Culturally Responsive Practices in Schools

The Checklist to Address Disproportionality

Madison (WI) Metropolitan School District
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

November 2007

Table of Contents

This project was developed to address disproportionality of students of color in special education. It was funded by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction through a mini-grant on disproportionality. The product was completed through a collaborative effort between the Madison Metropolitan School District (MMSD), the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh (UW-O), and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI).

Process

These materials were developed over a two-year period. During Year One, the UW-O research team met with MMSD staff to outline the project and set up timelines. The UW-O team then completed the research phase of the project. A comprehensive literature review around disproportionality was conducted. As well, the team reviewed IEP team records from MMSD. Seventy-five records of initial evaluations for special education and transfer records were reviewed, including files from elementary, middle, and high school. Records of students evaluated for specific learning disabilities (SLD) and/or emotional behavioral disabilities (EBD) were reviewed, as were records of some students who were white, some who were African American, and some who were Native American.

The next step was the validation process. A focus group of special education program support teachers, school psychologists, and others involved in the special education assessment process met to provide input on questions such as exclusionary factors, referral beliefs and practices, assessment factors, IEP team factors, staff needs and suggestions. Approximately one month later, a second focus group, consisting of the MMSD positive behavioral supports team, met to provide their perceptions of the pre-referral intervention process, consideration of exclusionary factors, general education experiences, and the conceptualization of the checklist. A final set of five focus group sessions were conducted with special education and program support teachers, school psychologists, related services personnel, principals, and other district administrators, for specific feedback on the draft checklist. A survey of MMSD staff on checklist items helped reduce the number.

Positive feedback on the use of checklist included the following:

- Useful in helping staff articulate professional development needs and school improvement goals;
- Led to deeper discussions about students of color and more patience in pre-referral interventions;
- Led to better documentation of pre-referral interventions and eligibility determination discussions; and,
- Caused staff to look beyond student deficits and focus more on environmental context.

Staff expressed some concerns and raised issues such as:

- Consistency in using the checklist from team to team and school to school;
- Some factors (e.g., economic disadvantage, culture) were difficult to evaluate and discuss with parents;
- More specific guidelines (e.g., how long to try an intervention before formal referral) were needed;

- Still a professional judgment call;
- Need for more support options for at risk students;
- Difficult to determine impact of factors on learning and behavior – issue of primacy; and,
- Some parents viewed discussion of factors as barriers to necessary services.

Year Two development activities were focused on implementation of the checklist. It was field tested in 10 MMSD elementary schools, with goals including:

- Sharing local subgroup data with staff to convince them the severe nature of the disproportionality problem at their school;
- Providing related staff training to <u>all</u> staff prior to implementing the checklist;
- Aligning the checklist with other existing paperwork (e.g. IEP forms) to ensure consistency;
- Integrating the implementation of the checklist with other existing structures/programs to avoid redundancy;
- Compiling a list of concrete examples of culturally responsive practice;
- Arranging opportunities for staff to observe culturally responsive practices whenever appropriate; and,
- Ensuring teacher buy-in vs. perception of a top-down approach or flashy bandwagon.

The guiding principle for implementation was *Equal Treatment Criterion of Fairness*[1]. Simply stated, this principle means "given the same behaviors or symptoms, the same decisions are made at the referral, assessment, and placement steps regardless of the race or ethnicity of the student".

As implementation continued, checklist items were continually reviewed and decisions made about combining or eliminating some items to focus in on key items and create a useable tool. In addition, two offshoots were developed – one for early childhood and one for evaluating transfer student records. Finally, draft checklists were forwarded to WDPI for review, revision, and dissemination.

Purpose

The overrepresentation of racially, culturally, ethnically and linguistically diverse (RCELD) students in special education is well documented. (For purposes of this checklist, any reference to students of RCELD shall include students of racial, cultural, ethnic, and linguistic diversity). Any effort to respond to the issue of a disproportionate number of students of RCELD being placed into special education programs must consider both external and internal factors. This is not only a special education issue and some sections of the checklist address issues broader than special education eligibility. Some sections are related to the special education evaluation process, but others look at school climate and pre-referral strategies.

---

[1] Reschly, D.J. (1988) . *Minority MMR overrepresentation and special education reform*. Exceptional Children, 54, 316-323.

The checklist is designed to assist school staff in thinking more deeply about issues and practices which may contribute to the overrepresentation of RCELD students in special education. It will help staff in identifying and discussing relevant external factors (e.g., impact of high stakes assessment and accountability demands, school district priorities and policies, etc.) and internal factors (e.g., school culture and supports, regular education teacher beliefs and practices, early intervening services, and IEP processes at the referral, evaluation, and special education eligibility determination stages).

The purpose of the checklist is to:

1. guide schools in eliminating the misidentification of students of RCELD in special education and to
2. ensure that only students with disabilities (an impairment(s) and a need for special education) are placed into special education programs based upon a comprehensive evaluation process and application of existing eligibility criteria.

This checklist is not intended to be used for teacher or program evaluation. The checklist is designed for school-age students (K-12). There is an adapted checklist for use with early childhood students, and another variation for transfer students. The process reflected in the checklist promotes a multi-tiered, problem-solving approach. This approach provides focus on early intervening services and accurate special education identification that will reduce the achievement gap and address the disproportionate representation of students of RCELD in special education.

As the checklist is used, keep in mind no one question stands alone as critical, or automatically generates a response one way or the other in a section. One must review and consider the instrument as a whole and factor in all of the responses to all of the questions when making decisions.

Related Wisconsin Requirements

In conducting appropriate assessments to determine special education eligibility, IEP teams in Wisconsin must ensure:

"That assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under this section are selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory and are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is clearly not feasible to do so."
(§115.782(2)(a) 3 a, Wisconsin Statutes)

Further, there is one exclusionary factor applicable to all disability areas:

"...The team may not determine that a child is a child with a disability if the determinant factor for the determination is lack of appropriate instruction in reading, including in the essential components of reading instruction, as defined in 20 USC 6368 (3), or lack of instruction in math, or because the child has limited proficiency in English." (§115.782 (3) (a), Wisconsin Statutes)

The Wisconsin eligibility criteria for emotional behavioral disability (EBD) does not include any exclusionary factors specific to EBD. There is a paragraph in the criteria which is neither inclusionary nor exclusionary, and reads as follow:

"The IEP team may not identify or refuse to identify a child as a child with an emotional behavioral disability solely on the basis that the child has another disability, or is socially maladjusted, adjudged delinquent, a dropout, chemically dependent, or a child whose behavior is primarily due to cultural deprivation, familial instability, suspected child abuse or socio-economic circumstances, or when medical or psychiatric diagnostic statements have been used to describe the child's behavior." [Wisconsin Administrative Code PI 11.36(7)(d)]

The Wisconsin eligibility criteria for specific learning disability (SLD) were in the process of being revised at the time this checklist was developed (2005-2007). However, IEP teams have a continuing responsibility to consider the "effects of a visual, hearing or physical (motor) disability; cognitive disability; emotional disturbance; cultural factors, environmental or economic disadvantage; or limited English proficiency on the student's achievement level." [DPI Sample Form ER-2, Additional Documentation Required When Child Is Evaluated For Specific Learning Disabilities, Item H. Available at http://dpi.wi.gov/sped/doc/form-er2.doc]

Finally, when assigning IEP team participants, it is important to remember the "spirit" of the law requires adequate expertise for decision making. The "letter" of the law establishes the minimum participants for an IEP team, but often adding more participants is good practice as the team works to gather information for sound decision making.

