DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 898 EC 222 056

TITLE	Larry P. Task Force Report. Policy and Alternative Assessment Guideline Recommendations.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Div. of Special Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 89
NOTE	109p.; For other reports in this series, see EC 222 053-055.
AVAILABLE FROM	Resources in Special Education, 900 J St., Sacramento, CA 95814-2703 ($20.00).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Students; Court Litigation; *Disabilities; *Educational Diagnosis; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Intelligence Tests; *Minority Groups; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Special Education; State Standards; *Student Evaluation; Student Placement; Test Bias
IDENTIFIERS	*California; Larry P v Riles

ABSTRACT

The report summarizes findings and recommendations of a California Task Force which arose out of a California court decision (Larry P. versus Riles) which prohibits the use of intelligence tests for assessing black pupils to determine their placement in special education programs and requires alternative means of assessment. Seven major recommendations are presented concerning inservice training, selection of alternative means for assessing intellectual functioning, general education's responsibility, and development of state and local norms including ethnic representation. Most of the report consists of guidelines for school psychologists and others on the Individualized Education Program team. The following areas are considered: (1) general education's role in the general education/special education continuum (e.g., the school consultation team process); (2) interface in the general education/special education continuum; (3) special education's assessment role in the general education/special education continuum (e.g., procedural model of assessment; report of documentation); (4) conceptual strategies (e.g., developmental assessment, ecological assessment, neuropsychological assessment, skills within subjects); and (5) selection of instruments (e.g., tests prohibited for black assessment for special education and identification of bias in assessment). A glossary and bibliography of about 100 references are also provided. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATIC
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced
received from the person or organizati
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to impro
reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this doc
ment do not necessarily represent offic
OERI position or policy.

Larry P. Task Force Report

Policy and Alternative Assessment Guideline Recommendations

An Advisory Report to Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent
California Department of Education
Special Education Division

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Wright

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

From
The Larry P. Task Force
January 1989

Larry P. Task Force Report

Policy and Alternative Assessment Guideline Recommendations

An Advisory Report to Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent
California Department of Education
Special Education Division

From
The Larry P. Task Force
January 1989

Other publications from the Larry P. Task Force

Appendices:

Larry P. Litigation
Current Trends in Curriculum Role of the School Psychologist by Jean Ramage and Steve Valdez
Implication of Effective Schools Research on Larry P. by Steve Valdez
Alternative Assessment Models
Descriptive Summaries of Instruments Cited
Form Samples
Policy Change Process Document (Legal References)
(Available on loan from Resources in Special Education).

Special Education Task Force Reports

General Education/Special Education Interface
Larry P.
Least Restricitve Environment
Model for Program Quality in Special Education
(Available for purchase from Resources in Special Education.)

This publication was edited and prepared for photo-offset production by Resources in Special Education (RiSE) under the direction of the Program, Curriculum and Training Unit, Special Education Division, California State Department of Education.

Copies of this publication are available from Resources in Special Education, 900 J Street, Sacramento, California 95814-2703.

RiSE Copyright ©1989 by Resources in Special Education.

Acknowledgments

The Larry P. Task Force was appointed by Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent, Special Education Division, California State Department of Education. The recommendations in this document are intended to assist in carrying out alternative assessments and making policy decisions. The guide was made possible by the support, cooperation, and encouragement of a coalition of school districts, county offices of education, professional organizations, parents, institutions of higher education and state agencies. Aid was given by granting release time; making available facilities, equipment, and supplies; financing participants' expenses; and providing critical comments, suggestions and advice. Task Force members unselfishly and eagerly engaged themselves, individually and in groups, in the varied activities necessary for the successful completion of the Task Force's charges, yet simultaneously carried out their primary salaried responsibilities.

Special acknowledgment is made to the following districts, county offices of education, and universities: Clovis Unified School District, Fresno County Office of Education, Fullerton School District, Long Beach Unified School District, Los Angeles County Office of Education, Los Angeles Unified School District, Merced Unified School District, Montebello Unified School District, Office of the Orange County Superintendent of Schools, Poway Unified School District, Rowland Unified School District, San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Office, San Diego Unified School District, and San Diego State University.

Professional organizations whose representatives made significant contributions through collaboration, attendance, research, writing, and providing a multidisciplinary perspective were: California Association of Professors in Special Education, California Association of School Psychologists, California School Nurses Organization, California Speech Language Hearing Association, California State Psychological Association, California Teachers Association, California Training and Resource Network/Crosscultural Unit, Advisory Commission on Special Education, Council for Exceptional Children, Institutes of Higher Education, Regional Centers, Special Education Local Plan Area Administrators, Special Education Administrators of County Offices, and Western Regional Resource Center.

Task Force members who particularly distinguished themselves in the creation of the document were: Marylud Baldwin, Sandra Bridges, Cordell Briggs, Sharyn Brown, Jane Coleman, Bill Desist, Gustavo Getner, Mary Gustafson, Beth Hadady, Betty Henry, Steven Morford, Edwin King, Gail King-Burney, Brian Leung, Katherine Lindenauer, Roy Logan, Linda (Tik) Menefee, Patricia Morales, Gary Myerson, Ken Oliver, Jean Ramage, Roxanne Schnell, Bertha Sightler, June Slaughter, Yolanda Smith, Clay Starlin, Kathryn Summers, Barbara Thomas, Steve Valdez, and Julia Wright.

Finally, the Task Force members are indebted to their families and colleagues for their patience, understanding, and recognition of the pioneering effort the guide represents.

Larry P. Task Force
Membership List

Chair: Jean Ramage, San Diego State University
Policy Committee Chair: Barbara Thomas, Fresno County SELPA
Alternative Assessment Committee Chair: Roy Logan, San Diego City USD

Advisory Commission on Special Education
Patricia Morales
Los Alamitos

Bay Area Association Black Psychologists
Harold Dent
Berkeley

California Association of Private Special Education Schools
Bennett Ross
Marian Frostig School
Pasadena

California Association of School Psychologists
Betty Henry
Berkeley

Edwin King
Modesto School District

Roy Logan
San Diego City Schools

Ruben Lopez
MercedCity Elementar School District

Ken Oliver
Community Alliance for Special Education
Oakland

California School Nurses Organization
Beth Hadady
Glendora

California Teachers Association
Gail King-Burney
Santa Ana Educators Association

California Training and Resource Network/Crosscultural Unit
Minnie Galvan
Crosscultural Unit Coordinator

Linda Halog
Alameda County Office of Education

Brian Leung
Pasadena

Council for Exceptional Children
Bertha Sightler
Cerritos

Field
Don Bishop, Administrator
San Bernardino Unified SELPA

Sandra Bridges
Rowland Unified School District

Sharyn Brown
Fair Oaks

Jesse Flores
Psychological Services
Los Angeles City Unified School District

Katherine Lindenauer
Los Angeles Unified School District

Ellen deRidder
Los Angeles Unified School District

Linda J. (Tik) Maneffe
Psychological Consultant
Regional Center of the East Bay

June Teske
Office of Education, Los Angeles County
Division of Special Education

Steve Valdez
Fullerton School District

Julia Wright
Psychological Services East
Los Angeles Unified School District

Gary Myerson
Poway Unified School District

Roxanne Schnell
Montebello Unified School District

Carol Slater-Horton
Program Specialist for Staff Development
Vallejo City Unified School District

Honig Informal Advisory Committee
Shela Barker
Arcadia

Olivia Martinez, Principal
Luther Burbank Middle School
San Francisco Unified School District

Institutes of Higher Education

Marylud Baldwin
California Polytech State University, San Luis Obispo

Reggie Jones
University of California, Berkeley

Rena Lewis
San Diego State University
Department of Special Education

Arthurline Towner
California State University, Hayward

Parent

Cordell Briggs
Department of English
Loma Linda University

State Department of Education

Gustavo Getner
Special Education Division

Kathryn J. Summers
Special Education Division

Special Education Administrators of County Offices

Bill Desist, Administrator
San Bernardino County Superintendent of Schools Offices

Val Parkhill, Administrator
Offices of Siskiyou County Superintendent of Schools

Special Education Local Plan Area

Jim Johnson, Administrator
Elk Grove Unified School District
Special Services

Barbara F. Thomas, Administrator
Offices of Fresno County Superintendent of Schools

State Special Schools

Ron Kadish, Superintendent
Diagnostic School for Neurologically Handicapped Children, Southern California

Steven Morford, Superintendent
Diagnostic School for Neurologically Handicapped Children, Northern California

Western Regional Resource Center

Clay Starlin
University of Oregon
College of Education

Statement to Parents

By Cordell A. Briggs, Ph.D.
A Parent Representative of the Larry P. Task Force

Our seven-year-old became an elementary school dropout. Although he had only completed the second grade, he lost his desire to read, to do math and even to attend school. In class, he seldom talked, seemed unable to keep up with his classmates, and became unwilling to participate in class activities. He even withdrew from his friends.

Perhaps, this description of our child's behavior may be familar to you. If it is, in part, you probably feel as my wife and I felt: devastated. We were devastated for so many different and unexplainable reasons. First, because both my wife and I are educators, we wondered how could such a problem affect us when we had done so much to enrich our son's pre-school years. Second, we were devastated because, like many parents, we had put our faith in an educational system that now seemed to have failed us—most importantly, however, one that had already begun to fail our child. Third, after investigating the causes for which our son had been labeled a "slow learner," we were devastated to find out how little his teachers and administrators knew about the linguistic and cultural differences and needs of minority and specifically Black pupils. Finally, we were especially devastated by the bombardment of suggestions and plans about how the school and we could address the special needs of our child.

My wife and I imagine that the parents in the Larry P. case, including other parents who have encountered similar problems in educating their children in a regular classroom, must have felt like us. They must have asked the same kinds of questions we asked: "Were we responsible for our child's being out-of-step with other pupils in the classroom which was 98 percent white?" "Were we the cause of our child's questioning his own ethnic identity when he said that he wanted to be white because no one else was Black?" "Were we the cause of his feeling insecure about attending school when his teacher warned him, 'You will not move on to the third grade unless you complete this work.'" Despite the fact that my wife and I are both educators, we had difficulty adjusting to the idea that our child was considered to be a "slow learner"—the same child who had received the benefit of our educational preparation during his pre-school years.

My wife and I also hesitate to identify a single reason for which our child ceased to grow academically and socially. Despite the abundance of educational research on learning, however, it is clear that educators have just begun to understand the specific academic and social needs of language and ethnic minority children. It is also clear that a misdiagnosis of the skills, abilities and cognitive strengths specific to the linguistic and cultural experience of a Black child may result in a mismatched score of the child with other children for whom an intelligence test was designed.

On rare occasions does educational research impact so significantly upon the American judicial system. One of those occasions is a judicial decision that involves prohibiting the special education proposes. U.S. Appellate Court Judge Robert E. Peckham's decision may be viewed as being the California version of the U.S. Supreme Court's decision on Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). *(This 1954 decision struck down the long accepted "separate but equal" doctrine in the field of public education.) As a result of Judge Peckham's decision, the use of intelligence tests is prohibited for assessing the skills, abilities, and cognitive*

strengths of Black pupils to determine their placement in special education programs, which have become overrepresented with Black pupils in California.

Judge Peckham's September 1986 mandate affects most seriously school psychologists throughout the state. These professionals are the ones who have often administered intelligence tests to determine appropriate placement of pupils in special education programs. School psychologists, however, should not be regarded as the "bad guys" of Judge Peckham's mandate. For them, the IQ test has been a valuable instrument when it has been used appropriately, just as valuable as the telescope to the astronomer, the paint brush to the artist, or the pen to the writer. In the hands of a skilled professional, almost any tool can transform the average into the exquisite, unless it attempts to mold material for which it was not appropriately designed to shape. In such an instance, the tool distorts the image and creates a marred impression.

What is clear is that a disproportionate number of Black pupils have been assigned to special education programs because of their performance or lack of comparable performance with white middle-class pupils on IQ tests. In effect, the tool in the hands of skilled professionals has not always been successful in the transforming the average into the exquisite.

Because intelligence tests have been prohibited for use in assessing the placement of Black pupils for special education purposes, school psychologists and other school district personnel associated with the mental and physical care of pupils have to find alternative means of assessing pupils for placement in special education programs. Realizing this dilemma, the California State Department of Education, Special Education Division, appointed the Larry P. Task Force to recommended policy and alternative assessment strategies that would assist school districts in carrying out the September 1986 mandate by Judge Peckham.

As an educator in higher education and a parent representative of the Larry P. Task Force, I have been extremely impressed with the degree of concern for excellence in education in general as well as in the committee. For example, what began as a specific focus on a mandate to provide policy and alternative assessment for Black pupils evolved into a concern to address the needs of language and other minority pupils in California. The attitude of the Task Force reflected, I believe, the ideal that an educational system cannot provide quality and equality unless it strives to meet the educational needs of all pupils regardless of their linguistic or cultural backgrounds. I saw this process at work and you may see it too as it is reflected in the Larry P. document, which provides a guide for school psychologists regarding Black pupils in special education programs.

When school psychologists, administrators, teachers, and parents work together to ensure the harmonious development of the physical, mental and social growth of pupils, everyone benefits, especially the pupils irrespective of their linguistic and cultural differences. I have already been encouraged by this process of working together with such a professionally diverse group of educators because my son, now entering the eighth grade, is no longer labeled a "slow learner;" instead, he is a "gifted" one.

As a parent, I encourage you to ask questions, to seek answers, and to insist that your school district provides a quality and an equitable education to the pupils of your community. We must remember: "A mind is a terrible thing to waste."

Foreword

The Larry P. Task Force has been involved in an evolutionary process that has sought to move beyond psychometrics toward a framework for assessment that will better serve Black children, children of cultural and linguistic diversity, and indeed, all children. We are impressed with a sense of urgency because, despite a variety of attempts to put into operation nonbiased assessment, Black children continue to be overrepresented in classes which serve the mildly mentally retarded in the learning handicapped programs.

It is clear that although the focus of Larry P. is on Black children, the implications reach far beyond the role of the IQ test in assessment and placement decisions for Black pupils. They extend beyond the development of culture-fair tests and even beyond special education itself. The impact of Larry P. is on all educational practices in general and special education. This requires focusing on the assumptions, instructional practices curriculum and environment that enhance or inhibit learning success or failure.

The Task Force seeks in this document to address the following four clear challenges expressed or implied in the Larry P. decision:

1. The amelioration of overrepresentation of Black pupils (and of all pupils inappropriately placed) in special education classes;

2. The need for nondiscriminatory alternative assessment processes (i.e., both psychometric and non-psychometric procedures) for children for whom IQ testing is prohibited or inappropriate.

3. The need for equity and access by all pupils to quality instruction and a relevant core curriculum; and

4. The need for continual cultural awareness and sensitivity within the entire educational community without which there can be no true educational equity.

The Task Force recognizes that the accompanying assessment guidelines and policy recommendations raise significant questions that all members of the educational community need to answer. While attempting to set a framework, we have examined the nature and role of cultural sensitivity and awareness among school personnel, within classroom environments and in assessment practices. We acknowledge the need for cultural awareness in terms of relevant core curriculum and instruction in general education. We have examined the assessment process itself and offer a framework of practical value to those in the field. Finally, we have attempted to stress the reciprocal nature of general education and special education, especially in relation to problem solving teams and procedures, and the role of the school psychologist. We have neither definitively operationalized nonbiased assessment, nor endorsed one single alternative

assessment strategy.

What we do offer in this document is a framework from which to explore the following issues:

1. A conceptual framework for a nondiscriminatory assessment process that begins in general education and may extend into special education.

2. An acknowledgment of the nature of a culturally relevant core curriculum and culturally sensitive instructional practices as they relate to equity and access to excellence in the general education program;

3. A description of some of the alternative assessment strategies that may be used in general education and special education; and

4. The meaning of cultural sensitivity and awareness in relation to education.

The Introduction which follows examines the Larry P. decision within the context of related pertinent court cases. The General Education/Special Education Continuum follows and touches on the role of effective schools and cultural awareness in problem solving beginning in general education, and in all educational practices. The role of the School Consultation Team within general education includes some practical examples of possible interventions. The Assessment Process includes an introduction to several alternative assessment techniques, tools, and strategies. We then offer a guideline on Selection of Instruments.

The need to design assessment and intervention strategies from questions generated by the problem solving teams is stressed throughout this document. In this initial effort to provide practical guidelines, the contributions of all those parents, school psychologists, educators, legislators and scholars whose commitment is to serve all children with excellence and equity is acknowledged and appreciated.

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Acknowledgments	iii
Task Force Membership List	v
Statement to Parents	ix
Foreword	xi
Introduction	1
Task Force Process	5
Recommendations	7
General Education's Role in the General Education/ Special Education Continuum	13
School Consultation Team	19
The School Consultation Team Process	21
Examples of Interventions	25
Interface in the General Education/Special Education Continuum	37
Pupil Characteristics	39
Special Education's Assessment Role in the General Education/ Special Education Continuum	43
Assessment Process	45
Procedural Model of Assessment	49
Alternative Assessment: Where I.Q. Testing is Invalid or Prohibited	51
Report of Documentation	67
Conceptual Strategies	69
Developmental Assessment	71
Dynamic Assessment	73
Ecological Assessment	75
Information Processing	77
Neuropsychological Assessment	79
Psychological Processing	81
Skills Within Subjects	83
Selection of Instruments	85
Prohibited Tests for Black Assessment for Special Education	87
Additional Standardized Intelligence Measures	89
Considerations in Test Selection and Interpretation	91
Identifying Bias in Testing Assessment	93
Glossary	95
Bibliography	107

Introduction

On September 25, 1986, the Honorable Robert F. Peckham, Judge, U.S. District Court, signed an order modifying the December 12, 1979 judgment in the *Larry P. v. Riles* case. In his order, Judge Peckham directed the California State Department of Education to issue a directive to all school districts which would reconfirm the federal court's 1979 decision and would also implement an additional order of the court.

One provision of this order was the complete prohibition against using IQ tests with Black pupils for any special education purpose. Another provision stated that school districts should use alternative means of assessment to determine identification and placement. Many of the present policies need revision. Thus, the primary directives to the Larry P. Task Force by Patrick Campbell, Assistant Superintendent for Special Education, were the following related charges:

1. Develop recommendations for policy changes.
2. Develop recommendations for alternative means of assessment.

As in any court case there are related issues from prior court cases. Thus, the four challenges outlined in the Foreword have judicial determinants. While there were only two specific charges to the Larry P. Task Force, this framework could be developed only with full cognizance of the common issues inherent in each case.

Larry P. and Related Litigation
For the Larry P. case, some of the pertinent related issues from other court cases are: a) tracking, b) overrepresentation, c) equity, d) cultural awareness and sensitivity, e) nondiscriminatory assessment, and f) services for pupils with achievement difficulties. These types of litigation have been evolving over the past twenty years (Mercer, 1970; Ortiz and Yates, 1983; Reschly, 1987b). The thrust of decision in each litigation was to eliminate barriers to equal access and create equity for educational opportunities.

Tracking
In the mid-1960's, *Hansen v. Hobson (1967)* was filed against the Washington, D. C. public schools on behalf of Black pupils because it was claimed that they were assigned disproportionately to lower ability groups or tracks. Because the achievement tests were determined to be primarily standardized on white middle class pupils, the tests were determined to be inappropriate for the Black pupils. Since this case, both ability grouping and standardized testing have come under judicial scrutiny (Salvia & Ysseldyke, 1988).

Gonzales (1988) points out that findings from research support the conclusions that tracking:

- retards academic progress of many students—primarily those in average and low groups

- appears to foster low esteem among these same students and promotes misbehavior and dropping out
- lowers aspirations of students not in the top groups, resulting in lower accomplishment
- often separates rich from poor, white from nonwhites
- does not benefit the accelerated student
- is based on placement information that is not adequate to be accurate, fair, or useful.

