group comparisons. Additional measures may include common formative assessments, universal screening, interim/benchmark assessments and outcome assessments.	SubjectArea: Math Computation Narrative: This test measures grade level calculation skills and ability to perform simple calculation skills with fluency. Overall, the student performed below average on math calculation skills. Calculation Skills: 55=83, 13th percentile Math Fluency: 55=79, 8th percentile Date(s): 2/24/18, 05/02/2018 Assessment Area: Educational Evaluation Assessment: Educational - Progress Monitoring of Targeted Skills SubjectArea: Broad Math Narrative: On STAR math assessment, student's baseline score of 310 scaled score points fell significantly below expected middle of the year 25th percentile score (403) and the 10th percentile score (349). At the end of the year, student's STAR math score of 325 falls significantly below the end of year 25th percentile score (449) and the 10th percentile score (402). Rate of improvement: STUDENT is growing at 1.5 scale score points (average growth based on national norms suggest that rate of improvement should be 3.7 scale score points.) Current growth on STAR suggests it will be 83 weeks until STUDENT reaches the average range on the STAR math assessment. Date: 05/18/2018 Assessment Area: Educational Evaluation Assessment: Educational - Progress Monitoring of Targeted Skills SubjectArea: Math Computation Narrative: STUDENT's addition within 100 score of 12 digits correct continues to fall below the 10th percentile. STUDENT's current growth rate is .26 digits per week (typical growth rate for same age peers is .7 digits per week). This rate suggests that STUDENT will not obtain the 25th percentile score of 27 digits for 50 more instructional weeks.	
	Other:		

* Optional



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

As a result of the required screenings, evaluations, and review of existing information, what do we now know about the student?

Strengths EXAMPLE	Source of Data
[A better example would include specific strengths regarding the area of need.] STUDENT'S strengths include that she is caring/kind, athletic, respectful, creative, honest, a good leader, and that she enjoys reading. Academically, STUDENT demonstrates strengths in her basic reading skills (decoding and fluency).	Classroom teacher Assessment Data from all sources (formal testing, progress monitoring, etc.)

Needs EXAMPLE	Source of Data
[A better example would include what had been specifically tried and did not work during intervention in the area of need.] STUDENT is currently demonstrating significant difficulty in the acquisition of grade level calculation (number sense and addition) and fluency skills. Her academic performance and growth continue to be below expectations for her grade level, with minimal progress noted, despite the level of intervention support that has been provided during both 1" and 2" grade.	Classroom Teacher Assessment Data from all sources (formal testing, progress monitoring, etc.)

To be determined eligible in the disability category of Specific Learning Disability, the criteria in subsections (A), (B), (C) and (D) below must be met:

Characteristic	Documentation/Summary			Source of Data
(A) The disability must not be the primary result of: 1. A visual, hearing or motor disability; 2. Intellectual disability; 3. Emotional disturbance; 4. Cultural factors; 5. Environmental or economic influences; and/or 6. Loss of instructional time due to factors that include, but are not limited to absences, tardies, high	Visual, hearing or motor disability	Data Regarding Each Factor		Summary of all information gathered from Tier 1,2,3
		Vision Screening Results:	(if applicable) additional vision information: N/A Passed vision screenings; no additional vision concerns noted	
		Date: 3/15/2018		
		Hearing Screening Results:	(if applicable) additional hearing information: N/A Passed hearing screenings; no additional hearing concerns noted	
		Date: 3/15/2018		
		Motor Information:	No concerns; observation data suggest adequate gross and fine motor skills to access educational	



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

transiency rates and suspensions. A child must not be determined to have a specific learning disability if the determinant factor for that determination is any of the following: 1. Limited English Proficiency; 2. Lack of appropriate instruction and evidence-based intervention in reading, including the essential components of reading instruction as defined in Section 1208(3) of the ESEA (i.e. phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension); and/or 3. Lack of appropriate instruction and evidence-based intervention in math.		4/30/2018	environment and complete assignments			
	Intellectual disability	Are there pervasive cognitive deficits: none noted	Are there deficits in adaptive functioning? none noted			
		No concerns with adaptive behavior functioning; student demonstrates near average scores in reading, and parents have no adaptive concerns within the home or community				
	Emotional disturbance	Is there a documented psychological disorder? non noted	Is there a family history of any disorders? none noted	Are there signs of emotional stress? none noted		
		No concerns regarding emotional functionings; establishes and maintains relationships with others; parents report no signs of emotional difficulties and her teachers report a happy and motivated student				
	Cultural factors	Number of years in the US: since birth	History of primary language development: English is primary language			
		No cultural factors				
	Environmental or economic influences	No environmental or economic factors reported; based on historical data and social history				
	Loss of Instructional time; not due to factors that include, but are not limited to, absences, tardies, high mobility rates, and suspensions	STUDENT has been absent for 4% of total instructional days so far this year; her number of days absent do not place her at-risk for academic failure. Although STUDENT has been tardy for a total of 16 days, it is noted that she arrived at school by 8:30 on 14/16 days tardy. She has only missed 2 of her intensive math intervention times and core classroom instruction in math because of tardies. No behavior incidents; no in school or out of school suspensions.				
Limited English Proficiency	No LEP factors to consider					
Instructional factors	STUDENT's access to instruction has not been					