Sections of the Checklist: Overview

Section I : Culturally Responsive Beliefs and Practices of Schools and General Education Classrooms

This section is designed to review the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of the school-wide and general education classroom practices, services and programs. It provides a school and general classroom profile which establishes necessary context in assessing any student's academic and behavioral performance, and can be reviewed or completed annually for each school. District-wide support for the completion of this section is critical, and it is important to identify any school-wide issues which may contribute to disproportionality.

This section could be completed on an annual basis, or more frequently if circumstances warrant. Input from the responses will assist schools in developing an improvement action plan, and this could serve as part of a school improvement plan.

Section II: Culturally Responsive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (EIS), Pre-Referral Interventions, and Referral for Special Education

This section focuses on the early coordinated interventions including classroom specific supports, school wide supports, and time limited specialized support. It is more selective, since not all students' educational experiences will be reviewed and assessed at this stage. There is an assumption that school personnel will <u>not</u> view a special education referral of a student of RCELD as inevitable. Use of the checklist encourages development of appropriate supplementary services and accommodations to address a student of RCELD who has academic and behavioral concerns within the general education classroom, and is completed for each student when early intervening services are needed.

Section III: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision Making – Evaluation and Eligibility Determination

At this stage, the student has been referred for special education evaluation, during which specific issues, beliefs, and practices pertaining to special education referral, assessment, and eligibility determination are reviewed and assessed. There are three parts of the checklist in this section:

- Evaluation and eligibility determination for students K-12;
- Review of existing data, evaluation and eligibility determination for early childhood age students; and,
- Review of existing data, evaluation and eligibility determination for transfer students.

The following individuals were instrumental in the development of the checklist:

Madison (WI) Metropolitan School District, Division of Educational Services: Sara Halberg, Dr. Jack Jorgensen
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh, Special Education Department: Dr. Bert Chiang, Dr. Craig Fiedler, Dr. Barbara Van Haren
Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Special Education Team: Lynn Boreson, Dr. Donna Hart-Tervalon, Patricia Williams

Special thanks to Jerry Wieland, Green Bay Area Public Schools, for his review and comments.

The Checklist to Address Disproportionality

Section I: **Culturally Responsive Beliefs and Practices of Schools and General Education Classrooms**

School/District Name: _____

Completed by: _____

Date Completed: _____

I. Culturally Responsive Beliefs and Practices of Schools and General Education Classrooms

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondent	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)
School Culture and Supports			
1. Does the school culture support and celebrate diversity and view students of RCELD (racial, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity) as assets?		• School environment contains evidence of contributions/work from individuals with diverse backgrounds on a regular basis, not just during a special week or month • Classrooms contain evidence of contributions/work from individuals with diverse backgrounds • Students of RCELD are regularly recognized and honored for their work • Bilingual programming • Materials translated for non-English speaking families	1. The school makes little or no attempt to acknowledge and celebrate diversity. 2. The school acknowledges and celebrates diversity during a special time of the school year. 3. The school and classrooms acknowledge and celebrate diversity on a regular basis. 4. Acknowledgement and celebration of diversity permeates the school and classrooms with frequent and varied examples.
2. Does the school have a positive behavioral support system for ALL students?		• School has established procedures that emphasize positive behaviors and regularly recognizes students for displaying appropriate behaviors • School staff have been trained in the implementation of a positive behavioral support system • Classroom incentive plans for positive behavior	1. The school does not have a positive behavioral support system in place. 2. The school has begun to implement a positive behavioral support system for all students. 3. The school has implemented a positive behavioral support system for all students and staff have been trained in its use. 4. The school has implemented a positive behavioral support system for all students, staff have been trained in its use, and school staff regularly discuss the effectiveness of school-wide positive behavioral support interventions.

3. Has the school principal established an attitude amongst staff that "all students are our students" as opposed to an attitude of "my students and your students?"		• Numerous examples of regular collaboration between general and special education teachers • IEPs of students of RCELD in inclusive classes are regularly shared with general education teachers and include numerous examples of classroom accommodations/modifications • Master schedules allow maximum time for shared planning and teaching	1. The prevailing attitude of school staff fosters isolation and little or no collaborative interaction between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff (e.g., related services, ESL). 2. The prevailing attitude of school staff fosters minimal collaborative interaction between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff. 3. The prevailing attitude of school staff fosters regular collaborative interaction between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff. 4. The prevailing attitude of school staff fosters extensive and effective collaborative interaction between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff.
4. Do teachers (e.g. general education, ESL, special education) work collaboratively to support all students?		• Classroom time in general education settings is devoted to social skills instruction and problem solving skills • When necessary, students of RCELD in general education classrooms have behavioral management systems that address individual cultural differences • Peer support mentors are provided • Co-teaching observed • Co-planning observed	1. There is little or no collaboration between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff (e.g., related services, ESL). 2. There is minimal collaboration between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff. 3. There is regular collaboration between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff. 4. There is extensive and effective collaboration between general education teachers, special education teachers, and other support staff.
5. Are differentiated reading interventions (e.g., Title I, Read 180, Reading Recovery) available to students of RCELD?		• Reading teachers or specialists are providing services to students of RCELD in inclusive environments • Reading teachers/specialists are regularly consulting with general education teachers on reading interventions and the effects of the interventions • Multiple reading levels and instructional groupings are used by general education teachers • ESL, Special Ed and General Ed staff receive common professional development • When necessary, 1-to-1 reading support is provided daily	1. There are no differentiated reading interventions provided to students of RCELD in general education classrooms. All students in general education receive the same type and intensity of reading instruction. 2. General education teachers receive consultation services from special education teachers, reading teachers or other specialists periodically. There is some differentiation of reading interventions for students of RCELD in general education classrooms. 3. General education teachers receive consultation and direct services from special education teachers, reading teachers or other specialists regularly. There are numerous examples of differentiation of reading interventions for students of RCELD in general education classrooms. 4. General education teachers receive consultation and direct services from special education teachers, reading teachers or other specialists on a regular and consistent basis. There are numerous examples of differentiation of reading interventions for students of RCELD in general education classrooms.

6. Has the school adopted a problem solving approach that values assessment to drive instructional decisions?		• Problem-solving teams are active and engaged in problem solving discussions on a regular basis • Examples of problem-solving teams implemented interventions with data on targeted behavior(s) of a student of RCELD for a reasonable amount of time. • Problem-solving teams provided follow-up support and monitoring of planned interventions • Families encouraged to participate in problem solving discussions • Data from general education classroom interventions designed to provide academic and/or behavioral support to a student of RCELD	1. The school has not implemented a problem solving process to review the academic performance of students of RCELD. 2. The school has implemented a problem solving process to review the academic performance of students of RCELD. Systematic implementation and monitoring of recommended interventions is inconsistent. 3. The school has implemented a problem solving process to review the academic performance of students of RCELD. Systematic implementation and monitoring of recommended interventions is usually provided. 4. The school has implemented a problem solving process to review the academic performance of students of RCELD. Systematic implementation and monitoring of recommended interventions is always provided and there is ample evidence of revisions to interventions based upon analyzed performance data.
7. Do school teams receive sufficient administrative support when expressing concerns about meeting the needs of students of RCELD?		• Principal regularly commits additional resources to address the needs of a student of RCELD • Problem-solving teams regularly shares concerns with the administration about issues/resources impacting a students of RCELD • Professional development support is provided to assist general education teachers in meeting the needs of students of RCELD • School/home connection activities	1. There is little or no administrative support/additional resources provided to address the needs of students of RCELD. 2. On an infrequent basis there is some administrative support/additional resources provided to address the needs of students of RCELD. 3. On a regular basis there is some administrative support/additional resources provided to address the needs of students of RCELD. 4. On a regular basis there is effective administrative support/additional resources provided to address the needs of students of RCELD. School teams can count on administrative advocacy and creative problem solving in attempts to address the needs of students of RCELD.