The judicial mandate and subsequent directive that spawned this task force were based on the role of standardized tests as the primary basis for special education placement decisions. The concern was that the intelligence of children from diverse cultural, linguistic, or socioeconomic class experience were not appropriately assessed by standardized tests. Consequently, the assessment of "intelligence" or "intellectual ability" or "general ability" is transformed in the current effort from reliance on an "IQ score" to a process of educational assessment and hypothesis testing that begins in general education as soon as a concern is presented.

Overrepresentation

The overrepresentation cases, such as *Diana* and *Guadulupe,* focused on the kind of tests given (e.g., nonverbal versus verbal) and the manner in which a test is administered (e.g., primary language versus second language). The cases in the 1970's, including the *Larry P.* and *PACE* cases focused on bias in IQ measures. Recent cases such as *Marshall* and *S-l* have focused on educational alternatives for pupils with learning needs and the conception, measurement and decision making process with adaptive behavior (Reschly, 1987b).

Many of the remedies agreed to in the consent decrees of the early cases have become policies by which we operate. For example, some of the California *Diana* case (1970) consent decree reforms are now imbedded in the regulations for Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children's Act, including:

- assessing pupils in their primary language "unless it is clearly not feasible to do so"
- using nonverbal measures of ability with non-English or bilingual pupils
- developing and using safeguards such as informed consent
- using a variety of information (not merely a single IQ score) when making eligibility or placement decisions for special education

The *Guadalupe* case in Arizona (1972) added assessing adaptive behavior. These early

cases emphasized the kind of test given (e.g., nonverbal) and the manner in which the test might be administered (e.g., primary language). They did not attack the test as such. The *Diana* and *Guadalupe* remedies, particularly the use of nonverbal measures, did lead to a reduction in the degree of overrepresentation in special education classes for Hispanic pupils.

The overrepresentation court cases in the 1970's, such as the Larry P. case, focused primarily on the question of bias in measures of general intelligence. The Larry P. case was filed with such a complaint. This filing took place in November of 1971 as a class action suit on behalf of Black pupils in the San Francisco Public Schools who were placed in special education classes for the mildly mentally retarded. The original hearing determined that overrepresentation existed primarily due to the use of individually administered intelligence tests. In June of 1972, a preliminary injunction was awarded which prohibited the use of IQ tests in San Francisco. In December of 1974, the injunction was expanded to all Black pupils in California for whom eligibility for educable mentally retarded classes was being considered. In January of 1975, the State Board of Education issued a moratorium on the use of IQ tests for all pupils if the test was to be used as part of the classification of pupils.

Overrepresentation was the major—implied or explicitly stated—thread that wove the different litigations into a common fabric to signal and generate efforts for nondiscriminatory and alternative assessment processes. The current effort is intended to expand thinking about the nature of assessment and the referral process. Assessment is not just testing, but takes into account a variety of cultural, linguistic and economic factors that affect learning style, problem-solving skills, gender roles and expectations, developmental factors, as well as factors indigenous to the pupil. In the years since the Larry P. decision, exciting and innovative developments in education and school psychology have helped to expand the way we understand, intervene, and approach instruction and address problems with learning. The enactment of Public Law 94-142, subsequent to the filing of the Larry P. case, has played a large part in enhancing assessment practices in California and elsewhere.

The Larry P. trial took place between October, 1977 and May, 1978. The court decision was issued by Judge Peckham in October of 1979. The injunction was sustained; that is, IQ testing of Blacks was not allowed if the testing results were to be used in a classification of mentally retarded. In September of 1986, Judge Peckham expanded the injunction, forbidding the use of IQ tests for any special education purpose with Black pupils. In December of 1987, Superintendent Bill Honig issued a directive to all California school districts which in part reads:

> School district are not to use intelligence tests in the assessment of Black pupils who have been referred for special education services.
>
> In lieu of IQ tests, districts should use alternative means of assessment to determine identification and placement. Such techniques should include and would not be limited to, assessments of the pupil's personal history and development, adaptive behavior, classroom performance, academic

> achievement, and evaluative instruments relative to a pupil's abilities and inabilities in specific skill areas ....
> There is no special education related purpose for which I.Q. tests shall be administered to Black pupils....

The primary means by which the California State Department of Education determines overrepresentation is to collect placement data and use the "E" formula to determine overrepresentation. (See Glossary for an explanation.) The "E" formula data for 1987 showed that there were still a number of districts where Black pupils were overrepresented in special education classes for the mentally retarded even though for the last sixteen years there has been a moratorium on IQ testing for pupils suspected of being educable mentally retarded.

Including mildly retarded and learning disabled pupils in the Learning Handicapped Program is based on the assumption that all these pupils can learn if the appropriate curriculum and effective instruction are employed. This has been an important factor in assuring that pupils are in environments where they are expected to learn and where the material and instruction are geared to their needs. However, since overrepresentation continues, there is a need to look at alternative ways of assuring equity and access.

The remedies in the *Marshall v. Georgia* (1984, 1985) and *S-1 v. Turlington* (1986) cases emphasize the need for appropriate curriculum and effective teaching in general education, and that when a pupil continues to have learning or behavioral problems interventions must first be tried in general education. Thus, special education would truly be for those pupils with a handicapping condition. To check on equity and access from this framework means not just looking at placement data, but monitoring along the continuum of service, including prereferral, referral, eligibility, placement and exit points.

Successful resolution of three Larry P. Task Force challenges outlined in the Foreword (equal access and equity, overrepresentation, and nondiscriminatory assessment) is heavily dependent on positive outcomes of the fourth—heightening awareness and sensitivity to cultural, ethnic and linguistic differences. Children's school performance and behavior are functions of their composite experience at home with language and cultural values, and the expectations and opportunities they find at school. The responsibility for creating expectations and opportunities that build on the skills and experiences of the child should rest with the school, not the pupil.

Cultural, ethnic and linguistic awareness and sensitivity are concepts that school personnel are struggling to, and must, understand. As we become more sensitively attuned we need to examine traditional instructional truisms through our "new" sensitivity perceptors. We must extend and apply our understanding of the relationship between language experience and cognitive development. We need to be aware of the impact of ethnic and linguistic patterns on social discourse and interactions, and ultimately the effect of all these on adjustment to expectations within the school community.

Task Force Process

The charge by Patrick Campbell, State Director of Special Education, to the Larry P. Task Force was to develop recommendations regarding policy and alternative assessment that would assist districts in carrying out the September 1986 mandate by Judge Peckham. The Task Force first met in April 1987 and completed their task in December 1988. Sessions were not held between June and December 1987.

Throughout the development of the guide, the Task Force was as sensitive to who would use the document as to the need to be pragmatic. Consumers of the product uppermost in the minds of the Task Force were school psychologists and administrators.

Initial meetings provided opportunities to examine the charge, review background information, and explore the most pragmatic approach to accomplish the responsibility. Two committees were formed—the Policy Committee and the Assessment Committee. Chairs were selected by the Task Force members. Task Force members also selected the committee upon which they preferred to serve. Two-day work sessions were held in Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego and Sacramento counties. Subgroups met in several other places.

The Policy Committee 1) examined federal and state mandates that impinge on assessment, the Larry P. Judgment and existing practices in the field; 2) determined the need for change based upon the information obtained, and finally 3) developed and prioritized recommendations needed for implementation. The Policy and Practice Review Document reflects this process. Additionally two letters to the field (See Appendix) were proposed for possible use by the State Department of Education.

The Assessment Committee accepted responsibility for developing a guide for the alternative assessment of Black pupils, with a special focus on the assessment of abilities for Black pupils and for all pupils for whom a standardized intelligence test is prohibited by law or is otherwise inappropriate. The Policy Committee examined federal and state mandates that impact assessment and developed recommendations for the State Department of Education that had implications for identification, assessment and eligibility.

The process the Assessment Committee followed was collaborative. First they developed a series of questions to frame their task. From these questions grew the outline for the recommended guide. Subcommittees were formed, again by member choice, for each of the outlined sections. Each subsequent session provided the opportunity for the full committee to critique subcommittee production, make adjustments in the original outline, plan for the succeeding sessions, suggest interim activities, and assign new responsibilities. When a section was approved by the Alternative Assessment Committee, the Policy Committee was asked to review the sections and make recommendations if change was needed. All committee members received a written communication from the Chair following each session that summarized the meeting and proposed the next sessions agenda.

The semi-final draft of the document was submitted to reviewers suggested by the Task Force including professionals outside the state who are nationally recognized in alternative assessment and who were knowledgeable of the issues in the Larry P. litigation. Reviews were requested, as well by persons within the organizations represented, by school psychologists, administrators, and parents in districts of varying size. Guidelines developed by the committee to formulate the reviews were provided. A system was devised to incorporate suggestions and comments the subcommittees deemed appropriate.

The final draft of the document was prepared by the Chair and an editor and then presented to the Task Force for comment and final approval. The document's recommendations were presented to the Special Education Division of the California State Department of Education in December of 1988. The Task Force believes that, as with any living document, it will need to be evaluated and updated as theoretical and practical knowledge grow.

Recommendations

1. **Recommendation:**
The Task Force urges statewide inservices to occur between January and December 1989, and to continue on an as needed basis. The inservices should be on two levels: 1) Awareness—an orientation for prereferral alternative assessment process appropriate to Local Education Agency Administrators, School Psychologists and other Individualized Education Program team members; and 2) Technical—a detailed training for school psychologists of the specific components of learning processes and of eligibility standards including guidelines for determining a severe discrepancy. The training should include the range of alternative assessments, interpreting environmental, cultural and economic effects on achievement and professional standards for the development and use of test and nontest procedures. Members of the Larry P. Task Force should be involved in the planning and implementation of the inservices.

The Task Force also recommends that monies/funds must be specifically designated on a priority basis for staff development in order to accomplish the above named recommendation. These trainings should follow current research on effective staff development (i.e. rather than one-shot workshops/trainings, each workshop training must be supplemented with ongoing coaching and feedback.

Rationale:
Full implementation of the Larry P. Judgment is highly dependent upon personnel who are knowledgeable in process and procedures for alternative assessments. Appropriate assessment procedures will not be consistently utilized otherwise.

Input from the field has indicated a need to have guidelines for determining a severe discrepancy when utilizing alternative means of assessment as well as to have guidelines for types of alternative assessments.

2. **Recommendation:**
Alternative means for assessing intellectual functioning may be utilized for any pupil, when considerations of reliability, validity and cultural sensitivity have been taken into account.

The State Department should take a leadership role in developing procedures in evaluating the outcome and the ability to generalize of assessment models being utilized by districts which have elected not to use IQ tests for any pupil.

Rationale:
It is the opinion of the Task Force that nothing in the federal or state regulations prohibits the use of alternative means in the assessment of intellectual functioning for any student. Further, it is the position of this Task Force that all children referred for special education programs and services should go through similar assessment

processes. However, it is critical that applied research be conducted utilizing a range of alternative assessment procedures and examining all pertinent outcome variables before consideration can be made for recommending alternative assessment for all children in California. At the present time given the level of knowledge in the field, it is not known how appropriate alternative assessment procedures are for determining intellectual functioning and/or establishing the existence of certain handicapping conditions.

3. **Recommendation:**
A strong statement in the form of a guideline needs to be made regarding general education's responsibility to provide modifications and a range of program options for "pupils whose educational needs are due primarily to unfamiliarity with the English language; temporary physical disability; social maladjustment or environmental factors..." (E.C. 56026). Further, "a pupil shall be referred for special education instruction and services only after the resources of the regular education program have been considered and where appropriate, utilized" (E.C. 56303).

Each school should have a systematic team process for consideration of alternatives within the general education program. The process is implemented by use of a school site, school consultation, student study or other related general education team. School consultation teams should document the resources of the general education program that have been considered, modified and when appropriate, the results of intervention (Title 5, Adm. Code, Section 3021). Modifications may include parent consultation, support staff involvement, behavior management, change in instructional style, and/or strategies, etc.

The documentation should further include delineation of the process used to determine the effects of environmental, cultural and economic differences upon academic performance within the core curriculum.

Rationale:
Procedures are necessary to insure that minority, disadvantaged, low-income and other pupils have access to a full range of educational opportunities and are not automatically or systematically channeled into remedial or special education tracks.

It is clear in both federal and state laws and regulations that general education has the responsibility for the pupils named above. It should be noted that, according to research, over-identification is more likely related to the referral process. Other research has shown a clear relationship between lack of options available within general education and the number of special education referrals. Therefore, the entire general education delivery system, including referral procedures, must be addressed in order to be responsive to the intent of the Larry P. Judgment.

4. **Recommendation:**
As a component of the local plan, the State Department of Education, should require that when conducting an assessment to determine eligibility for special education, a

step-by-step review should be utilized to identify educationally relevant health and developmental factors and to determine the effects of environmental, cultural/linguistic or economic differences on achievement [E.C. 56327(e)(g)].

Rationale:
The issue of overrepresentation of minority pupils in special education may be addressed in this manner. The review would ensure assessment "across all ecologies" and compliance with federal and state rules. It is important that assessors be sensitive to pupils' cultural/linguistic backgrounds in order to appropriately determine eligibility for special education.

5. **Recommendation:**
The Student Study Team that has become part of the support system for many schools should be renamed the School Consultation Team.

Rationale:
Changing the name emphasizes that the role of the team is to assess and devise interventions to resolve problem situations rather than to study problem students. Moving away from the assumption that the problem resides in the pupil (i.e., is a deficiency of the pupil's) is an important philosophical commitment to all children, and especially culturally and linguistically diverse children.

6. **Recommendation:**
The State Department of Education should take the responsibility to develop state and local norms, including ethnic representation. Separate ethnic and socio-economic status (SES) norms should also be developed. This development could be done in cooperation with researchers and test makers.

Rationale:
Until instruments are developed that are reliable, valid and fair, issues of parent rights, professional ethics and misidentification will plague the field of special education. It is most appropriate that the State Department of Education take the initiative in providing leadership in this area.

7. **Recommendation:**
There is need to do research and follow-up concerning what constitutes reliable and valid instruments and procedures for determining a pupil's abilities and inabilities in specific skill areas.

Rationale:
Further research is needed for the field to be able to appropriately meet the mandates of the Larry P. Judgment.

8. **Recommendation:**
A guideline should be adopted which stresses the need for school employees to follow existing standards regarding reliable and valid assessment instruments and procedures.

Following are sources to be consulted:
1. Federal/state laws and regulations
2. Professional associations standards
3. Office of Civil Rights
4. National authorities.

Rationale:
Federal/state laws and regulations concerning standardization issues are already in place. In addition, national professional organizations have devoted significant attention to these issues, including the assessment of handicapped and minority group students. One good source is Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (1985) published by the American Psychological Association.

9. **Recommendation:**
A guideline should be adopted indicating that standardized measures should be utilized to the extent that they are appropriate and available. The State Department of Education should encourage research to determine which standardized instruments and procedures are appropriate.

Rationale:
This would lead to more consistency as well as greater objectivity in determining eligibility for special education pupils.

10. **Recommendation:**
When local special education plans are approved, they should meet federal and state regulations requirements regarding the use of multidisciplinary teams with appropriately credentialed and certified personnel. Verification of appropriate use should be made through the Coordinated Compliance Reviews.

Rationale:
Reduced reliance on standardized tests will increase the need for highly trained and experienced personnel to insure valid, non-biased decisions. Review of current state rules confirms the inclusion of school psychologists in the assessment of intellectual and emotional assessment (for mental retardation, severe emotional disturbance and learning disability). Further, the new Title 5 regulations and proposed federal regulations in Public Law 99-457 strengthen this interpretation.

11. **Recommendation:**
The State Department of Education should establish a guideline or regulation which

mandates that an alternative assessment minimally should include but not be limited to "pupil's personal history (including health) and development, adaptive behavior, classroom performance, academic achievement, and evaluative instruments (and procedures) designed to point out specific information relative to a pupil's abilities and inabilities in specific skill areas." (Larry P. Judgment, p.#4). This would include assessments of language functioning.

Rationale:
Without a directive concerning the extent of a "full and individual evaluation" using alternative assessment procedures, pupils may be placed in special education without the benefit of information from a variety of sources as required by P.L. 94-142 [CFR 300.533 (a)(l)].

12. **Recommendation:**
For the purpose of special education eligibility, criteria as they exist in California Education Code and Regulations (E.C. 56026, CAC 3030) should be maintained. The criteria is to be used to direct the selection of alternative assessments for pupils for whom standardized instruments are not appropriate.

Rationale:
The following rules provide the basis for this recommendation. "Evaluation means procedures used selectively with an individual child..." (C.F.R. 300.500). "Testing and evaluation materials and procedures...must be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory" [C.F.R. 300.530(b)].

"When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for a specific pupil, the discrepancy shall be measured by alternative means..." [Title 5, Adm. Code, Section 3030(j)(4)(B) and 3030(c)(4)(A)].

13. **Recommendation:**
The following wording should be added to the general section of Title 5 on assessment (Section 3023) as follows: When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for a specific pupil, the alternative assessment process shall be specified on the assessment plan.

Rationale:
The enabling rules for alternative means in lieu of standardized tests appears only in the regulations governing specific learning disabilities and speech and language disorders. It needs to be in the general assessment section in order to apply to the mentally retarded and other handicapping conditions.

14. **Recommendation:**
A statement in the form of a guideline or an addition to Title 5 is recommended as follows: Whether or not an IQ test is valid for a pupil, data gathered in other perti-

nent aspects of functioning (personal history and development, adaptive behavior, classroom performance and academic achievement) should be integrated into the assessment of ability. In addition, such assessment would include nontest based procedures and an alternative model to determine specific information relative to a pupil's abilities and inabilities in specific skill areas, including language functioning.

Rationale:
The Title 5 definition of intellectual ability is not tied to IQ testing, although in practice an IQ test has been the most commonly used and researched instrument available for this purpose.

Recognizing that an IQ test may yield invalid results for some pupils and has been prohibited for others (Larry P. Judgment), it is important that a directive be given regarding how to arrive at a clinical judgment concerning a pupil's cognitive functioning. Existing research on clinical judgment suggests that reliability of the process is strengthened by corroboration of data gained through standardized procedures, e.g. adaptive behavior, structured interviews, achievement tests, etc.

15. **Recommendation:**
Institutions of higher education must be involved in alternative assessment training. This training should include the effects of environmental, cultural and economic differences upon academic performance.

Theoretical and practical readings and direct instruction in methods are important components of such training. Sensitivity can be heightened by providing student teachers and interns with experiences in districts that have a multicultural and multilingual population.

Rationale:
Preservice as well as inservice will be necessary to implement the Larry P. decision.

General Education's Role in the General Education/ Special Education Continuum

- The School Consultation Team
- The School Consultation Team Process
- Examples of Interventions

General Education's Role in the General Education/Special Education Continuum

California Education Code, Part 30, paragraph 56303, states, "A pupil shall be referred for special education instruction and services only after the resources of the regular education program have been considered and, where appropriate, utilized." According to the Title 5 regulations for the implementation of the Education Code, Section 3021 B. (2), referral to special education requires "...documentation of the resources of the regular education program that have been considered, modified, and when appropriate, the results of the intervention. This documentation shall not delay the timelines for completing the assessment plan or assessment." It is clear that documented efforts to meet a pupil's needs within the general education environment must precede a referral for special education assessment.

According to the National Academy of Sciences Panel concerning the overrepresentation of minorities and males in special education, efforts to correct for disproportion must focus on two issues: the validity of referral and assessment procedures and the quality of instruction in both general and special education (Heller, 1982).

As part of the Larry P. settlement, the Court has ordered school districts to monitor overrepresentation of Black pupils in special education. However, this overrepresentation cannot be addressed solely by the use of non-biased assessment since many minority pupils (including Black pupils) are overrepresented in referrals for assessment. In order for the problem of overrepresentation to be alleviated, the needs of minority pupils must be addressed within the general education program.