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

		impeded by any attendance issues. Locally designed classroom walkthrough data is used to determine high leverage teaching practices. Elements of effective instruction noted included scaffolding, questioning, lessons set up in 'I do/we do/you do' format. Intervention fidelity: interventionist is adequately trained in local evidence-based math protocol. Intervention integrity observation conducted through program-aligned observation checklist; all components of intervention program are implemented. Available group data provided to the IEP team for consideration in addressing the instructional requirements is below.	
	% of students in the same grade as the referred student meeting proficiency benchmark in the most recent universal data available on all students	Grade level: 1st Measure: Addition Target: 75% % meeting target: 71% Grade level: 2nd Measure: Subtraction Target: 75% % meeting target: 73%	
	% of students in the same intervention as student yielding successful response to intervention	Grade level of progress monitoring: 2nd Measure: Double digit addition probe Proficiency standard: 80% proficient (% students) % proficient: 1 student progressed to 20th %ile 3 students growing pasat 10th %ile STUDENT showing very slow progress (below 10th %ile)	
(B) Inadequate academic achievement: Inadequate academic achievement is based on evidence from multiple sources of data indicating the child does not achieve adequately for the age or grade-level standards in which the child is enrolled in one or more of the following areas when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the child's age or	STUDENT's math performance (summarized in educational evaluation, progress monitoring, and review of existing data sections above) across multiple measures (grades, universal screening data, standardized norm-referenced assessment data and progress monitoring data) suggest patterns of underperformance that is below standard for STUDENT's age and grade level. STUDENT'S overall performance in math, specifically computation and fluency, ranges from the 8th percentile to the 13th percentile.		Summary of all information gathered from Tier 1,2,3



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

State-approved grade-level standards: ☐ Basic reading skills; ☐ Reading fluency skills; ☐ Reading comprehension; ☐ Written expression; ☐ Mathematics calculation; ☐ Mathematics problem solving; ☐ Listening comprehension; or ☐ Oral expression.		
(C) Insufficient rate of progress: When provided with high-quality core instruction that a majority of students are responding to and evidence-based intervention(s) matched to area(s) of need, the child demonstrates either a lack of response to instruction and intervention or is responding at a rate that is insufficient to reduce their risk of failure after an appropriate period of time. Documentation of insufficient rate of progress must include: 1. The type, intensity, and duration of identified evidence-based instructional intervention(s) • Documentation that the intervention length and frequency is in accordance with the identified research-based criteria that supports effective results; 2. Progress monitoring on a schedule that: • Allows a comparison of the child's progress to the performance of peers; • Is appropriate to the child's age and grade placement; • Is appropriate to the content monitored; and • Allows for interpretation of the effectiveness of intervention; 3. Evidence that the intervention was implemented with fidelity; 4. The child's rate of progress during the instructional intervention(s); and 5. A comparison of the child's rate of progress to expected rates of progress, including	Multiple sources of available data (universal screening/benchmark assessments, progress monitoring, historical and current grades in math) indicate that STUDENT has shown minimal response to instruction and intervention in math. <u>Documentation of insufficient rate of progress:</u> 1. Evidence-based math intervention description summarized in the progress monitoring section above. Intensification of intervention and duration of delivery are explicitly described in the progress monitoring section. 2. Progress monitoring schedule included weekly monitoring of targeted skills through locally designed PM tool. Group comparison data was available within the intervention group, which allowed for interpretation of intervention effectiveness. 3. Fidelity of intervention delivery included structured observation (see observation section). interventionist followed the intervention protocol with corrective feedback was provided. 4. STUDENT is currently growing at a of .26 digits correct per 2 minutes on 2nd grade addition probe (typical growth = .7 digits correct/week) 5. STUDENT's growth rate is 2.7 times discrepant from typical growth. This rate also suggests that STUDENT will not reach the 25th%ile score of 27 digits correct for 50 more instructional weeks. This is not suggestive of a reduction in risk of academic failure.	Summary of all information gathered from Tier 1,2,3



Eligibility Worksheet – Specific Learning Disability

evidence that the intervention yielded successful responses and outcomes for the majority of other children receiving the intervention.		
(D) Demonstrated educational need; The disability must require specially designed instruction.	STUDENT is currently demonstrating significant difficulty in the acquisition of grade level calculation skills. Her lack of fluency and understanding impact her ability to complete more complex calculations and application skills to higher order math concepts. STUDENT demonstrates a need for explicit and systematic instruction in a small group beyond what can be provided within general education alone on number sense and addition using manipulatives, number lines, counters, and base ten blocks to visually represent numbers and how we combine them to add. This will improve acquisition of foundational math skills that will build confidence and efficiency in completing grade level math problems.	Summary of all information gathered from Tier 1,2,3

After completing the Eligibility Worksheet, the IEP Team must determine eligibility. (Complete the Eligibility Report)