8. Has the school established a multi-tiered model of intervention services?		• School examples of services available to all students (e.g., school-wide positive behavioral support system, instructional strategies in reading and math, differentiated curriculum, test taking strategies) • School examples of time limited specialized services for students of RCELD (e.g., extra support in the classroom, small group or 1:1 instruction, home support, tutors, after school programs) • School examples of long term intensive specialized support services for students of RCELD (e.g., collaboration with community programs, crisis response plan) • Clear guidelines and criteria have been established to move students from one tier to another	1. The school has not implemented a multi-tiered (e.g., prevention, intervention, and specialized support) model of intervention services. 2. The school has implemented a multi-tiered model of intervention services but differentiated interventions for students of RCELD in need are inconsistent. 3. The school has implemented a multi-tiered model of intervention services and there are numerous examples of differentiated interventions for students of RCELD in need. 4. The school has implemented a multi-tiered model of intervention services and the extent of differentiated interventions for students of students is significant.
Instructional Team Beliefs			
9. Do school teams actively consider other possible explanations (e.g., insufficient instruction, limited English proficiency, family risk factors) for the student of RCELD who has low achievement, rather than automatically assuming a disability?		• School and classroom environmental assessment is conducted to determine possible explanations for the problems experienced by the student of RCELD • Systematic use of curriculum-based assessment and error analyses data • Problem-solving teams recommendations focus on positive behavioral interventions & student strengths • Delineated and comprehensive referral process	1. School teams believe that general education classroom performance problems of students of RCELD primarily stem from student deficits and special education referral is the preferred option. 2. School teams believe that general education classroom performance problems of students of RCELD may not always stem from student deficits but special education referral tends to be the preferred option. 3. School teams believe that general education classroom performance problems of students of RCELD may stem from multiple issues (e.g., student deficits, cultural/linguistic/family risk factors, and mismatch between instructional and learning styles) and numerous general education classroom interventions are employed prior to special education referral. 4. School teams believe that general education classroom performance problems of students with RCELD may stem from multiple issues. Based upon a thorough analysis of the instructional environment, an extensive array of general education classroom interventions are implemented prior to special education referral.

10. Does the Instructional Team actively consider whether absence or parent/family mobility of the student of RCELD negatively impacts continuity of general education classroom instruction?		• If applicable, the instructional team discusses a student of RCELD and his/her excessive school absence or past history of mobility. • Strategies to increase attendance have been documented • Student and family support from school staff for attendance issues • Home visits	1. The impact of excessive absences or family mobility were not considered by the Instructional Team. 2. Excessive absences or family mobility were discussed by the Instructional Team, but there was no detailed analysis of the impact on the continuity of general education classroom instruction for the student of RCELD. 3. Excessive absences or family mobility were discussed by the Instructional Team with detailed analysis of the impact on the continuity of general education classroom instruction for the student of RCELD. 4. Excessive absences or family mobility were discussed by the Instructional Team with detailed and incisive analysis of the impact on the continuity of general education classroom instruction for the student with RCELD, and recommendations on how to minimize the instructional impact in the future.
11. Has the Instructional Team made concerted efforts to reach out to parents/family members of students of RCELD by fostering collaboration, mutual trust, and respect?		• School hosts events for parents/families of students of RCELD on a regular basis (e.g., potluck meals, parent groups) • School provides opportunities for parents/family members of students of RCELD to participate in regularly scheduled meetings outside the school setting (e.g, at community centers) • School administration promotes staff knowledge of diverse cultures • Problem-solving teams include parents/family members of students of RCELD in meeting discussions to formulate instructional and behavioral recommendations • Staff members offer to meet with parents outside the school setting (e.g., home visits or community sites)	1. The school has made little or no effort to collaborate with families of students of RCELD. 2. The school has made some effort to collaborate with families of students of RCELD by inviting them to school meetings. 3. The school regularly reaches out to families of students of RCELD by actively involving them in school meetings and problem solving discussions. 4. The school actively seeks the involvement and decision making input of families of students of RCELD and is committed to learning about the culture of those families and empowering them.

12. Does the Instructional Team use peer supports in the classroom?		- General education classroom instructional groupings promote heterogeneous groups of students working together - Implement flexible groupings of students for different purposes - Reading buddies - Cooperative learning groups - Cross age peer tutoring	1. The Instructional Team does not use peer supports in general education classrooms. 2. The Instructional Team sometimes uses peer supports in general education classrooms but instruction is usually whole class and teacher directed. 3. The Instructional Team regularly uses peer supports in general education classrooms and instruction is divided between whole group teacher directed and small group student directed (e.g., cooperative learning groups, peer tutoring) learning. 4. The Instructional Team regularly uses peer supports in general education classrooms and continuously seeks to empower students to take a more active responsibility for their learning and supporting each other.
13. Does the Instructional Team incorporate culturally responsive materials and content in the curricula and use culturally responsive teaching practices?		- General education classroom materials include stories and perspectives from diverse cultures - General education classroom instruction is varied (e.g., small group, cooperative learning high teacher-student interaction) - High energy and animation in the classroom, real world relevant learning activities, increased teacher-student interactions - Culturally responsive instruction including: acknowledging students' differences as well as their commonalities, validating students' cultural identities in classroom practices, educating students about diversity, promoting equity and mutual respect among students, assessing students' ability and achievement validly, motivating students to become active participants in their learning, encouraging students to think critically, challenging students to strive for excellence, assisting students in becoming socially and politically conscious - Instructional use of multiple intelligences & various learning styles	1. The Instructional Team rarely incorporates culturally responsive materials, content, and teaching practices. 2. The Instructional Team periodically incorporates culturally responsive materials and content but culturally responsive teaching practices are rarely displayed. 3. The Instructional Team regularly incorporates culturally responsive materials, content, and teaching practices. 4. The Instructional Team regularly incorporates culturally responsive materials, content, and teaching practices and school staff. School staff constantly seek to add to their knowledge of culturally responsive practices and the academic performance data of students of RCELD in general education classrooms is regularly reviewed and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of staff practices.