Factors such as environmental, cultural, economic, or linguistic differences do not, in and of themselves, constitute qualifying factors for special education. Pupils at risk primarily due to such factors must be provided services appropriate to their needs by general education and compensatory education (e.g., Chapter One, bilingual education). When minority pupils are referred for assessment in equal proportion to their non-minority peers, then we can expect non-biased assessment to facilitate equity in special education placements.

There are a multitude of intervention options within the school, home, and community environments which are available to assist pupils' learning. A few factors which may affect learning include instructional, physiological, cultural/linguistic, school environment, home environment, and community environment variables. It is important that information be available to teachers and parents regarding effective intervention practices (e.g., effective schools research). Having information and training relating to proven intervention procedures should be the first step in accommodating pupils who demonstrate some difficulty with the school curriculum environment.

Special needs should be met through programs based on effective instructional practices rather than categorical labels. This may require intensive inservice regarding the social and cultural interactions with the educating process. However, at the present time there is a need to bridge the knowledge bases of effective schools and classroom instruction with the multicultural literature.

To eliminate having a disportionate number of culturally diverse pupils, assessment needs to begin with a systematic examination of the child's learning environment and the nature and quality of the regular instruction received. Only after deficiencies in the learning environment have been ruled out should there be a referral and an individual assessment for special education consideration.

Such examination and assessment needs to reflect the following factors:

Community/district factors—The system factors in the school or community that affect assessment and intervention outcomes are such things as the following:

- Level of training of personnel
- Availability of culturally relevant educational programs
- Proportionate cultural representation in special programs.

School/classroom factors—The school and classroom factors that affect assessment and intervention outcomes are such things as the following:

- Educational leadership style
- Effectiveness of the curriculum for all children, including for various ethnic, linguistic and socioeconomic groups within the school
- Effectiveness of the instructional practices
- Expectations for achievement among different cultural grou
- Achievement of basic skills by all cultural groups
- Access to advanced courses and learning by all cultural groups
- Exposure to remedial approaches as needed.

Child/home factors—Hopefully, equity and access to schooling is shown to be present from the above analysis. If not, then there needs to be an especially careful bridging between these factors and the child/home factors. The child/home factors are such things as the following:

- Pupil's primary home language
- Social and cultural mores and customs of the home
- Achievement of the child compared to other children of the same ethnic or cultural group
- Child's or the family's expectations regarding education
- Information about out-of-school activities in which the pupil engages.

This information should be gathered for all children, but this is particularly important for children from diverse cultural backgrounds. There is a need for caution in interpreting this information, especially in relation to inadvertent stereotyping.

The above factors that are important to cultural sensitivity are very related to characteristics of effective schools, classrooms and instruction. Thus, in any school developing an alternative assessment and intervention plan, information regarding such factors needs to be gathered by administrators and/or other qualified personnel. The information should be gathered prior to consideration of special education referral and should be available for use by a School Consultation Team (SCT).

The School Consultation Team

The process of data collection presented herein begins in general education as soon as a concern is presented. The Task Force has recommended that the Student Study Team or Consultation Team that has become part of many schools be renamed the School Consultation Team (SCT). Changing the name emphasizes that the role of the team is to collect data and devise interventions to resolve problem situations rather than to study problem students. Moving away from the assumption that the problem resides in the pupil (i.e., is a pupil deficiency) is an important philosophical commitment to all children, and especially culturally and linguistically diverse children. Fortunately, in the years since the Larry P. decision, exciting and innovative developments in education and school psychology have helped to expand the way we understand and approach assessment and instruction.

The School Consultation Team should become involved as soon as a concern arises. The School Consultation Team (SCT) begins by approaching the presenting concerns as a team of "investigative reporters," asking questions and gathering information that allows the generation of hypotheses; i.e., working theories about the nature and resolution of the concern. Culture creates one base from which to raise hypotheses about the presenting concern. These hypotheses lead in turn to new avenues of investigation, leading to trial interventions which can then be implemented, evaluated, and modified as needed. Interventions should begin in the general classroom and be culturally and linguistically congruent with the experiences of the pupil. Referral to the special education Assessment Team would only occur if the response to general education interventions substantiate the hypothesis that the child may have a handicapping condition. This approach requires school psychologists to be thoroughly involved with general education rather than becoming involved at the point of referral to special education.

The School Consultation Team should include, but not be limited to, an administrator, a school psychologist, teacher(s), school counselor, school nurse, speech and language specialist and parents. It is crucial that at least one of the members be experienced in developing curricular and instructional interventions that build on the child's cultural and linguistic strengths; a multicultural specialist should be added where the team members do not have this expertise. Parents are to be a primary source of expertise on their child. Interventions are most successful when an active collaborative partnership can be developed among home, school and community.

Thus, the School Consultation Team:

1. provides a forum for school personnel to discuss pupil needs independent of consideration for special education placement;

2. considers site district expectations for pupils in the academic and social curriculum according to a developmental progression;

3. clarifies district/site alternatives within the general education program;

4. provides a defined forum for identifying areas of need for future expansion of general education program alternatives and modifications;

5. involves parents at an early stage in program review and planning for at-risk pupils;

6. provides a means for at least one school professional other than the child's general education teacher to observe the child's academic performance in the general education classroom, or, in the case of a child out of school, in an environment appropriate for a child of that age;

7. provides effective modification of instructional environment;

8. identifies instructional needs through systematic measurement of pupil progress;

9. identifies other classroom and school interventions and modifications potentially appropriate for a particular pupil;

10. documents that lack of pupil progress occurred under a variety of alternative, well-conceived instructional approaches;

11. documents that lack of pupil progress is not due primarily to health, environmental, cultural or economic factors.

A chart follows to illustrate the sources of data, activities and steps helpful in gathering information needed to formulate an intervention plan. It is important that interventions are selected with specific regard to the pupil's cultural and linguistic background and experiences.

The School Consultation Team Process

Steps in Making a Request for Assistance

Step 1: Asking Questions to be investigated by SCT members
Step 2: Collecting Data to answer the questions
(Parental involvement should be obtained at this point.)

WRITTEN RECORDS	OBSERVATIONS	INTERVIEWS
Current language proficiency Number years in U.S. Mobility Previous schooling Teacher comments Place of birth Attendance	Classroom Playground Community	Teacher Parent

Step 3: Raising Hypotheses

Determine if problem may be due to:

HEALTH/ DEVELOPMENT	OPPORTUNITY TO LEARN	ACCULTURATION/ SOCIO-EMOTIONAL	HOME/ COMMUNITY
Hearing Vision Other health problems	English proficiency Attendance Bilingual education	Anxiety Adjustment Risk-taking	Socio-economic status Goal oriented Conformity Isolated

Step 4: Initiate Regular Education Interventions
(some interventions may require written parental consent)

Examples include:

Referral to appropriate professional	English language acquisition Primary language support Modifications of instructional styles and methods	Counseling Peer support Time/space modifications	Parents: Consultation Education and involvement

Step 5: Feedback, Modification, Evaluation of Results and Raise New Hypotheses

Step 6: Final Documented Report of SCT that describes the findings of the data collection, of the evaluation of the interventions implemented and the conclusions of the SCT. These conclusions will either describe a satisfactory resolution of the concern within general education, will indicate the need for further general education modifications, or will support the basis for suspecting a handicapping condition.

In keeping to the stated purpose of addressing problem situations rather than studying problem students, the questions raised by the SCT should focus on the interactional relationships among school, family, community and culture. The most successful interventions begin where these domains are most congruent. Connecting and bridging areas of incongruence is the primary function of the teams. Some examples of the kinds of questions the SCT might ask to guide their appraisal and direct interventions and modifications include:

- Is the presenting problem clearly, precisely and objectively stated?
- Are parents asked to actively participate in all phases of the SCT process?
- How has the person making the request attempted to alleviate the problem?
- Are there special conditions about this pupil to consider (e.g., familial relationships, social and cultural customs, primary language)?
- Have all the available existing information about the problem(s) been explored and additional information sought (e.g., learning styles, classroom environment, community issues, health factors)?
- Has the pupil been given an opportunity to express perceptions of the problem?
- What special conditions do I need to consider as a member of the SCT?
- Does the SCT develop and document appropriate and workable recommendations?
- Is there documentation of pupil progress in relationship to the core curriculum? (Specifics of this point are detailed in the text below.)

Curriculum Based Assessment.

Curriculum Based Assessment (CBA) involves a standard process to directly assess the performance and learning of students on the critical school skills within a course of study. CBA measures are the "Curriculum Metrics" which indicate whether a student has achieved (or is achieving) mastery of a curriculum area.

Because CBA directly assesses student performance it is closely related to the teaching process. Results of CBAmay, therefore, be used by school personnel to monitor student progress on a daily basis. This is a great advantage for instructional personnel in making daily instructional decisions and for setting easily monitored goals and objectives.

Additionallly, CBA allows usage of local curriculum materials for measuring student achievement and progress. Face validity, therefore, is obviously high.

Purposes and Uses of CBA are:

a. To determine proficiency of students in basic curriculum area.
b. To determine discrepancy between student and norm group.
c. To monitor pupil progress relative to peers.
d. To monitor pupil's rate of learning.

e. To establish performance rate norms for pupils in basic curriculum areas.
f. To set goals and objectives for students who are performing below expectations.

It is important for assessors to have an understanding of the rationale for CBA and knowledge regarding the practical aspects of setting up a CBA system. Assessors should have training in procedures for selecting curriculum materials so the CBA system is statistically valid. It is also important for personnel using CBA to be trained in its implementation and in the usage and interpretation of data collected. They should also be aware of the differences between standardized test results and CBA so results may be properly interpreted to parents and others.

Areas of assessment include: Reading—major skills and subskills; written language—writing proficiency; arithmetic—basic skills; spelling; social skills; and skills in other curricular areas may be measured if desired.)

Basic scores are reported as performance frequencies, i.e., responses per minute. For example, in assessing reading one would count the number of words the student reads in one minute. The pupil's score can then be compared to scores normed for the material read.

Other useful data which may be calculated from CBA are student individual rates of learning. This information allows one to determine whether or not the student is learning at an acceptable rate in the curricula are of interest. Performance scores described in the preceding paragraph are used in making this calculation.

Training in methods of administration, curriculum selection, preparation of massessment materials, calculation and interpretation of scores, and appreciation of the historical and practical usage of CBA is important.

Samples of local (district) reading curriculum for grade levels K-8, written language starter statements; basic arithmetic skill sheets for grade levels K-8, local grade level spelling lists, behavioral description of social skills to be assessed are all resources for curriculum based assessments.

- Is there documentation that interventions have been attempted, monitored, evaluated, and modified as needed?

- Is there reason to initiate a referral for educational, community or other assessment services?

To summarize, School Consultation Team questions are tied directly to the presenting concern. The teacher(s) and other SCT members collect background data. Intervention strategies are generated from the data collected. The effectiveness of the interventions must be monitored. Modifications may need to be implemented and reevaluated. There needs to be a final written report that describes the consultation findings, evaluations of the interventions implemented and the conclusions of the SCT. These conclusions will either describe a satisfactory resolution of the concern within general education, will indicate the need for further general education modifications, or will support the basis for suspecting a handicapping condition.

Examples of Interventions

Once the necessary data has been gathered for formulating a plan, the School Consultation Team will make recommendations for interventions for the school setting and may want to make recommendations to parents. The following interventions are intended to help develop necessary skills which enable pupils to benefit from classroom instruction; enable pupils to apply approaches to learning situations; and enable pupils to develop independent performance. *Again, it is important that interventions are selected with specific regard for the pupil's cultural and linguistic background and experience.*

Environmental Interventions

(Alteration of time, space, materials and people in order to increase a pupil's appropriate functioning in a general education setting).

Alterations of Time:

- Use a timer.
- Provide a routine schedule.
- Reduce the amount of task.
- Allow pupil more time to complete task.
- Use a card contract.
- Encourage after school makeup.

Alterations of Space:

- Use the library.
- Use the Student Learning Center.
- Change grouping, class of seating pattern.
- Use time-out.
- Use systematic exclusion.

Alterations of Materials:

- Use visual aids.
- Use verbal instructions.
- Use library resources.
- Give pupil more choices.
- Use more concrete materials.
- Use high interest activities.
- Use written materials or make a list.
- Break the task down into small steps.
- Use a different learning approach (visual, auditory, multisensory, tactile/kinesthetic, cooperative).
- Reduce degree of difficulty of task.

Alterations of People:

- Redirect activities:
  - Before school - After school
  - Before lunch - Recess

- Model the desired behavior.
- Reward pupil for desired behavior.
- Have pupil tutor another child.
- Use a peer tutor.
- Use a parent tutor.
- Use individualized instruction.
- Use cooperative learning techniques.
- Use small group instruction.
- Use a study carrel.
- Give quick results of task.
- Teach to pupils' strength areas.
- List and use pupils' interests.
- Reward the task:
  - For starting - For continuing
  - For completing
- Provide individual counseling.
- Make rules clear.
- Ignore misbehavior.
- Use logical consequences.
- Give more acknowledgments.
- Send positive notes home.
- Conference with parent.

Reinforcers

Note: The activities that follow may serve as reinforcers for pupils by providing a tangible reward, permitting an enjoyable activity, encouraging socialization, and/or enhancing a pupil's status. (Consideration should be given to age-appropriateness of reinforcers.) In order for reinforcers to work they must be selected in consultation with the pupil and be clearly tied to specific agreed upon behaviors.

Tangible Reinforcers

- Writing with a pen or colored pencils.
- Using colored chalk.
- Recording his/her behavior on a graph/chart.
- Recording homework on a chart.
- Recording time taken to do a task.
- Receiving a sticker, star or small prize.
- Receiving an edible reward.
- Earning "free time."
- Earning buying privileges (e.g., pencils, pizza, candy, coke).
- Earning grooming time.
- Using private study booth.
- Removing lowest test grade.
- Skipping assignment of pupil's choice.
- Reducing detention time.
- Choosing a game to play.

Activity Reinforcers

Young children especially enjoy being helpers, e.g.,

- Cleaning the erasers.
- Erasing the chalkboard.
- Watering the plants.
- Feeding the fish or animals.
- Running the ditto or copy machine.
- Stapling papers together.
- Emptying the wastebasket.
- Using an overhead projector.
- Operating a slide, filmstrip or movie projector.
- Using a computer.
- Using a tape recorder with earphones for x amount of time.
- Listening to the radio as an individual, group, or class.
- Watching videos or a special movie.
- Doing math puzzles or puzzle contests.
- Doing searches and crossword puzzles.
- Reading the newspaper.
- Reading or looking at special interest magazines.
- Working with clay.
- Making a puppet.
- Making and/or flying a kite.
- Reading or making a road map.
- Reading or writing poetry.
- Making a book.
- Writing and/or directing a play.
- Making a pinata.
- Going to the library.
- Doing a science project.
- Reading a wall map test.
- Looking at a globe.
- Writing to the author of a favorite book.
- Playing checkers, cards or other table games.
- Sewing
- Having a spelling bee.
- Having an arithmetic contest at the chalkboard.

Social Reinforcers

- Earning free time at the end of the class.
- Visiting another class for special activity.
- Arm wrestling.
- Having class contests and games.
- Planning and putting on multicultural festivals.
- Encouraging cooperative learning projects.
- Planning a class party, encouraging multicultural foods and themes.
- Earning time to visit with a friend.
- Playing table games.

- Popping corn (and eating it!).
- Being "out-of-class" helpers (e.g., office monitor, flag monitor, playground assistant).
- Helping the custodian.
- Helping in the cafeteria.
- Helping the librarian.
- Going to principal, custodian, secretary, nurse, etc., for special attention.
- Sitting by a friend.
- Giving "thumbs-up" sign.
- Giving "Okay" sign with fingers.
- Saying "All right!" or putting out hands for "Give me five."

Status Reinforcers

- Leading the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Leading the line to recess or the lunch room.
- Giving a message over the intercom.
- Taking the class roll.
- Carrying messages to other teachers.
- Holding the door open during a fire drill.
- Serving as secretary for class meetings.
- Raising or lowering the flag.
- Carrying the wastebasket while other children clean out their desks.
- Distributing and collecting materials.
- Correcting papers.
- Tutoring another child.
- Being captain of a team.
- Doing "special," "the hardest" or "impossible" teacher-made arithmetic problems.
- Being allowed to move desks.
- Carrying the bat or ball to recess.
- Telling the teacher when it is time to go to lunch.
- Sharpening the teacher's pencils.
- Sitting next to the teacher at lunch.
- Giving a spelling test.
- Answering the phone in the office.
- Taking pupils out to lunch off campus.
- Giving pupil five minutes of teacher's undivided attention.
- Working as a tutor in a different room.
- Helping to supervise younger pupils.
- Having pupil select topic for class discussion.
- Name published in school paper as excellent citizen.
- Encouraging "show off" time at the beginning or ending of class once or twice a week (encourage kids to break dance, rap, do cheerleading, share any talent).
- Encouraging creativity and/or skills related to culture can bring high status to activities not normally acknowledged at school but worthy of acclaim, including all forms of dancing, multi-linguistic skills, artistic or musical talent, and anything else children can do well.

Attention-Focusing Ideas

Note: For children who are easily distracted, overly excited at changes in routine, have difficulty in transition from one activity to another, do not complete work, are easily upset by minor distress.

- Minimize distractions.
- Present assignments in small amounts.
- Begin with small workload and increase its length as ability increases.
- Determine what is necessary for pupil to demonstrate mastery of a skill and avoid assigning drill beyond that level.
- Limit choice of tasks to two or three which pupil can do well.
- Increase noise tolerance by initially isolating pupil and increasing degree of interaction.
- Experiment with novel teaching devices (e.g., computers are often effective).
- Structure the program so that the pupil knows what is expected at all times.
- Be aware of the pupil's limits and try to structure routines within those limits.
- Provide written directions.
- Be firm and consistent about pupil doing assigned task in assigned area.
- Insist that pupil clear desk of all items not essential to task.

Teaching Organizational Skills

Note: Approaching a problem, a written assignment, or a motor task in an organized fashion.

- Assign a peer to assist the pupil.
- Provide a lot of structure and develop daily routines.
- List, or have the pupil list, the day's activities and then have the pupil check off the activities completed as tasks are finished.
- Block off sections of work to be done and mark as completed so that the pupil always knows how much progress he/she is making.
- Provide the pupil with directing questions before an assignment is done so that she/he knows what is important.
- Encourage the use of folders and binders to organize work.
- Have an organized pupil use a carbon when taking notes so that the disorganized pupil has a copy.
- Outline on the board as you lecture if possible.
- Mark or fold worksheets into sections that group similar problems.
- Write homework assignments on board and have pupils copy into notebooks.
- Provide a time when pupil can come to you for additional help with assignment.

General Behavioral Management Interventions

- Establish a warm, firm, positive relationship.
- Provide consistency.
- Adjust classroom set-up.

- Use proximity control.
- State rules clearly.
- Use clear and specific communication.
- Use logical consequences (allow pupil to experience consequences of his/her actions).
- Use positive reinforcement.
- Increase positive comments and attention to pupil.
- Reward low probability task with a high probability task.
- Use contracts.
- Make telephone call to parent.
- Change the reward.
- Change schedule.
- Use time-out.
- Actively teach conflict resolution skills.
- Actively teach a sequence of problem-solving skills.

Specific Behavioral Interventions

Avoiding or Escaping School or Classroom

- Reward with a reinforcer for each day's attendance at school. Have a party on Friday for all pupils who had perfect attendance during the week.
- Increase positive attention to the pupil when they are in the classroom. Minimize interaction with the pupil when he/she is inappropriately outside the classroom.
- Reward the pupil for not leaving the room without permission with 5 to 10 minutes of your time working on a favorite activity.

Bullying

- Combine a reprimand with a dignified command. ("Mike, stop bugging Vincent, and bring me the science kit from the table.")
- Determine where the pupil's peer preferences and dislikes are. Use this information for grouping.
- Help the pupil interpret his or her own behavior. Keep a record of the specific incidents and discuss each one matter-of-factly with the pupil after a cooling-off period.
- Reinforce the pupil's good behavior
- Use models demonstrated on film or videotape to reinforce acceptable play ground behavior and roleplaying.

Challenging Authority

- Arrange a time-out area in the room. If the pupil does not obey a direct command within 15 seconds, place the pupil in the time-out area for 5 minutes. After 5 minutes, allow the pupil to leave the time-out area only if he/she is willing to follow your directions. Praise the pupil when commands are obeyed.
- Ignore the pupil when he/she disobeys a direction given to the class. Do not allow the pupil to comply with your next command to the class until he/she

follows the first directive. Compliment the pupil for obedient behavior when your directions are followed.

- When the pupil begins a dispute concerning an assignmen or directions, stop all interaction with him/her by turning and walking away. If the pupil begins an assignment or follows a directive without arguing, praise him/her.

Cheating

Note: In many cultures, a cooperative/collaborative learning style is normal and expected. Too often children bringing this style to the classroom have been wrongfully accused of cheating.

- Ask the pupils to contribute the questions for the exam.
- Control the testing environment by moving the furniture and separating pupils.
- Give credit where applicable for the process as well as for the answer.
- Give open-book or group participation exams.
- Use alternative versions of a test whenever possible.
- Examine cultural values of cooperation versus competition.
  Provide opportunities for all children to experience cooperative learning techniques.

Homework Difficulties

- Establish cooperative learning groups.
- Give each pupil a well-identified manila envelope in which to keep loose papers.
- Parent should give pupil a choice regarding when to do homework.
  Once time is set, it should be the same time everyday.
- Teachers should have pupils maintain an assignment book that parents may also refer to if necessary.
- Homework assignments should begin during the end of the general education class period. This allows for clarification of questions before school is out.

Lying

- Appeal to the pupil's high opinion of him- or herself. ("Joan, it makes me feel very bad when you don't tell the truth because I've always liked being able to count on what you say.")
- Arrange for the pupil to be paired with a more truthful child when working on class projects.
- Assure the child that you can be depended upon to tell the truth.
- Deal directly with the habitual liar instead of trying to trap him or her. ("Jim, you have Carrie's purse. Please return it to her.")
- Evaluate your expectations of the pupil and try to discern the areas in which she or he feels compelled to lie.
- Ignore fantasy-oriented tales that probably have no serious consequences.

Taking Others' Property

- Look at the situation--it may be symptomatic.
- Confront the pupil–consequences for stealing behavior must be laid out.
  Involve the parents after the first episode.

- Elicit suggestions from the offender and then establish a fair payment for the offense, giving preference to work and time over money.

Teasing or Interrupting Other Pupils When Working

- Do not reprimand the teasing pupil. Arrange with the pupil who is being teased that he/she will earn the privilege of helping you for 2 minutes after school each time he/she is teased but makes no response. Provide him/her with support.
- For each specific time interval during which the pupil does not bother anyone else in the class, allow him/her to spend 1 minute visiting socially with another pupil (at a specified time).
- Make a small isolation booth in a corner of the room by using a coat rack, bookcase, or other movable furniture. Each time the pupils interferes with the work of a classmate, send him/her to the time-out booth for 10 minutes.

Resisting Academic Tasks

- Require only a small amount of academic work, after which the pupil is immediately rewarded with a meaningful reinforcer.
- Ignore comments such as, "I don't want to" or "I ain't gonna do this stuff." If the pupil destroys his/her work, be prepared to give him/her another identical task. Do not allow the pupil to participate in an other activity until he/she has begun the task. As soon as the pupil has begun the task, comment positively on the fact that he/she is doing it.
- Compute the pupil's work rate each day. Provide one point for reaching a minimum rate and additional points for working at progressively higher rates.

Uncooperative or Disruptive in the Classroom

- Make an explicit rule concerning walking out and moving about the classroom.
- Allow any pupil who has remained in their seat during the work period to play a game involving movement.
- Set a timer for varying brief intervals. If the pupil has remained in his/her seat during the interval, reinforce the pupil with a reward of praise.
- Move the pupil's desk away from other pupils to whom he/she tends to talk, and near children with whom he/she is unlikely to converse.
- Give the pupil a slip of paper on which he/she is to record his/her own talk-outs during a study period. Have the pupil return the slip to you at the end of class.
- When the pupil begins a temper tantrum, immediately place him/her in the isolation or time-out area of the classroom.

General Academic Interventions

- In all subject areas follow proven teaching techniques which include, but are not limited to Cooperative Learning and Active Teaching
  - Model for the student what is expected of him/her.
  - Provide guided practice for the group.
  - Then guide practice for individuals or groups of two.
  - Only then move to independent practice.

- Use Primary Language to develop conceptual base while learning English.
- Allow the pupil to do fewer questions.
- On group projects, pair a pupil with learning disabilities with a pupil who excels.
- Reduce the amount of material to be tested at one time.
- When providing blanks in completion tests use a space that cues the word by allotting a line per letter (__ __ __ __ __) and, if appropriate, give the first letter of the answer.
- If the pupil was on task during testing, score the test according to the number correct out of the number attempted to credit the slower pupil for accuracy and effort.
- Seat child near you and make eye contact when helping.

Note: Eye contact has negative significance in some cultures. The important message to convey to the pupil is warm attention and encouragement. Eye contact accompanied by smiles and positive voice tones is rarely misinterpreted by a pupil.

Interventions for Specific Academic Subject Areas

Reading

- Have pupil go to a new skill only after the current skill is completely mastered.
- Utilize primary language reading materials whenever possible.
- Use big books, story charts and music in primary language.
- Color key vowel sounds to a matching chart that is accessible to the pupil.
- Allow the pupil to use aids to keep his/her place when reading.
- Read a selection to children daily.
- Underline important words or phrases when possible.
- Use predictable reading material, e.g., books, poems.
- If a pupil is able to read with extra time, try to allow for this so that the pupil succeeds.
- If a pupil is having difficulty learning to read by one method (e.g., phonics), switch to another method (e.g., linguistics or language experience) for a substantial period of time.
- Use high interest, relevant reading materials.
- Emphasize reading as a tool for life rather than a subject to be learned.
- Break a reading assignment into parts and limit the pupil assignment to a given number of such sections.
- Read story to student prior to having him read it, or have tape of story available.
- Encourage pleasure reading, perhaps by making it a part of the regular program.
- Avoid using reading as a punishment.
- Integrate reading and writing in a holistic framework.
- Provide the pupil with study questions or ask the pupil questions before he/she begins a reading assignment to aid in organizing and directing reading.
- For tests: use shorter tests; permit oral responses; give oral tests; use true-false, matching, or multiple choice (to avoid essay questions).

- Allow the extra time needed to complete assignments, but consistently enforce the revised timelines.
- Introduce new vocabulary words *before* having the pupil read.
- Avoid having each pupil read aloud. It can be embarrassing and can also hinder comprehension.

Spelling

- Reduce number of words to be learned.
- Use peer tutors for practice.
- Have the pupil use word lists from other subject areas.
- Test or have a peer test: orally, if there is visual-motor difficulty; more frequently than other pupils; more slowly than other pupils.
- Allow pupil to use age level dictionary.
- Incorporate spelling into the entire writing process.
- Allow "creative spelling" for words not formally taught in spelling.
- Allow misspellings of words in other class work, i.e., correct but do not count "against" pupil when grading.

Mathematics

- Use concrete and/or manipulative materials.
- Allow pupil to count fingers.
- Supply graph paper to assist pupil in organizing work.
- Mark process signs in color on worksheets to reduce carelessness and focus the pupil's attention.
- Use frequent drills assisted by peer tutoring.
- Reduce number of problems assigned.
- Allow pupil to use a calculator.
- Space problems farther apart on a page to reduce distractions.
- Group problems according to process or divide worksheets into sections.
- Do an example on the worksheet so that a pupil does not complete an entire study assignment incorrectly.
- Reduce the amount of material to be tested at one time.
- Tape cue cards with step-by-step instructions (e.g., for regrouping) to top of pupil's desk.
- Allow use of calculation matrices.
- Use computer "games."
- Eliminate timed tests and competitive speed teams.

Handwriting

- Require less copying.
- Allow oral responses to tests using a tape recorder or, for the older pupil, typed responses.
- Teach pupil to use a word processor or typewriter.
- Use a variety of writing implements or aids—thick pencils, felt tip pens, pencil grips.
- If copying from the board is a problem, allow the pupil to first copy from a second sheet of paper at his/her desk. Gradually move the paper further from his/her copy.

- Allow writing to be on larger paper with clearly marked lines for guides. Strips of tagboard may also be used as a guide.
- If the difficulty is starting on the correct side of the page, place a green dot or line along the left side of the paper so pupil knows where to begin.
- If spacing between words is a problem, have the pupil "finger-space" (i.e., place a finger between each word as a guide, when writing).
- If the pupil shows progress in cursive writing, allow him to use it.
- Provide individual tracing and copying activities (e.g., templates, dittos, boardwork, etc.).

Study Skills

- Provide instruction on note taking from content textbooks.
- Teach skimming and scanning.
- Provide a 3-ring notebook and instruction in its organization. Monitor and grade notebook on a regular basis for all classes.
- Set up contract grades where specific tasks, when completed, equal a set grade from D to A. This also promotes an internal locus of control.
- Create an assignment calendar with date of assignment and date due.

Parent Interventions

Talk with Your Child

- By initiating conversations with your child and drawing him/her into family discussions, you will help your child's language development. Don't hesitate to use words you feel your child may not know. You will increase his/her vocabulary by using new words frequently.

Read Together

- Reading is a skill and, like all skills, requires practice. Encourage your child to read to you and read to your child from a variety of materials—newspapers, magazines and children's books. Get your child a library card and check out new books regularly. Most important of all, let your child see you reading. If you enjoy reading, chances are your child will too.

Let Children Help in the Kitchen

- Reading recipes, making measurements and listening carefully to directions are all important skills your children can practice while enjoying a pleasurable afternoon cooking with you.

Go Shopping Together

- Going to the grocery store and discussing prices, bargains and buying decisions with your child will help him/her practice math while learning the value of money. For example, ask your child to compare prices by weight, to count your change on the way home, and so on. Teach good nutrition, too, by explaining how you select foods to make a balanced meal for your family.

Watch Television Selectively

- Watch programs together and discuss them. Ask your child, "If you had been that character, what would you have done?" After a news program, pull out an atlas or look at a globe or map and show your child where news events are taking place.

Encourage Children to Write

- Let them write shopping lists, stories and movie reviews. Catch up on your correspondence by dictating letters to them while you do the ironing or other chores.

Discuss Papers and Projects Your Child Brings Home

- Let your child know you are proud of his/her efforts and accomplishments. When the going gets tough, offer help and encouragement. This will give your child the confidence needed to persevere.

Establish a Daily Home Study Period

- Institute a 15 to 60 minute (depending on age of child) daily home study period to be completed in the same place every day. This study period should be free of the influence of television, radio, and other distractions, guided by standards and expectations developed with you and checked by you.

- Unfinished school work or a school-assigned task need not be the only activity of the study period. This is a good time for library book reading, writing letters or keeping a diary.

- All units of work undertaken at school include possibilities for projects that will take your child beyond the usual classroom offerings and these could become good study period tasks.

Establish Reasonable Expectations for Your Child

- It is important that you establish expectations in social, behavioral and academic areas for your child. This will promote the development of good peer relationships, appropriate behavior and will establish guidelines for school work. In the area of academics, expectations should reflect your child's ability level, span of attention, and content that is appropriate to age and ability. Work with your child's teacher to help you set reasonable expectations.

Interface in the General Education/Special Education Continuum

- Pupil Characteristics

Pupil Characteristics

Most referrals for Special Education assessment are due to inability to achieve in core curricula areas. Manifestations of need are generally failure in academic work or behavior related to that failure. The information gathered, assessments and intervention strategies of the School Consultation Team ensure that, to the extent that these problems manifest as a result of cultural or linguistic differences or inappropriate or inadequate programs or services in general education, they will be addressed there. The final report of the SCT ensures that further assessment, if recommended, will be based on documented conclusions supporting suspicion of a handicapping condition. Thus in both general education and special education there is the need for both standardized and alternative assessment.

It is important to recognize that alternative assessment is more than replacing an IQ test with another test. It is an assessment process that requires a thorough gathering of information and a creative development of pertinent interventions in both general education and special education. This assessment/intervention process needs to be guided by qualified professional school psychologists and administrators, who have specialized training and expertise. As we expand our thinking about the nature of assessment, we continue to take into account more than test scores and consider a variety of cultural, linguistic and economic factors, including understanding and sensitivity to family constellation and life situations, family stress levels, cultural values and beliefs that affect learning styles, problem-solving skills, gender roles and expectations, experience with school, health and developmental factors, self-concept, linguistic experiences in home and school language(s), geographic and relocation patterns.

A process of asking open-ended questions that illuminate relationships between pupils' skills and needs and the demands of the school curriculum and culture provide opportunities for using a variety of alternative approaches in both general education and special education for seeking solutions to presenting problem situations. Some of these approaches are introduced in the section on Alternative Assessments. Others are being developed in the field. All require expertise which depends upon adequately funded training made easily accessible to practicing school psychologists and other personnel.

Knowledge of general group characteristics may be useful in determining whether academic or social difficulties are due to learning rate, motivation, cultural/linguistic differences, or possibly a handicapping condition.

This information may be particularly useful to the School Consultation Team in making recommendations for instructional or program modifications and in better understanding students. (See chart on page 21).

The description of the pupil with learning disabilities is included on the chart (on page 41)to illustrate a genuine special education problem contrasted with problems of general education pupils. Many pupils with learning disabilities can be served effectively

in general education classrooms through the consultation model in order that they may participate fully in the core curriculum. And many of the alternative assessment strategies presented in the section on special education will be useful to the School Consultation Team psychologist for pupils in general education.

The chart on the following page illustrates the importance of assessment procedures that acknowledge the reciprocal nature of the general education/special education continuum. It may be helpful in understanding the overlap of needs between general education and special education students.

Some General Characteristics of Learning Disabled, Slow Learners, Unmotivated, Culturally and Linguistically Different Pupils

	Slow Learner*	Unmotivated	Culturally Different	Linguistically Different	Special Education: Learning Disabled
Cognitive Ability	Achievement is commensurate with potential. Pupil is deficient in academic areas, but about equal across all areas.	Achievement is usually far below potential, but fairly even across most areas. A particular interest may be evident.	Achievement should be commensurate with cognitive ability, motivation, quality and quantity of instruction.	Achievement is primary language is commensurate with measured cognitive ability and length of school experience. Pupils generally score better on non-verbal sections of cognitive tests.	Achievement is often far below potential in some areas. Usually has a very uneven learning profile.
Progress	Even with additional assistance, progress is slow. Probably will make less then one year's progress per year regardless of placement in regular or special class.	When attends, often learns new material with ease. May be the first person finished with a task. May be receiving low grades, but standardized achievement tests indicate good progress (under-achiever).	As with all other pupils, progress is dependent upon quality and quantity of instruction.	Progress in primary language is contingent upon adequacy of language of instruction. Academic progress in English will be dependent upon the quality and quantity of English instruction. During the language transition period, English performance may lag.	May show remarkable progress in some areas when tasks are analyzed, taught sequentially, and include higher extent of teacher-pupil interaction. Skills may jump 1-2 years in one year.
Productivity	In a lesson or task involving many concepts, may focus on only one. May need assistance with words or directions. May require graphic explanation. May have just begun a task when time is called. May be unable to switch from task to task.	May understand directions, be able to read some of the words, yet rarely completes task. Often appears disinterested.	Verbal and written directions are generally understood. Productivity, as with all other students, would depend on motivation and other factors.	Verbal and written directions may not be understood due to insufficient English development. This may lead to pupils not beginning tasks, or switching tasks without assistance.	Verbal directions may be too complex. May be unable to read written directions. May want to do task, be embarrassed about lack of skill, not be able to concentrate. May not begintask without assistance. Often unable to switch from task to task.
Health	May have mild delay in developmental milestones.	May have dysfunctional family, frequent family moves, nutritional and financial problems.	No significant health characteristics for this group, but consider developmental factors in cultural context.	No significant health characteristics for this group, but consider developmental factors in cultural context.	May have a history of risk infancy, ear infections/hearing problems, sleep/eating disturbances, incontinence and family incidence of learning disability.
Peer Interaction	Will often be a follower in a peer group.	May be rejected due to anti-social tendencies, or accepted as a leader. This leadership may be negative.	Pupil may tend to interact with more students from own cultural group.	Pupils may experience social isolation of social and linguistic rules. Because of lack of English competency, they may be likely to be followers rather than leaders in English group. Pupil may tend to interact with more pupils from own cultural group.	May have frequent fights or arguments. Others may complain of clumbsiness. May be a class isolate. May play with younger pupils. Occasionally pupils will be socially adequate.
Language	Similar to that of Learning Disabled child but may be at a lesser degree. Takes longer to learn a concept but will usually retain it once learned.	Usually language-adequate,but fails to apply skills consistantly in the classroom.	Receptive and expressive language is similar to all other pupils, however, may exhibit some sub-group dialectional differences.	Primary language is appropriate for age level while English skills are still in the acquisition stage. The non-verbal communication skills are appropriate for age level, i.e., eye contact, response to speaker, clarification of response, turn taking, etc. Pupil does not know specific vocabulary although he is familiar with item or concept. Sentence structure and grammar is in highly transitional stage that follows similar patterns of normal language development. Student may pass through predictable periods, i.e., silent period, speech emergence, etc.	Auditory processing usually at low skill level. Vocabulary and word-finding skills usually delayed. Sentence are simplified and lack complexity. Commonly cannot transfer skills learned in the classroom into everyday usage.

*Not to be confused with mild retardation

NOTE: These categories are not mutually exclusive Culturally Different = Native English speakers who identify with nonmainstream culture. Linguistically Different = Non-native English speakers who lack native-like skills in English

Special Education's Assessment Role in the General Education/ Special Education Continuum:

- Assessment Process
- Procedural Model of Assessment
- Alternative Assessment: Where IQ Testing is Invalid or Prohibited
- Report of Documentation

Assessment Process

Note: Assessment instruments or tests listed in any section of this document are intended solely as examples and not specific suggestions. The listings do not carry a recommendation from either the Task Force or the State Department of Education. Any assessment procedure must be evaluated on its own merits for the purpose it is intended and the information it is expected to provided. Assessment reports should include an explanation of the effects of measurement bias on the results obtained.

If the results of the SCT intervention process indicate that a referral for special education assessment is appropriate, the multidisciplinary assessment team will begin with the carefully documented information gathered, interventions attempted, and reasons for the referral to special education presented in the SCT's final report. This will ensure continuity and congruence throughout the entire consultation and assessment process. Composition of the multidisciplinary assessment team will be determined by the nature of the referral questions, with some continuity of members across the continuum, including the parent, school psychologist, special education teacher, classroom teacher, and other appropriate professional specialists (e.g., nurses, speech and language specialists, resource specialists).

The multidisciplinary assessment team will also follow a question-based process to determine if the child has a handicapping condition. Some of the questions will depend on the assessment plan developed by the team and in particular on the strategies chosen to assess cognition. Examples of the kinds of questions that may assist follow:

- What is the most reliable and valid assessment approach for this pupil: behavioral observations, record review, interview, informal or standardized techniques, or a combination of two or more?
- Is the chosen approach(es) consistent with the pupil's receptive and expressive abilities?
- What is the rationale for the approach of choice, and is the rationale defensible?
- What are the controllable variables that must be arranged to ensure optimum outcomes for the pupil?
- Has adequate preparation occurred to ensure the proper utilization of the selected technique(s) and the information provided?
- Can full recognition be made for the impact of cultural and linguistic differences of each technique on the information obtained?
- Can professional or clinical judgement be supported and corroborated?
- What information can most appropriately be provided by another professional discipline?