| 14. Does the Instructional Team actively seek to identify the reason for a RCELD student's behavior, learning or other difficulties? | | • Analyses of problem behaviors are regularly conducted to assess students of RCELD
• General education classroom examples of informal, curriculum-based, authentic assessments on academic performance of students of RCELD
• General education classroom examples of error analyses conducted on academic work of students of RCELD
• Parents are consulted to gain a better understanding of parent expectations for the student | 1. The Instructional Team does not systematically gather and analyze classroom performance data to identify the reasons for behavior, learning or other difficulties of a student of RCELD.
2. The Instructional Team periodically gathers classroom performance data but no attempt to systematically analyze that information to identify the reasons for behavior, learning, or other difficulties of students with RCELD is made.
3. The Instructional Team regularly gathers and analyzes classroom performance data to identify the r4asons for behavior, learning or other difficulties of the student of RCELD.
4. The Instructional Team regularly gathers and analyzes classroom performance data to identify the source(s) of behavior, learning, or other difficulties for the student of RCELD. This analysis of classroom performance data yields tentative hypotheses as to possible instructional environment variables that may be impact behavior, learning or other difficulties. The Instructional Team seeks to verify these tentative hypotheses by collecting student performance data. |

Instructional Team Practices

| 15. Does the Instructional Team use culturally responsive behavior management practices by considering the impact of culture on school performance of a student of RCELD? | | • General education classroom examples of understanding behavioral differences of students of RCELD (e.g., expressed preference for working individually or in groups, listening and responding style, peer interaction patterns, responses to authority, verbal and nonverbal communication, turn taking behaviors)
• General education classroom rules and procedures are accommodating to diverse student behavioral styles
• Staff confer with family about home expectations and behavior management practices
• Staff engage in self-assessments of their own cultural expectations and practices | 1. The Instructional Team does not consider the impact of culture on school performance of a student of RCELD.
2. The Instructional Team discussed the student's culture but no systematic analysis of its impact on school performance of a student with RCELD was conducted.
3. The Instructional Team discussed the student's culture and conducted a systematic analysis of its impact on school performance of a student of RCELD.
4. The Instructional Team discussed the student's culture and conducted a systematic analysis of its impact on school performance of a student of RCELD. The systematic analysis of the student's culture and potential impact on behavior included staff discussions with the family about home expectations and behavior management practices and staff self-assessments of their own cultural expectations and practices. |

16. Does the Instructional Team establish a classroom environment that accepts individual student differences and is positive, structured, and well managed?		• General education classroom examples of understanding differences of students of RCELD • General education classroom rules and procedures are accommodating to diverse student learning styles • General education classroom procedures and routines are actively taught to students with periodic reminders • General education classroom transitions are short and smooth • General education teacher-student interactions are positive	1. The Instructional Team does not establish a classroom environment accepting of student differences. The classroom environment is managed poorly and is not conducive to student learning. 2. The Instructional Team does not establish a classroom environment accepting of student differences. The classroom environment is primarily positive and well managed will all students having the same behavioral expectations. 3. The Instructional Team does allow for individual student differences in establishing its classroom environment. The classroom environment is primarily positive and well managed with some modification of classroom rules and behavioral expectations to accommodate for individual student differences. 4. The Instructional Team does allow for individual student differences in establishing its classroom environment. The classroom environment is primarily positive and well managed with extensive modification of classroom rules and behavioral expectations to accommodate for individual student differences. The classroom environment establishes a climate that celebrates student differences.
17. Does the Instructional Team set realistic, high expectations and standards for students of RCELD?		• General education teacher's expectations for achievement for students of RCELD are realistic • General education teachers set high expectations for students of RCELD • Standards-based curriculum for all students	1. The Instructional Team quite often does not maintain realistic and high expectations for the achievement of students of RCELD. 2. The Instructional Team usually maintains high expectations for the achievement of students of RCELD but quite often those high expectations are unrealistic because the Instructional Team does not regularly engage in culturally responsive teaching practices. 3. Instructional Team regularly maintains realistic and high expectations for the achievement of students of RCELD. Realistic and high expectations for students of RCELD are periodically supported by culturally responsive teaching practices. 4. Instructional Team regularly maintains realistic and high expectations for the achievement of students of RCELD. Realistic and high expectations for students of RCELD are regularly supported by culturally responsive teaching practices.
18. Are learning strategies explicitly taught to students of RCELD?		• Students are specifically taught thinking skills, specific learning strategies, cognitive behavioral skills (e.g., stop-and-think) and those skills are modeled • All teachers regularly explain how/why student's responses are correct and incorrect • Balanced literacy instruction with thinking skills taught	1. Systematic instruction in learning strategies is rarely, if ever, provided to students of RCELD. 2. Learning strategies are sometimes explicitly taught to students of RCELD in general education classrooms. 3. Learning strategies are regularly explicitly taught to students of RCELD in general education classrooms. 4. Learning strategies are regularly explicitly taught to students of RCELD in general education classrooms. Thinking skills used in completing and evaluating assignments are regularly clearly communicated to the students.

19. Does the Instructional Team accommodate the needs of students of RCELD through differentiated instruction that reflects the interests and experiences of students of RCELD?		• General education teacher employs a variety of teaching methods and materials • Students of RCELD receive additional review and practice in difficulty areas in the general education classroom • General education classroom teacher engages in direct, frequent, and continuous monitoring of instruction and student progress performance • General education classroom examples of differentiated instruction to address the needs of students of RCELD • General education classroom examples of individualized behavioral supports to address the needs of students of RCELD • Instruction builds upon existing student knowledge and experiences	1. The Instructional Team does little or no differentiated instruction for students of RCELD. 2. The Instructional Team regularly provides differentiated instruction in at least one of the five factors of instruction: (1) content = what is taught, (2) process = how content is taught, (3) product = how students demonstrate content mastery, (4) affect = how students connect their thinking and feelings, and (5) learning environment = how the classroom is designed and students are grouped. 3. The Instructional Team regularly provides differentiated instruction in 2 or 3 of the five factors of instruction (see #2 above). 4. The Instructional Team regularly provides differentiated instruction in 4 or 5 of the five factors of instruction (see #2 above).

Based on an analysis of the above statements, it is recommended that the following goals should be addressed in the improvement action plan:

The Checklist to Address Disproportionality

Section II: Culturally Responsive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (EIS) & Referral to Special Education

---

Student:_____ Student #:_____

School: _____ Grade:_____

Completed by: _____

Date completed: _____

II. Culturally Responsive Coordinated Early Intervening Services (EIS) and Referral

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondent	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)
1. Were early intervening or pre-referral services provided in a timely manner, for a reasonable duration, and with an intensive enough approach?		• Building team meets as quickly as possible after a teacher identifies a need for EIS • Clear plan for student interventions	1. Student did not make progress. The duration, frequency and intensity of intervention were below the level suggested. 2. Student did not make progress. The duration, frequency and intensity were consistent with recommendations. 3. Student did not make progress. The duration, frequency and intensity of intervention exceeded the recommendations. 4. Student making progress with prevention/early intervention supports.
2. Did the student receive a variety of services to address individual needs?		• Previous year's teachers are routinely invited to initial building team meetings to ensure a smoother transition • Counseling sessions are scheduled with students of RCELD to review expectations • A time/place for students of RCELD to receive individualized assistance with homework assignment has been established	1. One intervention has been tried. 2. At least two intervention have been tried. 3. Multiple, different strategies have been tried. 4. The team has implemented the appropriate interventions.
3. Did the student's classroom teacher initiate and receive support to select and implement appropriate interventions?		• Regular collaborative discussions to consider (a) specific accommodations for individual students, (b) teacher and staff roles and responsibilities are specified, and (c) plans for monitoring, adjusting, and providing feedback are drafted and implemented cooperatively	1. The classroom teacher works in isolation and selected interventions to improve student progress independently. 2. The classroom teacher consulted with at least one other staff member about strategies to meet the student's needs. 3. The classroom teacher consulted with other members of problem-solving teams. 4. The classroom teacher and his/her Instructional Team differentiated instruction for this student and planned strategies to minimize learning barriers during regular co-planning sessions.