- What contradictions must be reconciled in already available data?
- Can the assessment proceed in order to provide the maximum information for all who need to know with the least stressful effects for the pupil?

Assessment Plan

Based upon documentation that modification/interventions in general education have not served to enable a pupil's learning (or based upon a parent's direct request), a referral for consideration of special education services is made. This documentation should preferably be in the form of the final School Consultation Team report.

Withing 15 days of receipt of referral, an assessment plan shall be developed and presented to the parent. Such a plan shall provide for assessment in all areas of suspected disability(ies), shall be designed to respond to specific individual educational need, and shall provide for cultural/linguistic differences of the pupil. Assessment shall be conducted by a qualified multidisciplinary team upon receipt of parent written informed consent.

Where IQ testing is not allowed or appropriate, the plan shall describe how the school psychologist plans to assess cognition utilizing a multifaceted approach. No assessment shall proceed until the parent gives written informed consent. The California Education Code provides the parent 15 days in which to make an informed decision. The parent shall be provided a copy of parental due process rights with the assessment plan.

Team Concept

Assessment is provided in all areas of suspected disability by a multidisciplinary team competent to perform the assessment in specific areas. For culturally and linguistically different pupils, the team must reflect expertise in examining the unique interplay of cultural and linguistic factors with acheivement in the core curriculum. The team should be comprised of some members of the School Consultation Team to provide continuity.

One major responsibility of the school psychologist is the assessment of cognition. These guidelines are intended to identify an approach to assessment using instruments and procedures that are alternatives to standardized intelligence tests. Other vital team members include but are not limited to school nurses and language/speech specialists, who may also have been members of the School Consultation Team.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of educational assessment is to identify the unique learning needs of individual pupils and to provide a basis for implementing successful instructional intervention. Assessment does not only deal with eligibility for special education but with an analysis of strengths and weaknesses. The function of assessment is to provide information for educational programming and planning through a team decisionmaking process.

The educational team recognizes the importance of pupil and parent participation in all aspects of the assessment process. The assessment team is comprised of those individuals who provide evaluative data necessary to the formulation of an Individualized Education Program. All assessment procedures shall adhere to legal due process safeguards including assurance of nondiscriminatory assessment.

A comprehensive assessment plan includes consideration of appropriate nondiscriminatory and least restrictive measures for each of the dimensions to be assessed. The accomplishment of appropriate assessment necessitates administration by skilled and knowledgeable examiners and utilization of instruments and procedures which evaluate significant factors related to the learning process. The results of such assessment are described in a written document and shall lead to decisions which identify the least restrictive and most appropriate educational setting.

Assessment should progress to the point where sufficient information has been generated to answer referral questions, and educational decisions can be made based upon individualized assessment.

Principles

1. Assessment is the gathering of data from a wide variety of appropriate sources. Testing is not equivlent to assessment, which is far broader in scope.

2. All pupils are assessable regardless of physical, mental or emotional handicapping conditions. Testing is not equivalent to assessment, which is far broader in scope.

3. For each pupil there are appropriate assessment techniques and methods available to the assessment team.

4. Pupils have had differing opportunities to learn the materials, skills and behaviors utilized in assessment procedures.

5. Pupils have been differentially reinforced for learning and thus are not similarly motivated to learn.

6. Pupils have had differing experiences in assessment processes.

7. Pupils have differing levels of motivation, anxiety or affect which could interfere with the assessment process.

8. Developmentally disabled pupils have varying degrees of physical disability, sensory or motor handicaps which could interfere with learning.

9. Nondiscriminatory procedures apply to all pupils regardless of handicapping condition(s), linguistic performance and cultural variables.

10. Pupils within all sociocultural groups have a wide range of innate abilities.

11. Assessments are conducted with the goal of developing positive instructional interventions for pupils.

12. Every pupil has the potential for measurable change.

13. Assessors must recognize influences their own values may play in the assessment process.

14. The assessment instrument is unchanging; the individual is the variable.

Ongoing Assessment

Once a program has been established for a special education pupil, it is important to monitor progress toward meeting the goals and objectives of the IEP. Classroom progress is monitored on a daily basis by instructional staff. Collecting periodic data regarding pupil performance across the various curriculum areas in a pupil's special education program provides feedback regarding the effectiveness of intervention proram. If satisfactory progress is not being made, adjustments need to be made in the intervention program. Pupil progress is monitored through a core IEP team review of goals, objectives and classroom performance annually, and on a formal basis triennially, and as requested to facilitate learning.

Procedural Model of Assessment

An outline of the necessary steps to follow in the special education process is shown below. Following the steps will help to ensure parental protections are provided when general education interventions have proved to be insufficient, and in the event a special education placement is made.

Stage	Event	Information Related to Event	Assessment Responsibility	Timeline
Stage 1	Referral to Sp. Ed Assessment	Complete referral form.	Person making referral (assistance if needed)	
Stage 2	Development of Assessment Plan	Complete assessment plan form (establish evaluation questions)	Evaluation Coordinator	15 days
Stage 3	Parental Consent for Assessment	Parent signature on Assessment Plan	Parents	
Stage 4	Multidisciplinary Assessment	Assessment procedures/instruments to establish eligibility and identify potential interventions	Assessment Team	50 days
Stage 5	Placement Decision	Document eligibility	IEP Team	
Stage 6	Parental Consent for Placement	IEP objectives established based on assessed needs. Parent signature on IEP	IEP Team Parent	
Stage 7	Periodic Assessment	Monitoring of IEP	IEP member	
		Annual review of IEP	IEP member	yearly
		Triennial Evaluation	Assessment Team	Every 3 years

Alternative Assessment Where I.Q. is Invalid or Prohibited

Focus

The December 1986 State Directive regarding testing of Black pupils referred for special education services should provide stimulus for refining assessment of all pupils. The intent of assessment of all pupils has always carried the understanding that a clinical component will be brought to evaluation, one difference between psychometry and psychology. In addition to psychometric data, emphasis must be given to health and development, school history, and parent/family input. A multidisciplinary approach would include specialists bringing into congruence their individual insights to pupil development/progress/instructional needs. *Psychologists, however, continue to be responsible for assessment of cognition.* Term "cognition" because the word intelligence is closely linked to I.Q. testing in the minds of the general public.

Necessary Components of Assessment

1. **Reason for referral**
   This includes a few brief sentences to orient the reader quickly to the nature of the assessment.

2. **Background Information**
   This section includes a historical framework upon which to base all current assessment results.

3. **Recap of Previous Assessment**
   This includes relevant assessment data to compare against current information. *Note: For Black pupils, do not refer to IQ tests either by scores or names. (Should already be removed from pupil file).*

4. **Current Assessment Results** (within last 12 months or more recent for young children or where results may not have been valid)
   This includes a comprehensive evaluation which includes reports of classroom performance to gather necessary information to assess whether the pupil qualifies for special education services under any of the federal/state eligibility criteria.

5. **Analysis**
   This includes discussion and integration of assessment data needed before decision-making can take place.

Note: The material on this and following pages has been adapted from the California Association of School Psychologists (CASP) developed case study for SED referrals/assessments. Acknowledgment is made to that organization and developers for a very workable model.

6. **Eligibility**
   This includes substantiation that the pupil does/does not meet requirements for one or more of the state/federal (11) categories of handicapping conditions.

7. **Recommendations**
   a. To IEP team regarding the needs of pupil.
   b. Instructional interventions for the classroom.

Assessment Component Sources

1. **Reason for Referral**
   To answer the questions of reason for referral:

   a. Review materials submitted by person or persons referring for assessment, i.e., teacher, parent, agency, including prior interventions and results.

   b. Record specific areas/behaviors of concern in behavioral terms designed to answer specific questions to be answered through the assessment process.

   c. Note educational performance as established by daily classroom performance, achievement test results, progress toward IEP goals/objectives, and/or report card grades/notes.

2. **Background Information**
   To secure comprehensive background information to the extent available and relevant, the appropriate members of the multidisciplinary team, e.g., health assessment from the school nurse are suggested to pursue sources in the following areas:

Health History

a. Review existing pupis files/health folder for data including:
   - Development
   - Physical history and significant events
   - Current health status

b. Complete consultations with:
   - School Nurse
   - Teacher
   - Parent/s
   - Others as appropriate

c. Obtain current health reports from:
   - School Nurse
   - Medical professionals
   - Outside agencies

Family History

a. Review existing pupil record for family data including:
- Family make-up
- Significant family learning factors
- Relevant socioeconomicstatus, cultural factors
- Language(s) spoken

b. Complete consultations with:
- Family
- Teacher
- Others as appropriate

c. Obtain reports from outside agencies

School History

a. Review existing pupil records including:
- Psychoeducational reports
- Other assessment reports
- IEPs
- Attendance records
- Cumulative records
- Prior interventions
- Language dominance/proficiency

b. Complete consultations with:
- Parents
- Teacher
- Pupil
- Others as appropriate

c. Obtain reports from:
- Prior schools
- Outside agencies

Other

a. Initiate contact as appropriate with agencies such as:
- Regional Center
- California Children's Service (CCS)
- Mental Health
- Department of Children's Services (DCS)
- Probation
- Rehabilitation

b. Complete consultations with:
- Appropriate agency personnel

c. Consideration of outside assessment reports where available

3. **Previous Assessment**
A recap of previous assessment can proceed with a review of past school and outside agency records for individual and group test results. In particular, gather information regarding:

a. Adaptive Behavior
b. Achievement
c. Language/Communication
d. Perceptual Motor
e. Social/Emotional
f. Cognition (No reference to intelligence tests or results were prohibited)

4. **Current Assessment Results**
In the conduct of a current assessment, the following necessary components with sources and means include:

a. Classroom Performance
- Consult with classroom teacher(s)
- Review teacher assessment reports
- Observe performance during formal and informal activities (Required for LD pupils—observer must be other than the classroom teacher)

b. Adaptive Behavior
- Administer Standardized Instruments—examples including but not limited to:
  Adaptive Behavior Inventory for Children (ABIC)
  AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scales School Edition (ABS)
  Scales of Independent Behavior (SIB)—Woodcock Johnson Battery, Part IV
  Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales

- Administer Criterion-Referenced Instruments such as:
  Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development—Practical Abilities

- Complete Informal Interviews and behavioral checklists; with pupil, parent, teachers and school staff to ascertain daily living skills and functioning in the community.

- Complete Clinical Observation of pupil in home/school.

c. Achievement
- Administer Standardized Instruments—examples including but not limited to:
  Gray Oral Reading Test-R (GORT-R)
  Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement (K-TEA)
  Key Math-R
  Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
  Test of Written Language (TOWL)
  Wide Range Achievement Test-R

Behavior Characteristics
Progression Charts
Brigance Inventory of Basic Skills

- Complete Informal Assessments; writing samples, pupil work samples.

- Complete Clinical Observation of pupil performance in classroom and testing environment.

d. Language/Communication
- Administer Standardized Instruments, examples including but not limited to:
  Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities (ITPA)
  Adaptive Behavior Scales-Communication

- Administer Criterion-Referenced Instruments such as:
  Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development—Communication

- Complete Clinical Observation:
  Pupil interview and performance in testing, e.g., attention/listening, comprehension, following directions.

- Consult with Language and Speech specialist and refer for further assessment when language is suspected as a handicapping condition.

e. Perceptual Motor
- Administer Standardized Instruments—examples including but not limited to:
  Adaptive Behavior Scales—Gross and Fine Motor
  Bender Gestalt
  Motor Free Visual Perception Test (MVPT)
  Visual Aural Digit Span Test (VADS)
  Visual Motor Integration Test (VMI)

- Administer Criterion-Referenced Instruments such as:
  Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development—Gross Motor and Fine Motor

- Complete Clinical Observation:
  Playground observations
  Pupil performance in sports programs
  Collect informal writing and drawing samples

- Consult with and refer to APE Specialists, OT/PT for further assessment, as appropriate.

f. Social Emotional
- Administer Standardized Instruments, examples including but not limited to:
  Adaptive Behavior Scales—under that domain
  Behavior Evaluation Scale (BES)

Devereux Scales
Piers Harris Children's Self-Concept Scale

- Administer Criterion-Referenced Instruments such as:
  Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development—
  Social/Affective

- Complete Informal Assessment
  Interview and gather self-report of pupil
  Review anecdotal records
  Behavior checklists

g. Cognition
- Component Analysis: all of the foregoing components are essential in assessing an individual's cognitive functioning and must be considered for congruence when the psychologist determines level of cognitive ability.

- Conceptual Strategies* Brief descriptions of the following strategies are presented as some of the alternative approaches which may be utilized in assessing abilities. Expanded descriptions can be found in another section entitled "Conceptual Strategies." Included are:
  Developmental
  Dynamic
  Ecological
  Information Processing
  Neuropsychological
  Psychological Processing
  Skills within Subjects

Strategies utilized here to assist in determining special education service eligibility or needs are appropriate to utilize at earlier stages of the continuum as needed, keeping in mind the focus on informal assessment at earlier stages. One or more conceptual strategies may be utilized in determining cognitive functioning levels.

5. Analysis
Rationale: Integration of data is needed before decision-making may appropriately take place.

a. Interpret and summarize referral data, background information, previous assessment information to clarify current educational performance.

b. Establish level of cognitive functioning. When assessing a pupil referred for special education services, the following hypothesis is investigated:
A pupil is considered to have average intelligence.

- Clinical judgment is used to interpret the evidence gathered through comprehensive assessment with consideration given to factors which include but are not limited to:

**Note: Some of these strategies, such as ecological, are not designed to assess cognition as such but certainly contribute to hypotheses testing.*

The opportunity to learn
Language/culture factors.

- Information which must be obtained to support or reject the hypothesis includes:
  - Evidence of the ability to learn, remember and understand the new information.
  - Evidence of the ability to apply knowledge to cope with one's environment.
  - Evidence of the ability to utilize increasingly abstract concepts.
  - Evidence of the ability to generalize beyond the immediate task or context.
  - Evidence of the ability to analyze and synthesize information in a meaningful way.
  - Evidence of the ability to evaluate the processes and products of learning.

- The hypothesis *is not* substantiated if there are significant and pervasive delays across assessment domains.

- The hypothesis is substantiated if a clear pattern of functioning emerges within a pupil's appropriate age range.

c. To determine whether a learning disability may exist (required for CAC 3035j) the following information may be helpful:

- SEVERE DISCREPANCY:
  For establishment of a specific learning disability, substantiating factors must be developed in order to determine a severe discrepancy between ability and achievement. Levels of achievement and ability have already been established. (See Assessment Components Sources/Current Assessment Results c. — g. and Analysis b.) The following factors must be discussed:

  Patterns of current achievement are not commensurate with intellectual/cognitive functioning.

  Achievement levels are below the expected range of norms for the current classroom.

  Rate of achievement has become more disparate from peers as increasingly complex tasks are introduced.

  Documented interventions have not been successful.

  Teacher, parent and pupil reports identify problem areas and impact a pupil's achievement at home and school.

  When the level of cognitive/intellectual functioning is established as within the average range, and the achievement levels are significantly below expectancy, it can be assumed that the severe discrepancy criteria has been met.

- PSYCHOLOGICAL PROCESSES ANALYSIS:
  Note: Psychological processes have been discussed as an alternative strategy for evaluation of cognition.

As a separate factor in assessment when a pupil has been identified as having a learning disability with a significant discrepancy between cognition and academic skills, it is necessary to identify the psychological process(es) implicated in the learning problem.

The assessment of psychological processes draws on all information sources, including teacher information, parent information, observation, academic production and standardized testing (behavior and responses). Basic assessment may need to be supplemented with additional tests which provide specific insights into reasoning and learning skills. The focus in this area of assessment is on how instructional information is handled with the goal of planning for instructional modifications needed, potentially beyond those of general education classes.

To identify the psychological process(es) impairing learning, clinical analysis is necessary. Substantiating information can be drawn from observation and test performance. A process of elimination, differentiating the point in the sequence of learning where impediment occurs, must be made. At the decoding level, there must be adequate perception. At the mediation level, material has to be remembered, organized and understood in terms of the academic areas(s) involved. At the encoding level, there must be capacity to transpose information which is intact at the internal level. Further important information may be obtained by comparing learning requirements at the point of suspected impairment in the area of disability with those in another area of academics which is progressing in a satisfactory manner.

In the following sections, information regarding each process is provided as a foundation for analysis. Neither observational factors nor testing suggestions should be considered as comprehensive, and individual evaluators are expected to use their own professional expertise and insights as indicated by the individual differences encountered when making a clinical analysis. Information must be considered relative to each pupil's age/grade level and overall developmental status, and any physical or emotional or sensory conditions which are present.

Attention is the process of focusing on stimuli, and sustaining or shifting this focus as required by the learning or functioning situation. This process occurs repeatedly during activity and affects all academic areas. Observational data may include information on:

The activity level of the pupil
Response to materials or instruction

Distractability
Functional use of stimuli such as: appropriate shifts of attention, sense of task expectancy,immediate or delayed imitation of a model working with an array, task completion and absence of perseveration.

Supplemental assessment may include use of tests or tasks which allow comparison of attention to different instructional modalities such as visual versus auditory presentations, different formats of materials such as recognition versus recall. Care must be taken that emphasis is on *focus* rather than limitations in conceptual understanding.

Visual Processing involves perception and use of visual stimuli. This process is involved in all learning areas which rely on using symbols and pictures, and with pupils who rely on gestures and/or signing communication in all academic areas. Rule out any effects of visual acuity conditions. Observational data may include information on:

Physical or postural adjustments pupil makes
Attention to paper/pencil tasks
Difficulty working with crowded materials
Omissions in sections of materials
Functional use of visual stimuli such as in: differentiation of different symbols, sorting, matching, pattern recognition or replication, whole/part organization, working with complex visual materials, response to facial expression, immediate or short-term visual memory.

Supplemental assessment may include tests or tasks which emphasize visual processing development or strands such as the Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception, Motor Free Visual Perception Test, Beery Buktenica Test of Visual Motor Integration, Kohs Blocks or Wepman Visual Discrimination Test. Care must be taken that emphasis is on ***visual skills*** rather than attentional factors, the association process, or conceptual understanding.

Auditory Processing involves perception and use of auditory stimuli. This process is involved in all areas of academics with recognition that all instruction, except when signing is the mode of communication, involves verbal explanations and directions. Auditory acuity and oral-motor impairments must be ruled out as affecting factors.

Observational data may include information on:

Physical or postural adjustments of the pupil
Mispronunciations or unusual intonation or speech patterns
Frequent repetition of things heard
Functional use of auditory stimuli such as:
- Discrimination of sounds
- Imitation of sounds or sentences
- Immediate or short term auditory memory.

Supplemental assessment may include collaboration with audiologist and/ or speech specialists, and tests or tasks which emphasize auditory processing development such as the Wepman Auditory Memory Span.

Association is the process of acquiring basic units of information in memory, and establishing systems for relating these units to each other as in matching, same/different, pattern or logical groups. Association involves long-term memory, as opposed to immediate or short term memory which can be related to a sensory modality. The processing at this level serves as a foundation for more complex operations in conceptualization.

Observational data may include information on:

- Long term memory
- Sense of cause and effect relationships
- Sense of part/whole relationships
- Development of basic organizational relationships, such as matching, patterns, same/different

Supplemental assessment may include use of tests or tasks which evaluate memory directly, and status of basic learning and rate of learning. Information on background of educational opportunities is important to ensure that social, cultural or experiential factors have not impaired learning.

Conceptualization is the process of using information in an increasingly complex and fluid manner. Fundamental units of information can be combined, rearranged, used in multi-step operations, used as in classification and class hierarchies, and can be used in multiple situations with necessary transformations. Information can also be used logically and as a basis for inferences, conclusions or judgment. This process occurs in all areas of academics when reasoning beyond rote performance is required.

Observational data may include information on:

- Ability to follow directions
- Transfer and generalization of learned materials
- Understanding meaning and details from materials heard or read
- Understanding the meaning of mathematical operations
- Demonstration of logical thought
- Ability to make choices, inferences and conclusions
- Ability to do multi-step activities
- Ability to organize or understand hierarchical nature of materials
- Ability to demonstrate reversibility of thought

Supplemental assessment may include use of tests or tasks which provide information on concept development such as the Bracken Basic Concept Scale, or reasoning processes such as the Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development. The pupil may be able to provide invaluable information through discussion of the way he or she has thought about tasks and the strategies evidenced.

Expression involves the process of organizing thought in a form which can be understood by others. This is the medium through which learning is usually evaluated through which a pupil may ask for help, and through which social discourse occurs for social learning. This process is an integral part of all academic evaluation, and care must be taken to differentiate between internal understanding and the encoding process through which this is expressed. Information from speech/language evaluations may be critical in separating these factors.

Observational data may include information on:
- Verbal or signing fluency
- Conversational skills
- Organization of thought
- Acquisition of vocabulary and syntax skills

Supplemental assessment may include language tests and language specialist's clinical information including language samples, comparative assessment between verbal and written expression, sentence completion tasks, and other activities which allow for alternative means of expression such as recognition versus recall formats.

Sensory Motor Processing involves the transformation of information to motor production. While the emphasis in the Expressive Processing is on organization of thought, in Sensory Motor Processing the emphasis is on the perceptual to motor factor. This factor is seen in any academic activity requiring written work. The effect of any physical handicaps must be considered.

Observational data may include information on:
- General body control
- Hand control
- Copying
- Printing and writing
- Doing mazes
- Laterality
- Imitation of motor activity
- Define instructional needs (including LRE issues)

6. **Eligibility Criteria**
   a. Public Law 94-142/California Administrative Code Title 5, 3030 a-j
      - Mentally Retarded/Below Average Intellectual Functioning (h)
        "A pupil has significantly below average general intellectual functioning existing currently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affect a pupil's educational performance." [CAC, Title 5, 3030(h)]

      - Hard of Hearing/Hearing Impairment (a)

      - Deaf

- Speech Impaired/Language and Speech Disorders (c)
  "Language Disorder. The pupil has an expressive or receptive language disorder when he or she meets one of the following criteria:

  The pupil scores at least 1.5 standard deviations below the mean, or below the 7th percentile, for his or her chronological age or developmental level on two or more standardized tests in one or more of the following areas of language development: morphology, syntax, semantics or pragmatics. When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for the specific pupil, the expected language performance level shall be determined by alternative means as specified on the assessment plan,

  or

  The pupil scores at least 1.5 standard deviations below the mean or below the 7th percentile for his or her chronological age or developmental level on one or more standardized tests in one of the areas listed in subsection (A) and displays inappropriate or inadequate usage of expressive or receptive language as measured by a representative spontaneous or elicited language sample of a minimum of fifty utterances. The language sample must be recorded or transcribed and analyzed, and the results included in the assessment report. If the pupil is unable to produce this sample, the language, speech and hearing specialist shall document why a fifty utterance sample was not obtainable and the contexts in which attempts were made to elicit the sample. When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for the specific pupil, the expected language performance level shall be determined by alternative means as specified in the assessment plan." [CAC, Title 5, 3030 (c) (4)]

- Visually Handicapped/Visual Impairment (d)

- Seriously Emotionally Disturbed/Serious Emotional Disturbance

  "Because of a serious emotional disturbance, a pupil exhibits one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree, which adversely affect education performance:

  An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory or health factors.

  An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers.

  Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances exhibited in several situations.

A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression.

A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems."[CAC, Title 5, 3030 (j)]

- Orthopedically Impaired/Severe Orthopedic Impairment (e)
- Other Health Impaired/Chronic or Acute Health Problems (f)
  Autistic-like Behaviors (g)
- Specific Learning Disabilities/Disorder of the Basic Psychological Process (j)

"A pupil has a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, which may manifest itself in an impaired ability to listen, speak, read, write, spell, or do mathematical calculations, and has a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and achievement in one or more of the academic areas specified in Section 56337(a) of the California Education Code. For the purpose of Section 3030(j):

Basic psychological processes include attention, visual processing, auditory processing, sensory-motor skills, cognitive abilities including association, conceptualization and expression.

Intellectual ability includes both acquired learning and learning potential and shall be determined by a systematic assessment of intellectual functioning.

The level of achievement includes the pupil's level of competence in materials and subject matter explicitly taught in school and shall be measured by standardized achievement tests.

The decision as to whether or not a severe discrepancy exists shall be made by the individualized education program team, including assessment personnel in accordance with Section 56341(d), which takes into account all relevant material which is available on the pupil. No single score or product of scores, test or procedure shall be used as the sole criterion for the decisions of the individualized education program team as to the pupil's eligibility for special education. In determining the existence of a severe discrepancy, the individualized education program team shall use the following procedures:

A. When standardized tests are considered to be valid for a specific pupil, a severe discrepancy is demonstrated by: first, converting into common standard scores, using a mean of 100 and standard deviation of

15, the achievement test score and the ability test score to be compared; second, computing the difference between common standard scores; and third, comparing this computed difference to the standard criterion which is the product of 1.5 multiplied by the standard deviation of the distribution of computed differences of students taking these achievement and ability tests.

A computed difference which equals or exceeds this standard criterion adjusted by one standard error of measurement, the adjustment not to exceed 4 common standard score points, indicates a severe discrepancy when such discrepancy is corroborated by other assessment data which may include other tests, scales, instruments, observations and work samples, as appropriate.

B. When standardized tests are considered to be invalid for a specific pupil, the discrepancy shall be measured by alternative means as specified on the assessment plan.

C. If the standardized tests do not reveal a severe discrepancy as defined in subparagraphs a) or b) above, the individualized education program team may find that a severe discrepancy does not exist, provided that the team documents in a written report that the severe discrepancy between ability and achievement exists as a result of a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes. The report shall include a statement of the area, the degree, and the basis and method used in determining the discrepancy. The report shall contain information considered by the team which shall include, but not be limited to:

1. Data obtained from standardized assessment instruments;
2. Information provided by the parent;
3. Information provided by the pupil's present teacher;
4. Evidence of the pupil's performance in the general education and/or special education classroom obtained from observations, work samples, and group test scores;
5. Consideration of the pupil's age, particularly for young children; and
6. Any additional relevant information.

7. Recommendations

a. To IEP team regarding:
   - Identification of handicapping condition/s (See Eligibility section above)
   - Special education *services*, recognizing that eligibility decisions, placement decisions are made by consensus of the IEP team.

b. Instructional interventions:
   - Teacher—Instructional planning including but not limited to:

Learning modalities
Behavior management approaches

- Psychological processes, strengths/weaknesses
- Academic remediation
- Parent
- Other
  Report needs to relate to the instructional program of the pupil with recommendations to the classroom teacher to put the pupil on a successful educational trajectory.

Report of Documentation

California Education Code (E.C. 56327) requires that:
One comprehensive report shall include, but not be limited to, all the following:

- Whether the pupil may need special education and related services.
- The basis for making the determination.
- The relevant behavior noted during the observation of the pupil in an appropriate setting.
- The relationship of that behavior to the pupil's academic and social functioning.
- The educationally relevant health and development, and medical findings, if any.
- For pupils with learning disabilities, whether there is such a discrepancy between achievement and ability that it cannot be corrected without special education and related services.
- A determination concerning the effects of environmental, cultural, or economic disadvantage, where appropriate.
- The need for specialized services, materials, and equipment for pupils with low incidence disabilities, consistent with guidelines established pursuant to Section 56136.

California Administrative Code (CAC) Title 5, 3023, requires that assessment reports for LEP pupils document:

- Validity
- Cultural/ethnic factors
- Use of interpreters

Examples of the specific types of questions that might assist with report documentation include:

- Is the report clearly written and free of jargon so that it can be easily understood by the pupil's parents and teachers?

- Does the report answer the questions asked in the referral?

- Are the recommendations realistic and practical for the pupil, school, teacher and parents?

- Have alternative recommendations been provided?

- Does the report describe any problems that were encountered and the effects of such during the assessment process?

- Do the recommendations provide for possible modifications of the pupil's curriculum?

- Did all professionals on the team share their findings regarding this pupil?
- Are team members' assessments in agreement? If not, were differences reconciled?
- Did each member admit his or her discipline's limitations and seek assistance from other team members?
- Did the professionals willingly share their competencies and knowledge with other team members for the benefit of this pupil?
- Did the team arrive at its conclusions as a result of team consensus or was its decision influenced by the personality and/or power of an individual team member?
- Were team members aware of community resource personnel and agencies that might assist in developing an educational plan for this pupil? Were such resources used before, during and after the evaluation?
- Did the team include the pupil's parents in their discussions?

Conceptual Strategies

- Developmental Assessment
- Dynamic Assessment
- Ecological Assessment
- Information Processing
- Neuropsychological Assessment
- Psychological Processing
- Skills With Subjects

Developmental Assessment

Note: Strategies described below require specialized training.

DESCRIPTION: Development Assessment conceives of intelligence as a form of biological organization and adaptation between the individual and the environment. The individuals is constantly interacting with the environment, trying to maintain a fit between his or her own needs and the demands that the environment makes. According to Piaget, four basic factors influence cognition changes and growth: maturation, experience with the physical environment, social experience, and equilibration. Equilibration is seen as the basic cause of intellectual development and can be viewed as a form of adaptive self-regulation. Equilibration is maintained through the interaction of two equally important components: assimilation and accommodation. Through assimilation an individual interprets the environment (incoming information) in terms of his/her existing cognitive structures. Through accommodation an individual changes his/her cognitive structure to fit incoming information. Thus, the process of cognitive development is neither a direct function of biological developement nor a direct function of learning; rather change represents a reorganization of psychological structures resulting from organism-environmental interactions.

PURPOSE/USES: To determine developmental levels of the pupil, it is first necessary to determine the cognitive structure that is present which allows the child to engage in a particular behavior or set of behaviors. Cognitive structure is scored according to the following criteria.

1. The concept is just beginning to emerge at a given level of development.

2. The concept is in the early stages of developement where cues and prompts are still required in order to elicite a desired behavior.

3. The concept is fairly well generalized and therefore functional in routine daily living.

One should also be aware of those concepts which have become so much a part of the mental processes and so automatic that they are beginning to be combined with other generalized concepts into more complex forms of behavior and therefore are ready to emerge into a higher level of development. Utilization of this approach implies a direct link between readiness level and curriculum, and lead directly to appropriate classroom interventions. Emerging concepts and those concepts requiring cues and prompts are considered to be the instructional level.

CAUTIONS: The assessor must have a thorough understanding of Piagetian developmental theory and receive training in developmental testing procedures. The assessor must have the ability to assess a pupil's range and quality of functional using emerging as well as fully developed and functional skills.

ASSESSMENT AREAS: Stages of development in terms of:

- Methods of problem-solving including the ordering process
- Classification processes
- Linguistic and intellectual processes requiring reason, logic, and recognition of cause/effect.

REPORTING OF RESULTS: Individual developmental profile reflecting the quantity of demonstrated concepts—bands of functioning show skills at the mastery level, at the mid level, and at the emerging level.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: Thorough understanding of Piagetian concept development.

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS: In congruence with Adaptive Behavior, Health and Development, Background Information: Southern California Ordinal Scales of Development cognition.

RESOURCES: Foreworks Publishing

Dynamic Assessment

DESCRIPTION: In dynamic assessment, the examiner actively interacts with the examinee, using tests as tools to determine the nature of the input, elaboration and output cognitive functions of the child, to locate deficient cognitive functions within those realms, to attempt to "mediate" or see if those functions can be improved, and then to observe the transfer of learning throughout the assessment. This process differs deliberately and significantly from standard testing. The goals, rather than creating age or grade norms for classification or comparison, are to determine the child's efficient and deficient cognitive functions, to identify the type and quantity of interventions necessary to enhance functioning, and describe the peaks and valleys in the student's processing of information. The method, rather than standardized nonintervention during testing, includes teaching, intervention, or mediation during the test process. The situation, rather than to test in relative isolation, is to test in a "normal setting" with people present, including the parent and/or teacher. The role of the assessor becomes a collaborator with the student, attempting to help the child *learn to learn* new information with success, in contrast to the somewhat impersonal traditional role in which failure represents a point of discontinuation of testing, rather than a point of departure.

PURPOSES/USES: Dynamic assessment can provide a differential assessment for students of apparent low functioning ability, often discriminating between cultural difference and cognitive disability. It is especially useful in consultation with either educators or parents who are prepared to intervene in an individualized manner, and perhaps modify the student's ability to benefit from instruction. Where inadequate data is available from traditional sources, this process in invaluable.

CAUTIONS: Dynamic assessment is deliberately not a standardized procedure. Thus, it should not be used to label or classify children.

ASSESSMENT AREAS: Dynamic Assessment in general will be concerned with areas of cognitive functioning, learning style, modifiability of learning dynamics and appropriate interventions. If the Learning Potential Assessment Device (LPAD) is the dynamic assessment employed, then the assessment areas will cover specific characteristics of mediation (i.e., intentionality, regulation of behavior, feeling of competence) useful with that individual, a list of cognitive functions which the individual is using efficiently or inefficiently within the realm of input, elaboration and output in the mental act, what modalities or languages are the preferred or more efficient, and how open to modification the individual is at this time, with specific suggestions regarding the most salient areas in which to begin intervention.

REPORTING OF RESULTS: Results are usually reported in a narrative form, although sometimes a learning curve may be presented to illustrate the process observed during dynamic assessment and its transfer. This narrative should integrate behavioral observations as well as ecological data which might support the examiner's findings. If the examiner has used the LPAD in their dynamic assessment, the report should allude to the following dimensions of cognition: (1) content, 2) modality or language, 3) phase, 4) cognitive operations, 5) level of complexity, 6) level of abstraction, and 7) level of efficiency. Content is the core of information around which the mental act is centered. A

person's competence with specific content is directly related to familiarity with it through experience, culture and education. The modality or language in which the mental act is expressed may be verbal, pictorial, numerical, figural, symbolic, graphic or a combination. A person may be able to elaborate concepts in one or more modalities better than in others (or in some not at all). The phase of the mental act refers to the learner's involvement in input, elaboration or output of information. Although the three are interrelated, varying emphases may be needed on any one phase during a particular mental act. Each mental act also requires specific cognitive operations; for example, identification, comparison, analogical thinking, transitive thinking and syllogism. The level of complexity involved in a particular mental act refers to the number of units of information upon which it centers, in conjunction with the degree of novelty or familiarity of the information to the subject. The level of abstraction is the conceptual or cognitive distance between a given mental act and the object or event upon which it operates. Finally, the level of efficiency with which a mental act is performed refers to the rapidity and precision with which it is performed, and by the subjective amount of effort invested to perform it. The level of efficiency is a function of both the degree of crystallization of the mental act and the recency of its acquisition.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: Dynamic assessment requires a clear understanding of cognitive psychology, learning theories, learning style differences and cultural differences. Use of the LPAD requires specific training.

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS: Theoretically, any test or work sample could serve well as a tool, although it must lend itself to dynamic interaction. In LPAD, fifteen instruments have been specially constructed to meet particular requirements of this type of assessment. Since they must permit access to the various components of the individual's cognitive structure, they contain varying levels of complexity, abstraction, efficiency, content, modality and operation. They also present the examinee with novel tasks which are not likely to be rejected due to prior association with failure. Finally, the tools provide a format in which the examiner may see if transfer of new learning is taking place, and with what amount of ease and facility.

RESOURCES:

California Association of School Psychologists (1986). *Alternative assessment task force report;* Millbrae, CA: California of School Psychology.

Feuerstein, R. (1979). *The dynamic assessment of retarded performers.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Litz, C. (Ed.) (in press). *Dynamic assessment: Foundations and fundamentals.* New York: Guilford Press.

Ecological Assessment

DESCRIPTION: In ecological assessment, the focus of the assessor shifts from the child to the environment or child-in-environment. In the process, equal attention is given to both child and environment, and questions or hypotheses are posed in terms of "fit" "match" and "relationships," rather than child-owned deficits. Furthermore, the child-at-home and the child-in-community are valued equally with the child-at-school. As such, the child's culture is viewed as inseparable from the child and "match" of child's culture and school culture is of highest priority. The goal is to identify points of discord or clash, and enable those key adults in the child's ecosystem to intervene or to work toward harmony among the elements of the system (rather than to cure or fix the child). The difference between ecological assessment and traditional non-test based procedures lies in the philosophical orientation of the assessor rather than the techniques he/she uses

CAUTION: The assessor must be thoroughly grounded in ecological psychology (or ecosystems theory) and in the knowledge and respect for the child's culture. Furthermore, the assessor must be able to evaluate relationships and the impact of relationships on the child-in-school.

ASSESSMENT AREAS: The premise is to carry out the least restrictive assessment. Thus the assessment process could stop at any of the following steps if the issues are resolved. The process involves the following:

1. Analyzing of environmental factors, e.g., teaching style, etc.
2. Observing the child in a variety of settings and with a variety of people.
3. Carrying out informal assessment.
4. Carrying out formal assessment.
5. Placement to meet special needs.
6. Evaluation of placement.

REPORTING OF RESULTS: The least restrictive assessment process involves both formal and informal measures.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: To be effective the assessor must be highly trained. Assessors must understand systems theory and be able to apply these principles to general and special education. Assessors must be knowledgeable about the range of environmental conditions that can lead to an individual appearing as if handicapped.

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS: Ecological assessment makes use of a broad range of tools and techniques within the ecosystem's frame of reference that defines it.

Information Processing

DESCRIPTION: In simplified terms, Swanson (1987) described the conceptualization of Information Processing approach to understanding intelligence as a study of how sensory input is transformed, reduced, elaborated, sorted, retrieved, and used. Three general components depicting how each of these processes plays a part in the flow of information are (1) a constraint or structural component, which defines the parameters within which information can be processed at a particular stage (e.g., sensory storage, short-term memory, long-term memory); (2) a control or strategy component, which describes the operations of the various stages; and (3) an executive process, by which learners' activities (e.g., strategies) are overseen and monitored. In addition, to these components, the flow of information is also conceptualized as occurring in a sequence of stages, and each stage operates on and transforms the information for succeeding stages. Thus, at a global level, Information Processing theories consists of stages and components.)

PURPOSE/USE: This approach provides a means for theorizing about cognitive functioning through attempts to better understand how individuals input, process and output information, rather than simply examining what is output. By studying the stages and components which underlie thinking processes, rather than simply studying the products, it is the hope that we can determine how accurately and efficiently these processes are performed; thus, allowing for interventions.

CAUTIONS: This approach can provide psychologists a framework for examining students' thinking abilities, and there is a great deal of work in progress exploring its fit with understanding various academic skill development. Currently, however, it has not clearly defined assessment procedures and comprehensive intervention strategies for direct application within the complex sociopolitical realities of school systems. This is especially true for utilization in special education decision-making.

ASSESSMENT AREAS: Central concerns are how responses are arrived at rather than what the responses are: therefore, areas of assessment are those components that "directs" how information is processed, and those various stages where information is actually processed. While individual differences exist, some stages, according to Kolligian and Sternberg (1987) are: Encoding, Inference, Mapping, Comparison and Response.

REPORTING OF RESULTS: Results would include descriptions of the mental processes (i.e. components and stages) that an individual has employed, and the extent to which they have been used accurately and efficiently to process information presented.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: The assessor must have a thorough knowledge of cognitive psychology in general, and theories of information processing in particular. "Testing" can be directed at any skill, but the specific procedure is based on a clear conceptual understanding of this approach.