4. Did systematic follow-up occur to ensure that interventions were implemented as designed and student progress was monitored?		• A team member is designated to be responsible for systematic follow-up	1. Follow-up did not occur. 2. Follow-up and progress monitoring occurred only at the end of the implementation period. Implementation lacked consistency and systematic approaches. 3. Follow-up and monitoring usually occurred. Systematic implementation and consistency may occasionally be lacking. 4. Systematic follow-up occurred and adjustments were made as needed to ensure fidelity of implementation and progress monitoring occurred regularly.
5. Were the student's parents/ family involved as an equal partner in the problem-solving process?		• Clear guidelines are established for staff to use various communication methods to report student progress to parents/family members • Staff meets with parents/families to prepare them to participate in problem solving discussions before those meetings take place.	1. The student's parents/family were not involved. 2. The student's parents/ family were informed of concerns about the student. 3. The student's parents/family were invited to participate in problem-solving but no accommodations were made for the family. 4. The student's parents/family had an equal voice in problem-solving and decision-making.
6. Were community-based services for the student and his/her family considered and offered, if appropriate?		• Parents/family members are referred to appropriate community agencies and programs • Parents can have easy access to program brochure or flyers about community based services	1. Community-based services were not considered. 2. Community-based services were discussed, but follow-up with the family to connect them to services did not occur. 3. Appropriate community-based services were considered and suggested. 4. Community-based services were considered. The student's family was able to select from several appropriate options and were assisted in accessing the desired service(s).
7. Based on review of existing data, was cultural difference considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties? .		• Building team records document discussion about cultural differences (e.g. interaction with authority figures, varied expectations of school personnel) and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. Cultural difference was not considered. 2. Cultural difference was discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Cultural difference was discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Cultural difference was discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.
8. Based on review of existing data, were excessive absences considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• Building team records document discussion about the number of excused/unexcused absences, truancies, and tardiness and the effects on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. Excessive absences were not considered. 2. Excessive absences were discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Excessive absences were discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Excessive absences were discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.

9. Based on review of existing data, were family risk factors and/or family mobility considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• Building team records document discussion about stressors in home situation such as exposure to toxic substances or violence/abuse and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties • Building team records document discussion about the number of schools attended both within and outside of the district and its effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were not considered. 2. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.
10. Based on review of existing data, were life stressors considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• Building team records document discussion about stressors (e.g. death of parent/family member, witness to violence, immigration trauma) and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties • Building team records document discussion about various environments and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. Life stressors were not considered. 2. Life stressors were discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Life stressors were discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Life stressors were discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.
11. Based on review of existing data, was mismatch between instructional and learning styles in reading and/or math considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• Building team records document discussion about curriculum changes, differentiated instruction, and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.	1. Mismatch between instructional and learning styles was not considered. 2. Mismatch between instructional and learning styles was discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Mismatch between instructional and learning styles was discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Mismatch between instructional and learning styles was discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.

12. Based on review of existing data, was environmental or socioeconomic status considered a factor contributing to the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• Building team records document discussion about environmental or socioeconomic status and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.	1. Environmental and socioeconomic status were not considered. 2. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.

Based on an analysis of the data, is there a reason to suspect the student may have an impairment?

☐ **Yes**   ☐ **No**

Discussion:

The Checklist to Address Disproportionality

Section III: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision Making – Evaluation and Eligibility Determination

Student:_____ Student #:_____

School: _____Grade:_____

Completed by: _____

Date completed: _____

This section of the checklist contains 2 parts:

A: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Assessment and Evaluation K-12
B: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Eligibility Determination K-12

A. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Assessment and Evaluation K-12

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondents	Indicators of Quality	Rubric	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were multiple measures/modalities of evaluation, including non-verbal instruments, when appropriate, conducted across settings and time and were they appropriate for the student of RCELD?		• Evaluation included standardized tests that were normed based on aculturally representative population • Evaluation included other informal, age appropriate assessments, social and language history, observations, etc. from multiple sources in multiple environments • Multiple perspectives were gathered by involving parent/family, teacher, and student (if appropriate) • Standardized tests included non-verbal measures when appropriate	1. The evaluation included no standardized tests and no informal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 2. The evaluation included some standardized tests and minimal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 3. The evaluation primarily included standardized tests, and some informal evaluations such as social history, observations, etc. 4. The evaluation was comprehensive and included multiple standardized tests, informal evaluations such as social history, observations, etc. and non-verbal measures when appropriate.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List measures of evaluation: • Other:
2. Did observations of the student of RCELD include measurable and observable data?		• Observation report provided numeric data (e.g., % of time on task or # of interruptions) • Narrative report providing possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors	1. Observation report did not provide numeric data, (e.g., % of time on task or # of interruptions; and did not include possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 2. Observation report provided minimal numeric data and minimally included possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 3. Observation report provided some numeric data, and some possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 4. Observation report provided comprehensive numeric data, and possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List data: • Other:

3. Did the evaluation team gather and consider information about the student's home and family culture?		• Evaluation included a social history with information gathered from a home visit, non-school observation, etc. • Multiple perspectives were gathered including parent/family, and student (if appropriate)	1. Evaluation included no social history with no information gathered from student or parent/family .2. Evaluation included a social history with minimal information gathered from student or parent/family 3. Evaluation included a social history with some information gathered from student or parent/family 4. Evaluation included a comprehensive social history with information gathered from student or parent/family	• IEP Evaluation Report • Types of environmental evaluation: • Other:
4. When significant social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, were appropriate personnel, including pupil services personnel, included or consulted in the evaluation activities, and were evaluation procedures individually determined?		• IEP team included appropriately qualified staff who engaged in assessment activities • Composition of IEP team and evaluation procedures were individually determined	1. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team did not include appropriate staff, and/or no individually determined evaluation procedures. 2. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included some appropriate staff and/or some individually determined evaluation procedures. 3. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included many appropriate staff and/or several individually determined evaluation procedures. 4. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included all appropriate staff and a completely individualized evaluation.	• Consent for Initial Evaluation Form & IEP Evaluation Report • Staff Involved and Activities: • Other:

5. Were parents/family members and student, as appropriate, regularly involved throughout the evaluation process?		• IEP team members routinely provided written materials according to law and in native language, made phone calls or home visits to garner parent/family member input	1. IEP team members did not involve parents/family or student, as appropriate in the evaluation process. 2. IEP team members minimally involved parents/family or student as appropriate in the evaluation process. 3. IEP team members involved parents/family or student as appropriate by providing one or more of the following: written materials according to law and in native language, phone calls or home visits, etc. to garner input through out the evaluation process. 4. IEP team members involved parents/family or student as appropriate in the evaluation process by routinely providing written materials according to law and in native language, phone calls or home visits, etc. to garner input and involvement through out the evaluation process.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Dates and documentation of parent/family contact • Other:

B. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Eligibility Determination K-12