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS: In the process of development.

RESOURCES:

Furlong, M. et al. (1988). Alternative assessment committee report: Information processing. *CASP Today*.

Kolligian, J. Jr. & R. J. Sternberg. (1987). Intelligence, information processing, and specific learning disabilities: A triarchic synthesis. *Journal of Learning Disability*. *20* (1), 8-17.

Swanson, H. L. (1987). Information processing theory and learning disabilities: An overview. *Journal of Learning Disability 20* (1), 3-7.

(The entire Volume 20, Number 1 issue (1987). of *Journal of Learning Disability* was devoted to this topic.

Neuropsychological Assessment

DESCRIPTION: Neuropsychology is the study of brain-behavior relationships (e.g., the assessment and evaluation of behavior which is strongly influenced by brain functioning/dysfunctioning). Neuropsychology is also a conceptual model for understanding brain functioning in connection with the maturation of the nervous system and the corresponding systems that underlie psychological evaluation (i.e., the development of language, cognition, perception, and motor skills).

PURPOSES/USES: Clinical neuropsychology is the "application of our understanding of brain-behavior relationships to clinical problems" (Horton, Wedding and Phay, brain-behavior relationships." Behavioral neurology is concerned with the clinical applications of scientific knowledge, utilizing a qualitative, intuitive quantitative in tis approach. Clinical neuropsychology is more psychometric and quantitive in its approach. Clinical neuropsychology is useful in discriminating between situations when a teacher compensatory strategies to overcome neuropsycholoical defecits.

CAUTIONS: The assessor must have a thorough understanding of child development and the development of the neuropsychological system. This is especially important in determining whether skill deficits are within the normal range or should be viewed as significant. One must also be familiar with the neuropsychological indicators of various congenital conditions and long term injuries to the brain's integrity.

ASSESSMENT AREAS: Areas assessed will vary according to the age of the child, the questions being raised regarding the child's functioning or possible deficits, and the neurological techniques or system being used by the examiner.

REPORTING OF RESULTS: Reports should include information regarding the child's general health history and any significant disease or injury history. They should also

include data regarding the child's overall functioning level as well as areas of skill and deficit. If a system of evaluation is utilized, an individual profile of functioning in various areas may be provided.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: Thorough understanding of child development, neurodevelopmental stages, and the effect of congenital or acquired disease or injury to the neurodevelopmental system.

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS: Luria-Nebraska Neuropsychological Battery: Children's Revision; Halstead Reitan Neuropsychological Battery for children; Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children; complex Figure Test (Rey-Osterrieth); Benton Neuropsychological Tests (15).

RESOURCES:

Benton, A.L., Hamsher, K., Varney, N.R., and Spreen, O. (1983). Contributions to neuropsychological assessment: A clinical manual. New York: Oxford University Press.

Golden, C.J., Moses, J.A., Coffman, J.A., Miller, W.R., Strider, F.D. (1983). Clinical neuropsychological: Interface with neurologic and psychiatric disorders. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Horton, A.M., Wedding, D., and Phay, A. (1981). Current perspectives on assessment of a therapy for brain-injured individuals. In C.J. Golden, S.E. Alcaparras, F. Stedes and B. Graber (eds) *Applied technique in behavorial medicine*. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Hynd, G.W. and Obrzut, J.E. (eds) (1981). *Neuropsychological assessment and the school-age child*. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Lazarus, P.J. and Strichart, S.S. (eds) (1986). *Psychoeducational evaluation of children and adolescents with low-incidence handicaps*. New York: Grune and Stratton.

Lezak, M. (1974). *Neuropsychology: Current status and applications*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Reitan, R.M. and Davidson, L.A. (eds) (1974). *Neuropsychology: Current status and applications*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Rourke, B.P., Bakker, D.J., Fisk, J.L. and Strang, J.D. (1983). *Child neuropsychology: An introduction to theory, research, and clinical practice*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Psychological Processing

DESCRIPTION: Psychological Processing Assessment uses an analysis of the basic processing areas. It presupposes that the constructs of psychological processes, as specified in Pl 94-142, underlie cognitive ability. These processes include association, conceptualization, expression, attention, visual-processing, sensory-motor processing.

Psychological Processes can be defined as follows:

COGNITIVE AREAS	SKILLS RELATED TO ASSESSMENT TASKS
Association	The ability to see similarities, correspondence among stimuli. The ability to memorize and learn by rote.
Conceptualization	The ability to see basic similarities and differences, to draw conclusions, to make inferences, to classify, categorize, summarize.
Expression	The ability to communicate ideas through language such as writing, gesturing and speaking.
Attention	The ability to recognize and interpret visual stimuli involving: Perception (discrimination, closure), memory, sequencing, integration.
Visual-Processing	The ability to recognize and interpret visual stimuli involving auditory stimuli involving: Perception (discrimination, closure), memory, sequencing, integration.
Auditory-Processing	The ability to recognize and interpret visual stimuli involving auditory stimuli involving: Perception (discrimination, closure), memory, sequencing, integration, blending.
Sensory-Motor Processing	The ability to combine input of sensory information (auditory, visual, tactile with output of motor activity.)

PURPOSE/USES: To assess the development of cognitive functioning as related to specific skills in psychological processing May be used to determine strengths or deficits in specific processes within an individual.

(1) To assess strengths and weaknesses
   a. Within the individual
   b. Comparison of peers of similar and different experiential background.
(2) To develop instructional strategies
   a. To teach trough strengths
   b. To remediate weakness
(3) To establish discrepancy between ability and achievement.
(4) To establish deficits in psychological processing as required by PL 94-142, and Title 5 regulations.

CAUTIONS:

(1) Assessment results must not be reconstituted into or considered an IQ test.
(2) Cognitive level must be established by use of more than one instrument or method.
(3) Cross validation by other instrument is necessary to establish deficits.

ASSESSMENT AREAS:

Association	Visual-Processing
Conceptualization	Auditory-Processing
Expression	Sensory-Motor Processing
Attention	

ASSESSMENT METHODS:

Structured Observation	Adaptive Behavior Scales
Parent/Teacher Interview	Specific Standardized Instruments
Work Samples	Norm/Criterion Referenced Instruments

REPORTING OF RESULTS:

(1) Functional description	(5) Age levels
(2) Descriptive ranges	(6) Percentiles
(3) Instructional ranges	(7) Stanines
(4) Frequency count	(8) Standard scores

ASSESSOR TRAINING:

Training in utilizing and intrepreting data generated by each assessment method—School Psychologists

EXAMPLES OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS

Structures Observation	Adaptive Behavior Scales
Parent/Teacher Interview	Specific Standardized Instruments
Work Samples	

RESOURCES:

Los Angeles Unified School District— Psychological Services, Assessment Specialist

Skills Within Subjects

DESCRIPTION: Skills with subjects deals with a pattern analysis of diagnostic assessment in various academic areas with an initial hypothsis of normal cognitive functioning and assessment focused upon proving that hypothesis. A basic assumption is that if a pupil achieves at or close to grade level, normal cognition is inferred unless proven otherwise.

PURPOSE/USES: To determine functioning levels in school-related tasks, diagnostic assessment pinpoints strengths, weaknesses and specific roadblocks to learning. Subsumed in such assessment is attention to how a pupil processes/handles/copes with various learning tasks.

CAUTIONS:

(1) Care must be taken not to reconstitute the IQ test.
(2) Care must be taken that one or two splinter skills not be assumed to measure cognition.
(3) Care must be taken to utilize comprehensive measures (i.e., WRAT-R reading is recognition only).

ASSESSMENT AREAS (CAC Title 5/3030j):

(1) Listening
(2) Thinking
(3) Speaking
(4) Writing
(6) Spelling
(7) Mathematical Calculations

REPORTING OF RESULTS: Profile of learning skills in grade equivalents, age equivalents, percentiles, and/or standard scores.

ASSESSOR TRAINING: Competency in depth pattern analysis—school psychologist level.

EXAMPLES OF TOOLS:

- Bracken Test of Concept Development
- Sentence/story repetition
- Language sample and/or clinical interview
- Gray/Gilmore/Spache
- Work samples
- Wide Range Achievement-R
- Key Math-R
- K-TEA

RESOURCES: Test publishers

Selections of Instrument

- Prohibited Tests
- Additional Standardized Intelligence Measures
- Considerations in Test Selection and Interpretation
- Identifying Bias in Testing Assessment

Prohibited Tests for Black Assessments for Special Education

The basic list of intelligence tests from Larry P. included (*Larry P. v. Riles,* 495 F. Supp. 926 (1979), p. 931):*

- Arthur Point Scale
- Cattell Infant Intelligence Scale
- Columbia Mental Maturity Scale
- Draw-a-Person
- Gessell Developmental Schedule
- Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test
- Leiter International Performance Scale
- Merrill-Palmer Pre-School Performance Test
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test
- Raven Progressive Matrices
- Slosson Intelligence Test
- Stanford-Binet
- Van Alstyne Picture Vocabulary
- WISC, WISC-R, WAIS, WPPSI

*This list was entered as evidence in the Larry P. case from an APA listing and from CAC Title 5 regulations in effect at that time.

Additional Standardized Intelligence Measures

The Larry P. Settlement (1986) prohibits the use of IQ tests with Black pupils for special education purposes. IQ tests are construed to mean any test which purports to be or is understood to be a standardized test of intelligence. Additional tests recommended as subject to the Larry P. prohibition would therefore, include but not be limited to the following:

- Cognitive Abilities Test
- Expressive One-Word Picture Vocabulary Test
- K-ABC Mental Processing Subtests
- McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities
- Structure of Intellect Learning Aptitude Test
- Test of Non-Verbal Intelligence
- Tests of Cognitive Ability from the Woodcock-Johnson (including the cognitive section of the Bateria Woodcock Psico-Educativa en Espanol)
- Cognitive Subtest of the Battelle Developmental Inventories

Additional Tests Which Might Be Regarded as IQ Tests
School assessment personnel are cautioned regarding the use of other tests which may be controversial in the multidisciplinary assessment of Black pupils. Such tests include but are not limited to the following:

- Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude
- Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude—2, and Primary
- Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test—Revised
- Test de Vocabulario en Imagines Peabody

Criteria identical to those also cited by CASP were used to determine the appropriateness of these tests. See the Appendix for Task Force test reviews for the rationales in making these recommedations.

Considerations in Test Selection and Interpretation

1. In making a determination of whether a test falls under the IQ test ban for Black pupils one should consider

   a. Is the test standardized and does it purport to measure intelligence (cognition, mental ability or aptitude)?
   b. Are the test results reported in the form of IQ or mental age?
   c. Does evidence of the (construct) validity of the test rely on correlations with IQ tests?

An affirmative answer to any of the above indicates that use of the test may fall within the ban.

2. When testing Black pupils for special education purposes, it is not acceptable practice to use selected subtests of IQ tests.

3. The use of general population norms for minority pupils seriously compromises the ability of the assessment team to make valid interpretations, even if minorities have been sampled in representative proportions in the standardization.

4. Translated tests should not be construed as imparting validity to the results and should be used with great caution. If used, translations should preferably be written. On the spot translation severely compromises reliability. Regional dialect and cultural appropriateness of items must be considered when interpreting test responses.

5. The use of minority group and local norms provides a substantial improvement in the application of psychological tests.

6. Tests which have been constructed (reconstructed) and standardized on local minority groups with separate norms provided would be considered valid if the other psychometric standards have been met.

7. Primary reliance on tests designed for group administration in individual assessment detracts from the purpose of individual assessment.

8. The use of group tests for large group screenings would probably contribute to the over identification of minorities in special education.

9. The use of readiness tests for decisions regarding retention is not supported by the research literature.

10. Misidentification of language minority students as learning disabled often occurs because of misinterpretation of verbal ability and process test profiles as demonstrating a process deficit.

11. It is inappropriate to use achievement levels to demonstrate a severe discrepancy between ability and achievement when a pupil had not had the same school/language experience as the comparison age/grade group.

Identifying Bias in Testing Assessment

1. From the list below, select a behavioral area in which you conduct assessment.

2. In the space beside your selected assessment area, write the name of a test you typically use, might use, or have used in the past.

ASSESSMENT AREA	TEST USED
Basic skills (reading, math, etc.)	
Language	
Social/emotional	
Career/vocational	
Adaptive behavior	
Sensory-motor	
Cognitive	
Other:	

3. With this test in mind, respond to the following questions:

		YES	NO	N/A*	D/K*
3.1	Do you know what the test author states as the specific purpose for which the test was designed? Has the test been validated for this purpose?				
3.2	Are reliability and validity measures within acceptable limits?				
3.3	Are any limitations of the test described in the manual?				
3.4	Do you know the specific information about the group on whom the test was standardized (socio-cultural groups, sex, age, etc.)?				
3.5	Do you always compare the characteristics of the pupil to be tested to those of the persons in the standardization sample?				

	YES	NO	N/A*	D/K*
3.6 Does the test manual, or research literature, report any differences in test performance across cultural groups?				
3.7 Do the test items take into account differences in values and/or adaptive behavior?				
3.8 Does this test use vocabulary that is regional, colloquial, or archaic?				
3.9 Does the test rely heavily on receptive and expressive English language ability to measure abilities *other than* language?				
3.10 Is an equivalent form of the test available in another language?				
3.11 Do you conduct assessments in the pupil's primary language or other mode of communication?				
3.12 Do you keep in mind, during the testing, that some pupils may have difficulty understanding your grammar/pronunciation or may find certain of your speech sounds difficult to understand?				
3.13 Do you consider what the test demands of (or assumes about) the pupil in terms of: • reading level of questions or directions; • speed of response; • style of problem-solving; • test-taking" behavior?				
3.14 Would pupils with specific physical or sensory handicapping conditions be penalized by this test, or on certain items?				
3.15 Can the information obtained from this test be readily applied to planning instructional interventions?				
3.16 Do you feel that you are well experienced in the administration of this test?				

**N/A = Not Applicable D/K = Don't know*

Glossary

Glossary

Note: Common abbreviations are explained at the end of this section.

Academic Achievement: The extent of knowledge, skills and understanding in subjects typically taught in school, such as reading, arithmetic and written language. Achievement test results compare a pupil's performance with that of other pupils in such ways as identifying the grade level at which a particular score would be average (grade equivalent) or the percent of pupils at a particular age who would score lower than that pupil (percentile).

Adaptive Behavior: The ability to perform daily living tasks, such as dressing, eating, communicating and shopping appropriate for one's age and culture. The American Association of Mental Deficiency defines adaptive behavior as "the effectiveness or degree with which the individual meets the standards of personal independence and social responsibility expected of age and cultural group." Both federal and California regulations require deficits in adaptive behavior as one of the necessary characteristics of mental retardation.

Alternative Assessment: The development of strategies, procedures and techniques to provide a legal and valid determination of special education eligibility and interventions for pupils when traditional means would be invalid. The California Education Code, Title 5, 3030(j)(4)(b), referring to learning disabilities, establishes the need to use alternative means when standardized tests are considered to be invalid for a specific pupil. The Larry P. judgment states that IQ tests may not be used with Black pupils for special education purposes. "In lieu of IQ tests, districts should use alternative means of assessment to determine identification and placement. Such techniques should include, and would not be limited to, assessments of the pupil's personal history and development, adaptive behavior, classroom performance, academic achievement, and evaluative instruments designed to point out specific information relative to a pupil's abilities and inabilities in specific skill areas" (Order Modifying Judgment C-71-2270 RFP, *Larry P. vs. Wilson Riles*, p.4).

Assessment: The process involved in the evaluation of a pupil's needs and/or eligibility for services by means of formal testing and observation. There are several stages to educational assessment which include screening and the identification of pupils with potential problems, the implementation and evaluation of classroom-based strategies, determination of current functioning and educational needs, decision-making regarding educational needs and services.

Assessment Instruments: Specific tests and measures used within an assessment. See **Test.**

Bias: The tendency to favor a certain position or conclusion incorrectly, based upon an individual's group membership such as race. Test bias refers to systematic error in the validity of test scores caused by a test defect.

Black Pupil. See **Ethnicity.**

Classroom Performance: Academic and non-academic behavior observable within the educational setting, involving the response to both curriculum and to the social forces of the setting. Both qualitative and quantitative measures are available for use.

Clinical Judgment: The making of inferences by receiving evidence; forming a hypothesis by interpreting evidence utilizing professional training, experience and information; gathering evidence; and substantiating or ruling out the hypothesis. The use of scientific knowledge and methods by a professionally trained person to form hypotheses to test regarding a problem within that person's area of expertise. Methods may include obtaining information from standardized instruments and using structured observations and interviews.

Cognition: The ability to learn, understand and to deal with new or unfamiliar learning tasks; the ability to apply knowledge to cope with one's educational environment; the ability to handle concepts in an increasingly abstract manner; the ability to generalize beyond the immediate task and context; the ability to analyze and synthesize information in a meaningful way. Cognition includes a person's unknown potential, which cannot be directly measured, and the description of a person's actual, current performance on a variety of intellectual tasks as described above. See **Intellectual Ability.**

Cognitive Assessment Strategies: A theoretical approach to assessing cognition whether through traditional or alternative means. Four possible strategies are 1) skills within subjects (Pattern Analysis) assessment (a diagnostic profile of a pupil's academic skills such as reading and mathematics); 2) psychological processing assessment (analysis of constructs such as association, conceptualization, expression, attention, visual processing and sensory-motor skills); 3) developmental assessment (a Piagetian approach stressing the reorganization of psychological structures resulting from organism-environmental interactions); and 4) neurological/psychological assessment (analysis of cognitive, behavioral and psychological skills to determine the brain-behavior relationship).

Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR): An evaluation of a school district's special education categorical programs. One facet is a review of how the district has addressed the mandate to have non-discriminatory assessment materials and procedures, the elimination of IQ scores in Black pupil files and the elimination of ethnic over representation in special education.

Core Curriculum: A specific body of subject content, adopted by the local school board and aligned with the state curriculum framework. This content is sequenced by grade or developmental levels and intended to provide all pupils with a common body of acquired knowledge. The purpose of the Core Curriculum is to ensure that all students fully develop the skills of reading, writing, speaking, listening, calculating, learning and critical thinking.

Cultural Test Bias: Regularly occurring cultural or racial differences in test results which are caused by test defects. Possible categories of such bias include test material that is more familiar to one group than another, examination procedures which are different for different pupils, nonrepresentative standardization of the test, different meaning of the test content to different groups, different predictive ability of the test for different groups and inequitable consequences of the use of the test results.

Curriculum: The content of what is taught in schools. This can be identified as to the specific skills and knowledge to be taught, the sequence and organization of such instruction and the method by which mastery will be evaluated.

Defendant: The person required to make answer in a legal action or suit. In the Larry P. case, the defendant was the California State Department of Education, Wilson Riles as the then current Superintendent of Public Instruction and the San Francisco Unified School District.

Deficit: A lack in the amount of something considered to be necessary. With IEP includes the present levels of the pupil's educational performance, linguistically appropriate annual goals including short-term instructional objectives, specific special education instruction and related services required, the extent to which the pupil will be able to participate in general education programs, the projected date for initiation and the anticipated duration of such programs and services and appropriate annual evaluation criteria, procedures and schedules. This statement is developed annually at a meeting of the Individualized Education Program Team.

Different Validity: The degree or extend of evidence which suggests that more errors will be made by on population subgroup than by another on a particular test. If two groups are equal in a particular skill or ability and yet perform at systematically different levels on a test of that particular skill or ability, the test could be said to have differential validity for the two groups. **See Cultural Test Bias.**

Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR). Term no longer in use in California. See **Mental Retardation.**

E Formula: A statistical formula used by athe California State Department of Education to verify district compliance with the mandate to eliminate over-representation of Black or Hispanic pupils in special educaiton in the mentally retarded category. The formula is based on a consideration of the relationship between the percentage of Black or Hispanic pupils in the district to the total number of Black or Hispanic pupils in special education in the mentally retarded category.

$$E = A + \sqrt{\frac{A(100-A)}{N}}$$

Where A = % Black or Hispanic in district and N = number of Black or Hispanic pupils in the special education program.