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondents	Indicators of Quality	Rubric	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were multiple attempts to involve parents /family members made during eligibility determination?		• Alternative means for participation were offered such as teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. • Transportation was arranged for the parents/family members • Criteria documentation and checklist completed after discussion and conclusion is reached at IEP meeting	1. Minimal or no efforts were made to involve parents/family members. 2. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members. 3. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and only one alternative for participation was offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. 4. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and more than one alternative for participation was offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List evaluation tools and procedures: • Other:

| 2. Was the student's RCELD a primary explanation for learning, behavior, or other difficulties? | | | • IEP records document discussion about cultural or language differences and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties
• The student has had behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration
• Classroom or other settings provided strategies to minimize RCELD differences were provided (e.g., incorporating the student's home culture when establishing setting norms and curriculum, involving the parent and others of the same RCEL group in developing strategies, activities, and understanding of the child's background
• Specific interventions were documented | 1. No classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided.
2. Few classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism.
3. Some classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism.
4. A number of classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism. | • IEP Evaluation Report
• Other: |

3. Were excessive absences the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about the number of excused, unexcused absences, truancies, and tardiness and its effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. Student's attendance is within expectations and has not impacted the success of the student. 2. Student's attendance exceeds 10 days, but has not impacted the success of the student. 3. Student's attendance exceeds 10 days and has impacted the success of the student. 4. Student's attendance greatly exceeds 10 days considered for habitual truancy and has significantly impacted the success of the student.	• IEP Evaluation Report • # of absences and timeframe: • Other:
4. Was family mobility the primary explanation for the student's learning and behavior, or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about the number of schools attended both within and outside of the district, and the effect on student learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. The student has not attended more than one school. 2. The student has attended more than one school, but the change has not affected the continuity of instruction or success of the student. 3. The student has attended more than one school and mobility has somewhat affected the continuity of instruction and success of the student 4. The student has attended multiple (3 or more) schools and mobility has significantly affected the continuity of instruction and success of the student.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
5. Were life stressors (i.e., divorce, death of a family member) or other factors the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about stressors in home situation, exposure to toxic substances, violence/abuse • IEP records document discussion about stressors such as death of parent/family member, witness to violence and the effect on student difficulties • IEP records document discussion about various environments and the effect on student difficulties	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records document full discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List any relevant stressors: • Other:

6. Was insufficient instruction in reading and/or math the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about curriculum changes, inadequate instruction, methodology, etc. that may have lead to a lack of learning	1. The student received insufficient instruction in reading and math (2 or more of the following factors: no curriculum changes, methodology delivered as intended, and consistent exposure to instruction) and there was negative impact on student success . 2. The student received inadequate instruction in reading and math (1 or more of the following factors: no curriculum changes, methodology delivered as intended, and consistent exposure to instruction) and there was negative impact on student success. 3. The student received insufficient instruction in reading and math (no curriculum changes, methodology delivered as intended and consistent exposure to instruction) and there was no impact on student success. 4. The student received sufficient instruction in reading and math (no curriculum changes, methodology delivered as intended and consistent exposure to instruction) and there was no impact on the student's success.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
7. Were environmental and/or socioeconomic factors the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about the environment, socioeconomic status, and other cultural factors and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. The student has experienced three or more factors and the factors have impacted student's success. 2. The student has experienced two factors and the factors have impacted student's success. 3. The student has experienced one or no factors and the factors have not impacted student's success. 4. The student has experienced one or no factors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:

8. Were exclusionary factors addressed when discussing specific criteria components during eligibility determination?		• IEP records document discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 3. IEP records document some discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 4. IEP records fully document discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:

Checklist to Address Disproportionality:
Early Childhood

Student: _____ Age/DOB: _____

Environment: _____

Date completed: _____

This section of the checklist contains 3 parts:

C: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Review of Existing Data Early Childhood
D: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Assessment and Evaluation Early Childhood
E: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Eligibility Determination Early Childhood

C: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Review of Existing Data Early Childhood

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.
Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.
Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondent	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)
1. Did the child have adequate opportunities for exposure to, and participation in, experiential enrichment and developmentally appropriate activities?		• Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) or other records document discussion about opportunities for social interactions with peers and participation in developmentally appropriate activities	1. The child did not have any opportunities for enrichment and developmentally appropriate activities. 2. The child had minimal opportunities for enrichment and developmentally appropriate activities. 3. The child had adequate opportunities for enrichment and developmentally appropriate activities. 4. The child had numerous opportunities for enrichment and developmentally appropriate activities.
2. Based on review of existing data, was cultural difference considered a factor contributing to the student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy), and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs?		• IFSP or other records document discussion about cultural differences (e.g. interaction with authority figures, varied expectations of child care providers) and the effect on student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs	1. Cultural difference was not considered. 2. Cultural difference was discussed, but no analysis of was documented. 3. Cultural difference was discussed with detailed analysis of its effect documented. 4. Cultural difference was discussed with detailed and thorough analysis of its effect documented.
3. Based on review of existing data, was linguistic difference considered a factor contributing to the student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs?		• IFSP or other records document discussion about proximity expectations, topics of conversation, nonverbal communication and family expectations placed on oral and written communication and the effect on student's positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs	1. Linguistic difference was not considered. 2. Linguistic difference was discussed, but no detailed analysis was included. 3. Linguistic difference was discussed with detailed analysis was included 4. Linguistic difference was discussed with detailed and incisive analysis was included.

4. Based on review of existing data, did family risk factors and/or family mobility influence the student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs?		• IFSP or other records document discussion about family risk factors and/or stressors, and/or the effect on student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs • IFSP or other records document discussion about family mobility and its effect on student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs	1. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were not considered. 2. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed, but no analysis of their effects was included. 3. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed with analysis of their effect was included. 4. Family risk factors and/or family mobility were discussed with detailed analysis of their effects.
5. Based on review of existing data, were life stressors considered a factor contributing to the student's social-emotional skills , acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs?		• IFSP or other records document discussion about stressors (e.g. death of parent/family member, witness to violence, immigration trauma) and the effect on student's social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs	1. Life stressors were not considered. 2. Life stressors were discussed, but no analysis of their effect on the student was included. 3. Life stressors were discussed with analysis of their effect on the student included. 4. Life stressors were discussed with detailed analysis of their effect on the student included.
6. Based on review of existing data, was environmental or socioeconomic status considered a factor contributing to the student's social-emotional skills , acquisition and use of knowledge and skills , and/or use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs?		• IFSP or other records document discussion about environmental or socioeconomic status and the effect on student's positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet his/her needs	1. Environmental and socioeconomic status were not considered. 2. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed, but no detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 3. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed with detailed analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties. 4. Environmental and socioeconomic status were discussed with detailed and incisive analysis of its effect on the student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties.