Ethnicity: For purposes of compliance with the Larry P. judgement, ethnicity shall be determined by parent statement. This guideline is intended to keep the determination of student ethnicity independent of the job responsibilty of educators.

Handicapped Child: A child evaluated in accordance with legal requirements as being mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, other health impaired, who because of those impairments needs special education and related services [34 CFR Ch. III (7-1-86]. See **Exceptional Needs.**

Individual with Exceptional Needs. A pupil who requires instruction and/or services which cannot be provided with modification of the regular school program, excluding those needs due primarily to unfamiliarity with the English language, temporary physical disabiltities, social maladjustment and/or environmental and economic factors (California Education Code, Part 30, paragraph 56026). See **Handicapped Child.**

Individualized Education Program (IEP): A written statement developed for a pupil with a handicapping condition which includes the present levels of the pupil's educational performance, linguistically appropriate annual goals including short-term instructional objectives, specific special education instruction and related services required, the extent to which the pupil will be able to participate in general education programs, the projected date for initiation and the anticipated duration of such programs and services and appropriate annual evaluation criteria, procedures and schedules. This statement is developed annually at a meeting of the Individualized Education Program team.

Intellectual Ability: Acquired learning and learning potential, determined by a systematic assessment of intellectual functioning (Title 5, California Administrative Code, paragraph 3030(j.)(2). See **Cognition.**

IQ Test: A test which purports to be a test of intelligence or general intellectual functioning in its title or manual or which results in a standard score labeled IQ. The term "IQ" stands for "intelligence quotient."

Larry P: One of six Black children who were plaintiffs in a lawsuit brought in 1971 against Wilson Riles, Calitornia State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The suit charged that the IQ tests used in determining eligibility for placement in classes for the educable mentally retarded (EMR) were culturally biased. The lawyers for the plaintiffs based their charges of cultural bias on the fact that the average scores for Blacks were lower than for whites, and that using the scores resulted in a higher percentage of Black children than white children in EMR classes. The final judgment, dated September, 1986, stated that IQ tests could not be administered to any Black child for any special education purpose in California.

Learning Disability (LD): See **Specific Learning Disability.**

Linguistically Appropriate: The extent to which decisions are made (or document

written) with the consideration of a pupil's proficiency in both his or her primary and second language.

Related Definitions:

Primary Language: The language that the pupil is exposed to first.

Dominant Language: The language the pupil communicates in most capably.

Second Language: The language(s) the pupil is exposed to after the primary language.

Mental Ability: See **Intelligence** or **Cognition.**

Mental Retardation: Significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period which adversely affects a child's educational performance.

Multidisciplinary Team: A group of professionals representing the disciplines pertinent to the needs and education of a child being considered for special education services. These individuals work together to assess the child's needs and/or develop an individualized education program.

Plaintiff: The complaining party in a lawsuit. In the Larry P. litigation, the plaintiff was the group of six children collectively referred to as Larry P.

Regular Education Interventions: Efforts to provide a thorough and efficient education for children prior to the initiation of any formal referral.

Reliability: The absence of error in measurement; the degree to which test results are consistent when the same people are retested with the identical test or with an equivalent form of the test. A test is considered reliable if a second administration would lead to essentially the same results, regardless of whether the test is valid.

School Consultation Team (SCT): A multidisciplinary team of professionals at a school site (that should include a school psychologist) who meet together regularly to consider problems and concerns presented about specific pupils and their needs. The SCT then gathers information, develops hypotheses, and devises alternative strategies and interventions within general education to resolve these concerns. The final report of the SCT may describe how the concern was resolved, suggest further interventions, or refer the pupil for special education assessment.

Screening: Procedures designed to select from a group those pupils who may be in need of further assessment and provided appropriate educational services. School districts, special education services, regions or county offices must develop policies and procedures to actively and systematically seek out all individuals with exceptional needs, ages 0 through 21 years. One component of this search is screening (California Education Code, Part 30, paragraphs 56300, 56301).

Special Day Class: A classroom for individuals with exceptional needs whose educa-

tional needs as determined by the Individualized Education Program Team cannot currently be met in a less restrictive environment and whose needs preclude their participation in the general school program for a majority of the school day.

Special Education: Specially designed instruction, at no cost to the parent, to meet the unique needs of individuals with exceptional needs, whose educational needs cannot be met with modification of the general instruction program, and related services which may be needed to assist such individuals to benefit from specially designed instruction.

Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA): A single district or two or more school districts/county offices may choose to join together in planning and delivering special education services for children within their boundaries. Special education pupils within these districts may then receive services from any of the participating educational agencies pursuant to their local plans.

Special Education Program: See **Individualized Education Program.**

Specific Learning Disability (SLD): A handicapping condition which involves a severe discrepancy between intellectual ability and academic achievement due to a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes and is not primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor handicaps, of mental retardation, or of environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage (California Education Code, Part 30, paragraph 56337, and PL 94-142).

Standard Error: A measurement of the degree to which a statistic, such as a test score, will differ from its true value (the value that would be achieved if there were no error) by chance.

Standard Score: Transformed raw scores from tests that have a given mean and standard deviation. They express how far the examinee's score lies from the mean of distribution (normal curve) in terms of standard deviation e.g., scores, T scores, IQ scores.

Standardization: The establishment of fixed procedures for administration, scoring and interpretation of a test, as well as the establishment of norms for the test, which allow test use to be independent of the subjective judgment of the examiner. The intent of standardization is to allow different examiners to use a test equally well with the implication that results for different individuals or for the same individual across time will be comparable.

Standardized Tests: Evaluative instruments composed of empirically selected materials with specific directions for administration, information or scoring and interpretation on reliability and validity. Such instruments have previously developed norms.

Student Study Team (SST): See **School Consultation Team (SCT).**

Test: A method of obtaining a sample of behavior under controlled conditions. Tests

used in a special education assessment must be selected and administered so as not to be racially, culturally, or sexually discriminatory and should be provided and administered in the pupil's primary language, validated for the specific purpose for which they are used and administered by trained personnel (California Education Code, Part 30, paragraph 56320). See **Standardized Test.**

Validity: The degree or extent to which a test fulfills a function or actually measures what it is purported to measure. There are two primary types of test validity: content and empirical validity. Content validity refers to the accuracy and adequacy of the individual and collective test items (do they measure what they say) and empirical validity refers to the accuracy of the test in practice (does the test work). Subtypes of validity are construct validity (do test items correctly reflect the range of behaviors that a definition of the test topic would include) and face validity (do test items look to the casual observer as if they measure what they claim to measure). Tests and assessment materials used in special education eligibility decisions must be valid for the specific purpose for which they are used (California Education Code, Part 30, paragraph 56320 b2).

Common Abbreviations

AAMD	American Association of Mental Deficiency
CAC	California Administrative Code
CASP	California Association of School Psychologists
CBA	Curriculum-Based Assessment
CCR	Coordinated Compliance Review
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
EC	Education Code
ELA	English Language Acquisition
EMR	Educable Mentally Retarded
ESL	English as a Second Language
IEP	Individualized Education Program
L_1	Primary Language
L_2	Second Language
LD	Learning Disability
LEP	Limited English Proficient
LRE	Least Restrictive Environment
SCT	School Consultation Team
SDE	State Department of Education
SELPA	Special Education Local Plan Area
SLD	Specific Learning Disability
SST	Student Study Team

Bibliography

Bibliography

Assessment/Evaluation of Diverse Populations:

Archuleta, K., & Cervantes, H. T. (1981). The misplaced child: Does linguistically different mean learning disabled? In P.C. Gonzales (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Education Conference.* Rosslyn, VA: National Clearing House for Bilingual Education.

Bernal, E. M. (1975). A response to Educational uses of tests with disadvantaged students. *American Psychologist. 30,* 93-95.

Cook, V. J., & Henry, B. (1987). Alternate assessment task force report. *CASP Today.* 36 (3), 20-25, 35. (Reprinted in Larry P. A monograph published by the California Association of School Psychologists, Millbrae, CA.

Cook, V. J., Eyler, J., & Ward, L. (1981). *Effective strategies for avoiding within school resegregation.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Educational Policy Development Center for Desegregation.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education issues in assessment and pedagogy.* San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

Deno, S. L. (1985). Curriculum-based measurement: The emerging alternative. *Exceptional Children, 52,* 219-232.

Feuerstein, R. (1979). *The dynamic assessment of retarded performers: The Learning Potential Assessment device, theory, instruments, and techniques.* Baltimore: University Park Press.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: Theory of multiple intelligence.* New York: Basic Books.

Germann, G. & Tindal, G. (1985). An application of curriculum-based measurement: The use of direct and repeated measurement. *Exceptional Children, 52,* 244-265.

Grimes, J. P. & Reschly, D. J. (1986). *Relevant educational assessment and intervention model (RE-AIM).* (Project proposal funded by the United States Department of Education). Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education, Bureau of Special Education.

Jones, R. L. (1988). *Psychoeducational assessment of minority group children casebook.* Berkeley: Cobb & Henry.

Lidz, C. S. (1981). *Improving assessment of school children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lidz, C. (Ed.) (1987). *Dynamic assessment: An interactional approach to evaluating learning potential.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Mattes, L. J. & Omark, D. R. (1984). *Speech and language assessment for the bilingual handicapped*. San Diego: College-Hill Press.

McShane, D. & Cook, V. J. (1985). Transcultural intellectual assessment: Performance by Hispanics on the Wechsler scales. In B. Wolman (Ed.) Handbook of intelligence: Theories, measurements and applications. New York: John Wiley & Son.

Miller-Jones, D. (1981). *Future follow-through documentation and research: The assessment of academic/cognitive abilities of Black children*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Mowder, B. (1980). *Strategy for the assessment of bilingual handicapped children. Psychology in the Schools, 17*, 7-11.

Oakland, T. (1980). Nonbiased assessment of minority group children. Exceptional *Child Quarterly, 1*, 31-46.

Reschly, D. J. (1987b). *Nonbiased assessment and school psychology*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Public Instruction, Special Education Section (96 pages). ERIC Ed No. 157240.

Reynolds, C. (Eds.). (1982). *Perspectives on bias in mental testing*. Plenum Press.

Salvia, J., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1985). *Assessment in special and remedial education (4th ed.)*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Samuda, R. J. (1975). *Psychological testing of American minorities: Issues and consequences*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

Sanchez, R., Romo H., Rivera, I. S. & Wiliams, B. (1978). *Issues in language proficiency assessment*. San Diego, CA: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.

Shapiro, E. S. & Lentz, F. E. (1985). Assessing academic behavior: A behavioral approach. *School Psychology Review, 14*, 325-338.

Sternberg, R. J. (1986). *Intelligence applied: Understanding and increasing your intellectual skills*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Ysseldyke, J. E. & Christenson, S. L. (1987). *The instructional environment scale*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Consultation/Interventions:

Alpert, J. L. (1982). *Psychological consultation in educational settings.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Batsche, G. M. (1985). *Referral-oriented consultive approach to assessment/decision-making.* Washington, D.C.: National Association of School Psychologists.

Brislin, R., Bochner, S. Lonner, W. J. (1975). *Cross-cultural perspectives on learning.* New York: Sage Publications.

Conoley, J. C. & Conoley, C. W. (1982). *School consultation—A guide to practice and training.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Idol-Maestas, L. (1983). *Special educator's consultation handbook.* Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Publication.

Parsons, R. D. (1984). *Developing consultation skills.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Plas, J. M. (1981). The psychologist in the school community: A liaison role. *School Psychology Review, 10,* 72-81.

Sarason, S. B. (2nd Ed.) (1985). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Curriculum:

Almanza, H. P. & Mosely, W. J. (1980). Curriculum adaptation and modification for culturally diverse handicapped children, *Exceptional Children,* 46, 608-114.

Alper, T. & White, 0. R. (1971). Precision teaching: A tool for the school psychologist and teacher. *Journal of School Psychology, 9,* 445-455.

Benavides, A. (1985). Planning effective special education for exceptional language minorities. *Teaching Exceptional Children,* Winter.

Buckley, M. H. (1986). When teachers decide to integrate the language arts. *Language Arts. 63*(4).

Johnson, D. W. & Johnson, R. T. (1987). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Ortiz, C. D. (1981). Training educators to meet the needs of Hispanic exceptional students: A perspective. *Special Education and the Hispanic Child,* N, 74.

Plata. M., & Santos, S. L. (1981). Bilingual special education: A challenge for the future. *aching Exceptional Children, 14,* (3) 97-100.

Tindal, G., Wesson, C., Deno, S., Germann, G. & Mirkin, P. (1985). The Pine County model for special education delivery: A data-based system. In T. R. Kratochwill (Ed.), *Advances in school psychology Vol. IV*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Thompson, V. P., Gicking, E. E. & Havertape, J. F. (1983). *The effects of medication and curriculum on task-related behaviors of attention deficit disordered and low achieving peers*. Monographs in behavioral disorders: Severe behavior disorder of children and youth. Arizona State University. Series #6.

Ysseldyke, J. E. & Christenson, S. L. (1987). *The instructional environment scale*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Interventions:

Fine, M. J. (Ed.) (1984). *Systematic intervention with disturbed children*. Boston: Spectrum.

Feuerstein, R. (1980). *Instrumental enrichment: An intervention program for cognitive modifiability*. Glenview: University Park Press.

Keane, K. J. & Kretschmer, R. E. (1987). Effect of medicated learning intervention on cognitive task performance with a deaf population. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 79*, 49-53.

Kehoe, J. (1983). Enhancing the multicultural climate of the school. *History and Social Science Teacher, 19*, 65-75.

Lewis, R. and Doorlag, D. (1983). *Teaching special students in the mainstream*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Litigation:

Mac Millan, D. L., Hendrick, I. G. & Watkins, A. V. (1988). Impact of Diana, Larry P., and P.L. 94-142 on minority students, *Exceptional Children, 54*, 426-432.

Reschly, S. J., Kicklighter, R. & McKee, P. (1988). Recent placement litigation. *School Psychology Review, 17*, 9-50.

Multicultural Perspectives:

Albert, M. L. & Obler, L. K. (1978). *The bilingual brain.* New York: Academic Press.

Aspira of America, Inc. (1979). *Trends in segregation of Hispanic students in major school districts having large Hispanic enrollment: Ethnographic case studies. Vol. 2.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Baca, L. (1980). *Policy option for insuring the delivery of an appropriate education to handicapped children who are of limited English proficiency.* Preston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

Baca, L. M. & Cervantes, H. T. (1984). *The bilingual special education interface.* St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby.

Baron, A. (Ed.) (1981). *Explorations in Chicano psychology.* New York: Paeger.

Bird, H. R. & Canino, G. (1982). The Puerto Rican family: Cultural factors and family intervention strategies. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 10,* 257-268.

Chu-Chang, M. and Rodriquez, V. (Ed.) (1983). *Asian and Pacific-American perspectives in bilingual education: Comparative research.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, R. M. (1983). *Family life and school improvement: Why poor Black children succeed or fail.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coles, R. (1977). *Eskimos, Chicanos, Indians: Volume IV of children of crisis.* United States of America: Atlantic-Little, Brown.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education issues in assessment and pedagogy.* San Diego: College-Hill Press.

Daniels, R. E. and Katino, H. (1970). *American racism: Explorations of nature of prejudice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Diaz-Guerrero, R. (1975). *Psychology of the Mexican.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Duran, R. (Ed.) (1981). *Latino language and communicative behavior.* Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Co.

Endo, R., Sue, S. & Wagner, N. (Eds.). (1980) *Asian Americans: Social and psychological perspectives.* Palo Alto: Science & Behavior Books.

Grossman, H. (1984). *Educating Hispanic students: Cultural implications for instruction, classroom management, counseling and assessment.* Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.

Hale-Benson, J. E. (1982). *Black children: Their roots, culture, and learning styles* (Rev. ed.). Baltimore: John S. Hopkins University Press.

Haywood, H. C. (Ed.) (1970). *Social-cultural aspects of mental retardation*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Heller, K., Holtzman, W., & Messick, S. (Eds.). (1982). *Placing children in special education: A strategv for equity*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Hollins, E. R. (1982). Beyond multicultural education. *Negro Educational Review*. 33,140-45.

Jones, R. (Ed.). (1980) *Black psychology*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Jones, P. L. (Ed.) (1976). *Mainstreaming and the minority child*. Minneapolis: Council for Exceptional Children.

Kitano, M. K. (1980). Early education for Asian American children. *Young Children, 35*, 13-26.

Labon, W. (1975). Academic ignorance and Black intelligence. *Culture, child and school*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishers.

Lebra, T. S. & Lebra, W. P. (Eds.) (1974) *Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings*. Honolulu, HA: University Press of Hawaii.

Martinez, J. L., Jr. (Ed.) (1977). *Chicano psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

Martinez, J. L. & Mendoza, R. (Eds.) (1984). *Chicano psychology*. New York: Academic Press.

McAdoo, H. P. & McAdoo, J. L. (Eds.) (1985). *Black children: Social, educational, and parental environments*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Pasteur, A. B. & Toldson, I. L. (1982). *Roots of soul: The psychology of Black expressiveness*. Garden City, NY: Author/Doubleday.

Pedersen, P., Lonner, W. J. (Eds.) (1974). *Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Petersen, W., Novak, M., & Gleson, P. (1982). *Concepts of ethnicity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Powell, G. J., Yamamoto, J., Romero, A. & Morales, A. (Eds.) (1983). *The psycho-social development of minority group children*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.

Pugh, R. (Ed.) (1972). *Psychology and the Black experience*. Monterey, CA: Brooks Cole Publishers.

Reschly, D. J. (1984). Beyond IQ test bias: The national academy panel's analysis of minority EMR overrepresentation. *Educational Researcher, 13* (3), 15-19.

Rosenthal, T. L. & Zimmerman, B. [illegible] *ul learning and cognition*. New York: Academic Press.

Sarason, S. (1985). *The culture of the school and the problem of change* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Serpell, R. (1976). *Culture influence on behavior*. London: Methuen.

Taylor, O. L. (Ed.) (1986). *Nature of communication disorders in culturally and linguistically diverse populations*. San Diego, CA: College-Hill Press.

Ysseldyke, J. E. & Algozinne, B. (1982). *Critical issues in special and remedial education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Watanabe, C. (1973). Self expression and the Asian American experience. *Personnel and Guidance Journal, 51*, 390-396.

Wilson, R. N. (1978). *The development psychology of the Black child*. New York: Africana Research Publications.

Yamamoto, J. & Steinberg, A. (1981). Affect among Asians and Asian Americans, *Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis, 9*, 447-457.

Policy:

Diana v. State Board of Education (1970). C-70-37 (RFP District Northern California).

Diana v. State Board of Education. (1973, June 18). Civil Action No. C-70-37 RFP. (ND. Cal. Jan. 7, 1970).

Elliott, R. (1987). *Litigating intelligence: I.Q. tests, special education and social science in the courtroom*. Dover, MA: Aubern House.

Larry P. et al. v. Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of California et. al. (1979, October 11). No. C-71-2270 (N.D. Cal.).

Larry P. v. Riles (1986). Order modifying judgment, No. C-71-2270 RFP, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

Parents in Action on Special Education (PASE) v. Joseph Hannon. U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, No. 74 (3586), July, 1980. Also 506F. Supp. 83, (N.D. 111., 1980).

Reschly, D. (1980a). Psychological evidence in the Larry P. Opinion: A case of right problem—wrong solution. *School Psychology Review, 9*, 123-135.