Based on an analysis of the data, there is reason to suspect the child has an impairment that is not primarily a result of the external factors addressed in this section (C):

___ Yes

___ No

Comments:

D: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Assessment and Evaluation Early Childhood

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical questions	Respondents	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were multiple measures/modalities of evaluation, including non-verbal instruments when appropriate, conducted across settings and time and were they appropriate for the student of RCELD?		- Evaluation included standardized tests that were normed based on culturally representative population - Evaluation included other informal, age appropriate assessments, social and language history, observations, etc. from multiple sources in multiple environments - Multiple perspectives were gathered by involving parent/family, and teacher - Standardized tests included non-verbal measures when appropriate	1. The evaluation included no standardized tests and no informal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 2. The evaluation included some standardized tests and minimal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 3. The evaluation primarily included standardized tests, and some informal evaluations such social history, observations, etc. 4. The evaluation was comprehensive and included multiple standardized tests, informal evaluations such as social history, observations, etc. and non-verbal measures when appropriate.	- IEP Evaluation Report - List measures of evaluation: - Other:

2. Did observations of the student of RCELD include measurable and observable data?		• Observation report provided numeric data, (e.g., % of time on task or # of interruptions) • Narrative report providing possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors	1. Observation report did not provide numeric data, (e.g., % of time on task and # of interruptions); narrative report did not include possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 2. Observation report provided minimal numeric data and the narrative report minimally included possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 3. Observation report provided some numeric data, and the narrative report included some possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 4. Observation report provided comprehensive numeric data, and the narrative report included possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List data: • Other:
3. Did the evaluation team gather and consider information about the student's home and family culture?		• Evaluation included a social and language history with information gathered from a home visit, non-school observation, etc. • Multiple perspectives were gathered by involving parent/family, and student (if appropriate)	1. Evaluation included no social or language history with no information gathered from student or parents. 2. Evaluation included a social or language history with minimal information gathered from student or parents. 3. Evaluation included a social or language history with some information gathered from student or parent. 4. Evaluation included a complete social or language history with information gathered from student or parent.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Environmental evaluation • Other:

4. When significant social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, were appropriate personnel, including pupil services personnel, included or consulted in the evaluation activities, and were evaluation procedures individually determined?		• IEP team included appropriately qualified staff who engaged in assessment activities • Composition of IEP team and evaluation procedures were individually determined	1. When significant social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team did not include individually determined evaluation procedures. 2. When social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included some individually determined evaluation procedures. 3. When social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included several individually determined evaluation procedures. 4. When social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included a completely individualized evaluation.	• Consent for Initial Evaluation Form & IEP Evaluation Report • Staff Involved and Activities • Other:
5. Were parents/family regularly involved throughout the evaluation process?		• IEP team members routinely provided written materials according to law and in native language, made phone calls or home visits to garner parent/family member input	1. IEP team members did not involve parents/family as appropriate in the evaluation process. 2. IEP team members minimally involved parents/family as appropriate in the evaluation process. 3. IEP team members involved parents/family by providing one or more of the following: written materials according to law and in native language, phone calls or home visits, etc. to garner input through out the evaluation process. 4. IEP team members involved parents/family in the evaluation process by routinely providing written materials according to law and in native language, phone calls or home visits, etc. to garner input and involvement through out the evaluation process.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Dates and documentation of parent/family contact • Other:

E: Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making - Eligibility Determination Early Childhood

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Respondents	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were adequate attempts to involve parents /family members made during eligibility determination?		• Alternative means for participation were offered such as teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. • Transportation was arranged for the parents/family members • Criteria documentation and checklist completed after discussion and conclusion is reached at IEP meeting	1. Minimal or no efforts were made to involve parents/family members. 2. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members. 3. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and only one alternative for participation were offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. 4. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and more than one alternative for participation were offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc.	• IEP Cover Sheet • Other:

| 2. Was the student's RCELD a primary explanation for learning, behavior or other difficulties? | | | IEP records document discussion about cultural or language differences and the effect on student's learning, behavioral, or other difficulties The student has had behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration Classroom or other settings provided strategies to minimize RCELD differences were provided (e.g., incorporating the student's home culture when establishing setting norms and curriculum, involving the parent and others of the same RCEL group in developing strategies, activities, and understanding of the child's background Specific interventions were documented | 1. No classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided.
2. Few classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism.
3. Some classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism.
4. A number of classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided, such as: behavioral and/or academic support in their primary language at appropriate level and duration, incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and other staff/consultants of that race in developing strategies that eliminate racism. | IEP Evaluation Report Other: |

3. Was family mobility the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?		• Family mobility has not been an issue and the student has been able to attend the same school and school district or remain in the same environment (e.g., day care, preschool, etc.) continuously • When the student has attended more than one school and/or environment, there is documentation of contact with previous settings to gather relevant information and provide for reasonable continuity programming	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about mobility and its impact on the success of the student. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about mobility and its impact on the success of the student. 3. IEP records document some discussion about mobility and its impact on the success of the student. 4. IEP records document full discussion about mobility and its impact on the success of the student.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
4. Were life stressors (i.e., divorce, death of a family member, etc.) the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?		• Educationally relevant information is provided about the impact of life stressors on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties • Community resources have been identified for the family and assistance with referrals made, if appropriate • Information has been shared across agencies	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records document full discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List any relevant stressors: • Other:

5. Were environmental and/or socioeconomic factors the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?		• IEP records document discussion about the environment, socioeconomic status, and other cultural factors and the effect on student's learning, behavior, or other difficulties	1. The student has experienced three or more factors and the factors have impacted student's success. 2. The student has experienced two factors and the factors have impacted student's success. 3. The student has experienced one or no factors and the factors have not impacted student's success. 4. The student has experienced one or no factors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
6. Were all other suspected disabilities considered prior to determining a significant developmental delay during eligibility determination?		• IEP documents other disabilities considered and rejected, including reasons the student did not meet the criteria	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about other disabilities considered and reasons student did not meet criteria. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about other disabilities considered and reasons student did not meet criteria. 3. IEP records document some discussion about other disabilities considered and reasons student did not meet criteria. 4. IEP records fully document discussion about other disabilities considered and reasons student did not meet criteria.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:

42

Checklist to Address Disproportionality:
Transfer Students

Student: _____ Age/DOB: _____

School/grade: _____ Disability(ies): _____

Date completed: _____ By: _____

This section of the checklist contains 2 parts:

F. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Review of Existing Evaluation Data Transfer Students
G. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Eligibility Determination Transfer Students

F. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Review of Existing Evaluation Data Transfer Students

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were multiple measures/modalities of evaluation, including non-verbal instruments when appropriate, conducted across settings and time, and were they appropriate for the student of RCELD?	• Evaluation included standardized tests normed on culturally representative population • Evaluation included informal, age-appropriate assessments, social history, classroom observations, etc. from multiple sources in multiple environments • Multiple perspectives were gathered by involving parent/family, teacher, and student (if appropriate) • Standardized tests included non-verbal measures when appropriate	1. The evaluation included no standardized tests and no informal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 2. The evaluation included some standardized tests and minimal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 3. The evaluation primarily included standardized tests, and some informal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. 4. The evaluation was comprehensive and included multiple standardized tests, informal evaluations such as curriculum-based measures, social history, observations, etc. and non-verbal measures when appropriate.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List evaluation tools and procedures: • Other:

2. Did observations of the student of RCELD include measurable and observable data?	• Observation report provided numeric data, (e.g., % of time on task or # of interruptions) • Narrative report providing possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors	1. Observation report did not provide numeric data, (e.g., % of time on task or # of interruptions) and the report did not include possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 2. Observation report provided minimal numeric data, and the report minimally included possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 3. Observation report provided some numeric data, and the report included some possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors. 4. Observation report provided comprehensive numeric data, and the report included possible cultural reasons for identified behaviors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List data: • Other:
3. Did the evaluation team gather and consider information about the student's home and family culture?	• Evaluation included a social history with information gathered from a home visit, non-school observation, etc. • Multiple perspectives were gathered by including parent/family, and student (if appropriate)	1. Evaluation included no social history with no information gathered from student or parent/family. 2. Evaluation included a social history with minimal information gathered from student or parent/family. 3. Evaluation included a social history with some information gathered from student or parent/family. 4. Evaluation included a comprehensive social history with information gathered from student or parent/family.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Types of environmental evaluation: • Other:

4. When significant social, emotional, behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, were appropriate personnel, including pupil services personnel, included or consulted in the evaluation activities, and were evaluation procedures individually determined?	• IEP team included appropriately qualified staff who engaged in assessment activities • Composition of IEP team and evaluation procedures were individually determined	1. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team did not include appropriate staff, and/or no individually determined evaluation procedures. 2. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included some appropriate staff and/or some individually determined evaluation procedures. 3. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included many appropriate staff and/or several individually determined evaluation procedures. 4. When social/emotional/behavioral or medical concerns were expressed in the referral, IEP team included all appropriate staff and a completely individualized evaluation.	• Consent for Initial Evaluation Form & IEP Evaluation Report • Staff Involved and Activities: • Other:
5. Were parents/family members and student, as appropriate, involved throughout the evaluation process?	• Parents/family were provided written materials according to procedural requirements and in the family's native language • IEP team members made phone calls or home visits to gather parent/family input	1. IEP team members did not involve parents/family or student, as appropriate, in the evaluation process. 2. IEP team members minimally involved parents/family or student, as appropriate, in the evaluation process. 3. IEP team members involved parents/family or student, as appropriate, by providing required notices, materials in the family's native language, and seeking input through phone calls or home visits. 4. IEP team members involved parents/family or student, as appropriate, in the evaluation process by providing required notices, materials in the family's native language, and seeking input by multiple means including phone calls or home visits.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Dates and documentation of parent/family contacts: • Other:

G. Culturally Responsive IEP Team Decision-Making – Eligibility Determination
Transfer Students

Respondents: The school can determine the respondents that are best suited to complete the section of the checklist. The individuals completing this section of the checklist should have knowledge about school wide policies and practices.

Quality Indicators: Examples of best practices are offered to illustrate appropriate responses to the critical questions. The list may be edited to reflect options available locally.

Rubrics: A rubric is provided for each critical question to assess to what degree the school has addressed each item.

Note: To be as inclusive as possible, references to families within this checklist may refer to biological parents, step-parents, adoptive or foster parents, legal guardians, other family members such as grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. and to "social family members." Social family members are not biologically related members of the student's family, but, nevertheless, play an important part in the student's family life and upbringing.

Critical Questions	Quality Indicators	Rubric (Circle the # most applicable)	Evidence and Documentation
1. Were multiple attempts to involve parents /family members in eligibility determination?	• Alternative means for participation were offered such as teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. • Transportation was arranged for the parents/family members • Criteria documentation and checklist completed after discussion and conclusion is reached at IEP meeting	1. Minimal or no efforts were made to involve parents/family members. 2. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members. 3. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and only one alternative for participation was offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc. 4. Three good faith attempts were made to involve parents/family members and more than one alternative for participation was offered such as transportation was arranged to encourage attendance by parents/family members, teleconference, meeting outside of school setting etc.	• IEP Cover Sheet documentation of 3 attempts to involve parents • Other:

2. Was the student's RCELD a primary explanation for learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• Classroom strategies to minimize racial, linguistic, cultural, ethnic differences were provided (e.g., incorporating the student's home culture when establishing classroom norms and curriculum, involving the parent and others of the same RCL group in developing strategies, activities, and understanding of the child's background • Specific interventions were documented	1. IEP records indicate no discussion of classroom strategies to address the student's racial, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion of classroom strategies to address the student's racial, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion of classroom strategies to address the student's racial, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records document complete discussion of classroom strategies to address the student's racial, cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
3. Was excessive absence the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• Student's attendance is within expectations and has not impacted the success of the student • Support services (e.g., tutoring, after school assistance, etc.) have been provided to assist a student with excessive absences to make up the material missed • If appropriate, the school nurse has been involved • If appropriate, a medical excuse has been required	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about attendance and no provision of instructional support services to address excessive student absences and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion and provision of instructional support services to address excessive student absences and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion and provision of instructional support services to address excessive student absences and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records fully document discussion and ample use of instructional support services to address excessive student absences and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Attendance records • Other:

4. Was family mobility the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• Family mobility has not been an issue and the student has been able to attend the same school and school district continuously • When the student has attended more than one school and/or school district, there is documentation of contact with previous schools to gather relevant educational information and provide for reasonable continuity of instruction and curriculum	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about mobility and its impact on the continuity of instruction and success of the student. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about mobility and its impact on the continuity of instruction and success of the student. 3. IEP records document some discussion about mobility and its impact on the continuity of instruction and success of the student. 4. IEP records document full discussion about mobility and its impact on the continuity of instruction and success of the student..	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
5. Were life stressors (i.e., divorce, death of a family member, immigration trauma) the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• Educationally relevant information is provided about the impact of life stressors on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties • Community resources have been identified for the family and assistance with referrals made, if appropriate • Information has been shared across agencies	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records document full discussion about life stressors and the effect on student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • List of any relevant stressors: • Other:

6. Was insufficient instruction in reading and/or math the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• School personnel provided the student with differentiated and effective instruction in reading and math (appropriate curriculum, methodology, etc.) • School personnel established an ongoing data collection and student progress monitoring system to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional interventions	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about instruction in reading and/or math and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about instruction in reading and/or math and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion about instruction in reading and/or math and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records fully document discussion about instruction in reading and/or math and its impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
7. Were environmental and/or socioeconomic factors the primary explanation for the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties?	• School personnel documented and considered the impact of these factors on eligibility	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about environmental, cultural, and/or family socioeconomic status and the impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about environmental, cultural, and/or family socioeconomic status and the impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 3. IEP records document some discussion about environmental, cultural, and/or family socioeconomic status and the impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties. 4. IEP records document full discussion about environmental, cultural, and/or family socioeconomic status and the impact on the student's learning, behavior or other difficulties.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:

8. Were exclusionary factors addressed when discussing specific criteria components during eligibility determination?	• IEP records document discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors	1. IEP records indicate no discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 2. IEP records document minimal discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 3. IEP records document some discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors. 4. IEP records fully document discussion about environmental, socioeconomic disadvantages, and cultural factors.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other:
9. Were Wisconsin eligibility criteria discussed and was documentation of how the student met or did not meet those criteria?	• WDPI eligibility criteria checklists were used with documentation and examples of how the student met or did not meet the criteria	1. IEP records do not provide any specific information that Wisconsin eligibility criteria were addressed in the student's specific area(s) of disability. 2. IEP records provide some information that Wisconsin eligibility criteria were addressed in the student's specific area(s) of disability. 3. IEP records provide some information that most of the Wisconsin eligibility criteria were addressed in the student's specific area(s) of disability. 4. IEP records provide sufficient information that all of the Wisconsin eligibility criteria were addressed in the student's specific area(s) of disability.	• IEP Evaluation Report • Other: