

ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW

Background

Jane is a 12th grader a student receiving special education services for 43% of her day; she was last assessed for special education in XX/XX/XX, as part of her triennial evaluation. The IEP team at this time felt that previous assessments did not take into consideration second language and “strong bilingual influence” issues and changed her eligibility from Intellectual Disability (ID) to Specific Learning Disability (SLD) as her primary disability and Speech Language Impairment (SLI) as the secondary disability. Prior to this she had been identified ID since the 1st grade.

Personal Strengths

- Hard worker
- Wants to please
- Relative Strengths (low–low average range)
 - Visual Sequencing
 - Associational Memory
 - Practical Adaptive Behavior
 - Social Adaptive Behavior

Challenges

- Intellectual Disability
 - Globally very low cognitive ability
 - Conceptual Adaptive Behavior

Post Assessment Psycho-Educational Diagnosis

Meets eligibility for Intellectual Disability

Key Recommendations

- Help Jane understand her progress at school and work.
- Practice one task with repetition until mastery is obtained
- Provide opportunities for peer interactions
- Encourage Jane to ask for clarification when she is not sure of something
- Explore additional supports of XXX Regional Center
- Provide real life/functional academics
- Orchestrated leadership opportunities

Reason for Referral:

Jane was referred by the Your Town Union High School District to answer the following questions:

- 1. Does student demonstrate characteristics of a student with significant deficits in language and cognition that qualifies under specific learning disability and speech and language impairment or would the student be better identified under intellectual disability?**
- 2. What services would best support student in meeting post high-school needs and goals?**

Background:

Jane is a 12th grader a student receiving special education services 43% of her day; she was last assessed for special education in XX/XX/XX, as part of her triennial evaluation. The IEP team at this time felt that previous assessments did not take into consideration second language and “strong bilingual influence” issues and changed her eligibility from Intellectual Disability (ID) to Specific Learning Disability (SLD) as her primary disability and Speech Language Impairment (SLI) as her secondary disability. Prior to this she had been identified ID since the 1st grade.

The district psycho-educational assessment documented a scattered profile ranging from the very low to average range. This was deemed a low end estimate of her ability, given second language issues; there was also a belief regarding secondary speech and language impairment. The report also documented inconsistent adaptive behavior. At home (with the aid of an interpreter item by item) Jane’s adaptive behaviors fell in the Low Average to Average range (Conceptual: Low Average-Average range; Social: Average range; Practical: Low Average-Average range). However at school, Jane’s adaptive behavior were rated predominantly in the Very Low range with only one sub scale falling into the Low Average range (Personal Living). As the adaptive behaviors were not pervasively low across environments in at least one domain, the criteria for ID was not met.

Academic assessment documented skill levels for the following academic areas:

Oral expression: Very Low <0.1 percentile
Listening comprehension: Very Low <0.1 percentile
Written expression: Very Low <0.1 percentile
Basic reading skill: Low to Low Average 13th percentile
Reading fluency skills: Low 5th percentile
Reading comprehension: Very Low 0.2nd percentile
Mathematics calculation: Very Low – Low 2nd percentile
Mathematics problem solving: Very Low 0.4 percentile

This concurs with her performance on California Standards Tests (CST) and teacher reports.

Speech and language assessment documented all scores in Spanish and English in the Very Low range. Spanish scores were all below the 1st percentile except for one subtest score in expressive language that was at the 2nd percentile. English scores were all below the 1st percentile.

Jane's IEP team is concerned if SLD & SLI accurately identifies her disabilities or if she is better identified under ID.

Assessment Process:

- Review of application and records.
- Discussion and interviews with school staff and family: Student, Father, Mother, Translator, Director Psychological Services & School Psychologist, Resource Specialist, and Speech Language Pathologist
- Assessment plan developed.
- Formal and informal assessment, including observations.
- Conference on XX/XX/XX to discuss findings with: : Student, Father, Mother, Translator, Director Psychological Services & School Psychologist, Resource Specialist, Speech Language Pathologist, and High School Counselor.

Response to Referral Questions:

- 1. Does student demonstrate characteristics of a student with significant deficits in language and cognition that qualifies under specific learning disability and speech and language impairment or would the student be better identified under intellectual disability?**

Special education eligibility is an IEP team decision, and the CENTER team is not part of Jane's IEP team. Nonetheless, the diagnostic impression of the CENTER team strongly supports Intellectual Disability (ID) as the appropriate special education eligibility for Jane, based on record review, interviews, observations (in various classes, transitioning between classes and during assessment), and non-standardized and standardized assessment

According to the *California Code of Regulations (CCR) 3030 (b)*:

“(6) Intellectual disability means significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning, existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period that adversely affects a child's educational performance.”

Jane meets all four of the criteria for ID (for an in depth explanation of these criteria see Appendix below).

1) Significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning,

Jane's general intellectual functioning falls in the very low range of her peers (<0.1 percentile). Unlike an individual with an SLD who has an otherwise normal cognitive ability profile with the exception of a processing area deficit, Jane - with the exception of a few processing area relative (low to low average range) strengths - has a very low cognitive ability profile (see Assessment Data). These specific areas of relative strength should be tapped to facilitate her educational development. However, expectations for progress should be mitigated by understanding how having a relative strength is compromised by other processing areas, because the real world rarely, if ever, only requires one narrow processing area to problem solve.

Previous concerns regarding second language and bilingualism were considered. However:

- Current assessment results indicate there is no difference between her language ability in Spanish and English as both are significantly delayed
- the rest of her cognitive profile is similarly as significantly low as her language
- ID better explains her language performance than an SLI

2) Existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior

Jane's adaptive behavior deficit in the conceptual domain falls in the very low to low range (2nd – 4th percentile). The conceptual domain involves competently acquiring practical knowledge, solving everyday real world problems, and using good judgment in novel situations. Jane's estimates may be high given observations and interviews with parents and staff. Jane is quick to try and please those around her. It may appear that she is doing a task independently without being asked, when in fact she is being prompted by copying what others around her are doing. These tasks are then prompt dependent, not independent. There is a noticeable difference when in unfamiliar situations or environments. Jane has difficulty generalizing from past experiences to novel situations. Jane requires support in order to plan, organize, set priorities, and be cognitively flexible. She is more concrete in her problem solving than her peers. Global cognitive delays are often associated with conceptual domain deficits.

3) And manifested during the developmental period

The developmental period is before the age of 18. Jane's was initially identified as ID in the first grade, placing her well within the developmental period.

4) That adversely affects a child's educational performance

Given that Jane's educational performance is consistent with her cognitive ability estimate (very low range), Jane' meets eligibility for ID.

2. What services would best support student in meeting post high-school needs and goals?

Currently Jane is receiving many opportunities to support her post high school goals.

- Workability- Jane has had the opportunity to work with multiple businesses
 - Sears
 - Grocery Outlet
- Regional Occupation Program- Floral Design offered at Your Town High School
- Culinary class- This is an area of interest on the Individual Transition Plan (ITP) that has be integrated into her high school schedule.
 - Supports school functions (football snack shack)
 - Earns college credit
 - Class will visit local Junior college to observe culinary program

Jane's educational team has worked very hard to create an individualized program that considers her interests, strengths, and preferences, placing her in mostly general education classes. Jane's need to develop independence with safety, focus on "real life" academics and to build self-advocacy skills may warrant additional adjustments to her current school schedule.

Self-Awareness

Jane has a difficult time with self-reporting on her progress. When asked about her workability placement at Sears last spring and why it ended, she was not able to give a clear answer. She was placed with an understanding employer who had extensive experience with special education students. With direct instruction, job repetition and frequent check-ins with her job coach, she was not able to retain directions and complete simple tasks (vacuuming, cleaning). Jane, stated that she **was** following directions and completing tasks correctly; she was not aware that her perception was incorrect.

Suggestions for this year's placement at Grocery Outlet include:

- Practice one task with repetition until mastery is obtained.
- Add additional tasks one at a time until each is mastered without losing previously mastered tasks.
- Provide visual supports that outline tasks step by step so that Jane can double check independently. These may be photographs, words, or a combination of both.
- Check for her understanding before allowing her to work independently. Have her restate and demonstrate steps from beginning to end before beginning.

- Provide positive reinforcement so that Jane is aware when she is doing something well.
- Allow daily “check ins” with supervisor or job coach.

Within Jane’s classrooms, she also lacks the awareness of her progress. She does not know how she is doing. During interviews with her teachers it was reported that she does not ask questions for clarification or voluntarily participate in class discussions. This was also observed during assessment with CENTER assessors. When Jane was given explanation to unknown questions, she would often say, “Ohhhh!”, giving the impression that she then understood. When further questioned it became very apparent that she still did not understand. Within the classroom there are several strategies that will provide feedback to Jane.

- Call on her in class to facilitate active participation.
 - Have her report known information.
 - Answer yes/no questions.
 - Provide a fill in the blank answer for her to complete.
- Come up with an agreed upon cue that signifies the need for help.
 - During assessment Jane was able to “give a look” to one of the CENTER assessors to signal that she was unsure of her response or how to proceed.
- Repeatedly check on her throughout the period to make sure she is keeping up.
 - This was an effective strategy observed in her government class during an on-line assignment in the computer lab. Jane was able to stay focused and complete the assignment independently.

Build Independence with safety

Jane will need to develop increased independence before completing her education. She is vulnerable to the behaviors and actions of others and does not have the ability to advocate for herself effectively. She could benefit from an adult program that would support and incorporate skills to increase her independence.

- Mobility training using local bus line
- Attendance at community college with similar aged peers
- Opportunities to choose courses that would lead to certification of interest such as Day Care paraprofessional, culinary, or working with animals
- Age appropriate opportunities to build communications skills
- Structured opportunities to practice social pragmatics
- Exploration of emergency services offered in the Your Town area

Jane and her family are encouraged to elicit the support of additional agencies that can also provide support.

- Regional Center: (www.regionalcenter.org) Regional Center supports can help with:
 - family support
 - planning, placement, and monitoring for 24-hour out-of-home care
 - training and educational opportunities for individuals and families
 - community education about developmental disabilities
- Conservatorship may be an option to explore to expand the rights and ability for Jane's parents to continue to support her legally. (See Resources.)

Real Life Academics

While Jane has voiced her opinion in not attending the Life Skills class at Your Town High School, she could benefit from instruction that is presented in a hands-on fashion and focuses on practical, real-life academics. Her current class schedule offers some application to real life:

- Government- political party, voting in elections, branches and role of government
- Culinary Arts- cooking, reading recipes, selecting healthy foods, safety in the kitchen
- Spanish- increasing language skills to converse with family members
- Floral Design- hands on skills, job skill

Additional needs for practical academics are in the areas of math and reading. Jane could benefit from strengthening her skills using time and money. Reading text tied to community events, social situations, recipes, bus schedules etc. would also make reading applicable to her daily life.

One way to incorporate math and reading academics is within her Workability experiences:

- Math:
 - Time-time on the job, how much time it takes to get to/from job, starting/ending time, break time
 - Money- hourly wage, understanding pay check, budgeting amount of money needed for personal items
- Reading:
 - Steps of new task, description of job skills needed, reviewing interview questions, job applications.

Jane would be an excellent mentor to others who could benefit from real life academics. She stated that she was interested in becoming a Teacher's Assistant within the Life Skills classroom. This would provide Jane the chance to demonstrate leadership skills, share her knowledge with others and take advantage of incidental learning while being present in the classroom.

Assessment Data:

Throughout the report standardized test scores are provided followed by discussion of how a student's performance is best interpreted. The qualitative descriptors used to label these standardized scores are not consistent across test makers. Some tests have wider or narrower ranges, different labels, or the same label but for a much different area. This often makes for confusing interpretations. Therefore, for the sake of statistical consistency and logical interpretation, we will be using the descriptors below. The following chart provides descriptive ratings for Standard Scores (means of 100 and standard deviations of 15), and Scaled Scores (means of 10 standard deviations of 3) for normally distributed norm-referenced tests:

Descriptive Rating	Standard Score	Scaled Score	Percentile Rank
Very Superior	>130	>16	≥98
Superior	120-130	14-16	92-98
Above average	110-120	12-14	75-92
Average	90-110	8-12	25-75
Low Average	80-90	6-8	9-25
Low	70-80	4-6	2-9
Very Low	<70	<4	≤2

Cognitive Processing

The chart below reports scores from selected subtests from the Woodcock Johnson IV Cognitive Ability (WJ-IV) and Kaufman Ability Battery for Children 2nd Edition (KABC-II), organized by cognitive ability area. KABC-II scaled scores are converted to standard scores for ease of interpretation. Cells that are darkened represent overall estimates of a Broad Ability Category. Lightly darkened cells directly above a darkened cell are the subtests that make up a Broad Ability Category, identified by the Specific Narrow Ability being assessed.

Gc – Verbal Comprehension-Cognitive Expression

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Oral Vocabulary (WJ-IV)	Comprehension & Knowledge (Language)	Language Development & Lexical Knowledge	54	0.1	Very Low
General Information (WJ-IV)	Comprehension & Knowledge (Language)	General Verbal Information	49	<0.1	Very Low
Story Recall (WJ-IV)	Comprehension & Knowledge (Language)	Listening Ability	63	1	Very Low - Low
Verbal Knowledge (KABC-II)	Comprehension & Knowledge (Language)	General Verbal Information & Lexical Knowledge (receptive)	65	1	Very Low

	Comprehension & Knowledge (Language) WJ-IV		49	<0.1	Very Low
--	--	--	----	------	----------

Language is the ability to apply the breadth and depth of acquired knowledge such as language, culture, adaptive and academic skills. It can be viewed as a product of what an individual has had the opportunity to invest in learning about. Previous language assessment had scores predominantly below the 1st percentile in both Spanish and English. As can be seen above all areas of language currently assessed are also this pervasively low. This is not a bilingual, second language issue, and is commensurate with other cognitive ability areas.

Gf – Fluid Reasoning-Cognitive Conceptualization & Attention

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Number Series (WJ-IV)	Fluid Reasoning	Induction & Quantitative Reasoning	46	<0.1	Very Low
Concept Formation (WJ-IV)	Fluid Reasoning	Induction & Quantitative Reasoning	54	0.1	Very Low
Analysis - Synthesis (WJ-IV)	Fluid Reasoning	Induction & Quantitative Reasoning	83	12	Low to Average
Story Completion (KABC-II)	Fluid Reasoning	Induction & General Sequential Reasoning	80	9	Low to Low Average
Rover (KABC-II)	Fluid Reasoning	General Sequential Reasoning	75	5	Low
	Fluid Reasoning EXT		54	0.1	Very Low

Reasoning (also called fluid reasoning) is the ability to solve novel problems without relying on previous situations or solutions. Previous assessment had overestimates of this overall area, most likely because of those subtests' over reliance on random, multiple choice successful responses and a narrow ability strength area in visual processing (Serial Perceptual Integration), which is responsible for the two subtests (Analysis-Synthesis of the WJ-IV and Story Completion of the KABC-2) indicating a slight relative strength area (between the 9th and 12th percentile). When tasks do not tap this visual sequencing area, Jane's Fluid reasoning fall into the Very Low to Low range.

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Verbal Attention (WJ-IV)	Short Term Working Memory	Working Memory Capacity & Attention Control /	57	0.2	Very Low

Executive functions are cognitive processes that organize, manage and regulate resources to complete a task or achieve a goal. One executive function is working memory. Working memory requires the ability to initiate and organize information, often requiring a person to filter out what is important, what is not, and prioritize.. Jane's working memory also falls in the very low range.

Gs – Processing Speed – Sensory Motor Integration

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Letter-Pattern Matching (WJ-IV)	Processing Speed	Perceptual Speed	80	10	Very Low to Average

Jane's processing speed is an area of relative strength and benefits from her visual sequencing relative strength, discussed above in Reasoning.

Ga – Auditory Processing

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Verbal Attention (WJ-IV)	Auditory Processing	Memory for Sound Patterns	57	0.2	Very Low
Phonological Processing (WJ-IV)	Auditory Processing	Memory for Sound Patterns /	60	0.4	Very Low

Auditory Processing is the broad ability to perceive, process, and use aural information. It includes being able to: identify the key components of auditory information; analyze similarities, differences, patterns (sequential) and categories, as well as store and retrieve auditory information such as blending sounds for reading (phonological processing). Jane's ability to recall sound patterns falls in the very low range. Learning to read phonetically was very difficult for Jane. Given her relative visual sequencing strength, developing sight vocabulary has been a beneficial strategy for her.

Glr – Long Term Retrieval- Cognitive Association

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Story Recall (WJ-IV)	Long Term Retrieval	Meaningful Memory & Naming Facility	63	1	Very Low - Low
Phonological Processing (WJ-IV)	Long Term Retrieval	Speed of Lexical Access & Word Fluency	60	0.4	Very Low
Visual - Auditory Learning (WJ-IV)	Long Term Retrieval	Associative Memory	75	5	Low to Low Average
Verbal Knowledge (KABC-II)	Long Term Retrieval	Associative Memory	65	1	Very Low
	Long Term Retrieval WJ-IV		66	1	Very Low - Low

Long Term Retrieval is the broad ability to store what is learned (ideas, names, concepts, etc.) in long term memory and be able to fluently recall it later through association. Long Term Retrieval often involves retrieval of information that is language based. For Jane, long term retrieval of information falls in the very low range. Jane's ability to recall improves, when she is supported by visual, and falls in the low range.

Gc – Visual Processing

Subtest	Broad Ability Category	Specific Narrow Ability	Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
Visualization (WJ-IV)	Visual Processing	Visualization	75		Very Low – Low Average
Picture Recognition (WJ-IV)	Visual Processing	Visual Memory	64		Very Low – Low
Rover (KABC-II)	Visual Processing	Visualization	75	5	Low
	Visual Processing WJ-IV		64	1	Very Low - Low

Visual Processing is the broad ability to perceive, process, and use visual spatial information. It includes being able to: identify the key components of visual information; analyze similarities, differences, patterns (sequential) and categories; as well as store and retrieve visual information. As mentioned above, visual processing (especially visual sequential processing) is an area of relative strength, placing her in the low to low average range. However, memory and the more abstract processing of visual information, places her in the very low range.

Overall Estimate of Cognitive Ability

			Standard Score	Percentile Rank	Range (C.I. 90%)
		General Intellectual Ability (WJ-IV)	47	<0.1	Very Low

Adaptive Behavior Assessment System 3rd Edition

ABAS-3 Scores	Parents			Teacher		
	Scaled Score	%tile Rank	Range	Scaled Score	%tile Rank	Range
Communication	4	2	Very Low-Low	4	2	Very Low-Low
Community Use	4	2	Very Low-Low	7	16	Low Average
Functional Academics	5	5	Low	6	9	Low – Low Average
Home Living	7	16	Low Average			
School Living				8	25	Low Average - Average
Health and Safety	7	16	Low Average	7	16	Low Average
Leisure	4	2	Very Low-Low	5	5	Low
Self-Care	9	37	Average	9	37	Average
Self-Direction	4	2	Very Low-Low	7	16	Low Average
Social	6	9	Low – Low Average	6	9	Low – Low Average

Composite	Standard Score	%tile Rank	Range	Standard Score	%tile Rank	Range
Global Adaptive Composite (GAC)	74	4	Very Low-Low	78	7	Low – Low Average
Conceptual	70	2	Very Low-Low	74	4	Very Low-Low
Social	79	8	Low –Low Average	78	7	Low – Low Average
Practical	79	8	Low –Low Average	85	16	Low Average

Previous district's adaptive behavior ratings were done with what was available, which included translation of each item. This may have caused those scores to be inflated. Current questionnaire was one developed in Spanish, and an interpreter was on hand to discuss any items that may have been difficult for the parents to answer. Subscale scores that contribute to the Conceptual Domain are bolded for ease of identification. These scores between school and home are very consistent with significant weakness in the conceptual domain with relative strengths in practical and social (low to low average range). At school Jane may appear more self-directed, but that has to do with being a very good rule follower and copying the behaviors of others.

Academic Assessment

Kaufman Test of Educational Achievement, Second Edition (KTEA-III)

The KTEA-III is a comprehensive measure of educational achievement. Results of the subtest given indicate that Jane has stronger rote skills than skill in applying the skills she has learned. In Math, she used TouchMath to add and subtract. She was not consistent in her ability to regroup double and triple digit numbers. She was able to follow the steps but made errors in her math facts. She consistently had difficulty solving items with time and money. With a relative strength in spelling she was not able to write sentences that answered questions. Errors in punctuation, language, and content were noted.

Subtest	Standard Score	Percentile
Letter & Word Recognition	70	2
Reading Comprehension	40	<.01
Math Computation	69	2
Math Concepts & Applications	40	<.01
Spelling	72	3
Written Expression	40	<.01

Kaufman Functional Academic Skills Test (K-FAST)

The K-FAST is an achievement test that provides a measure of the student's ability to apply academic skills to functional daily living skills. The test items reflect real life situations that might occur within the school setting as well as outside the school setting. Items that involved the use of time and money were difficult for Jane. She was able to interpret information (number of items) from a graph correctly. In reading she was able to read and describe community signs (entrance, exit, restroom, push, out, closed), but demonstrated difficulty following the directions of a recipe.

Subtest	Standard Score	Percentile
Arithmetic	55	<1
Reading	80	9
Functional Academic Skills Composite Score	66	1

Take Charge for the Future- Jane completed a Take Charge for the Future inventory that suggests she is able to do many tasks at home independently as listed below. Several of her answers marked “Yes” were refuted by other sources (teacher/parent). These have been marked with an “*”. Lack of understanding of the question or her desire to please are possible explanations.

Activity	Yes	No
Get up in morning independently	X	
Use phone	X	
Pay for things at store	X	
Ride public bus		X
Order for self at restaurant		X
Use computer	X	
Check out books at library		X
Have own bank account		X
Fill out job applications	X	
Do fun things with groups after school		X
Turn homework in on time	X	
Do chores at home	X	
Know how adults at school can help with future plans	X	*
Make after-school snack	X	
Can say no, when I need to	X	*
Comb hair everyday	X	
Look people in the eye when I talk with them	X	
Go to school meetings	X	*
Do laundry	X	*
Take daily shower	X	
Make bed	X	
Have California ID	X	*
Shop for food	X	
Have a part time job	X	*
Use the internet	X	
Keep up with news	X	*
Know how to use phone book	X	*
Brush teeth daily	X	
Call friends on the phone		X
Choose what I wear	X	
Answer the phone	X	
Use microwave independently	X	

Resources:

Conservatorship Information

www.usegoogletofindinformationinyourcounty.org

Regional Center

www.regionalcenter.org

Appendices:

Explanation of Intellectual Disability (ID) Criteria

California Code of Regulations (CCR) 3030 (b):

“(6) Intellectual disability means significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning, existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period that adversely affects a child's educational performance.”

1. Significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning,
2. Existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior
3. And manifested during the developmental period
4. That adversely affects a child's educational performance

The four vague criteria in CCR 3030 (b) (6) are defined in other documents: Social Security Administration Recommendation 2010; Diagnostic Statistical Manual Fifth Edition summary; and American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. These are used to help clarify how an individual can meet these four criteria in order to qualify as ID below.

1. Subaverage general intellectual functioning is defined as a standardized, overall intelligence/cognitive ability score, falling 2 standard deviations below the mean including the standard error of measurement. Therefore if the mean of a standardized overall intelligence/cognitive ability score is 100 and the standard deviation is 15 a score of 70 ± 5 (which is $100 - (2 \times 15) \pm 5$ the standard error of measurement which is $1/3$ of the standard deviation) would be considered subaverage.
 - a. There is also discussion that an overall ability measure often does not necessarily adequately capture the variability of intellectual functioning when individual processing areas are significantly different.
 - b. Therefore, looking at an individual processing areas of strength and weakness are often more helpful, especially when developing programs to support these individuals.
2. Deficits in adaptive behavior are defined as overall measures of adaptive functioning in one of three domains: Conceptual, Practical or Social domain, that are significantly impaired requiring ongoing support to be able to function in one or more settings (school, home, community, or work).
 - a. The level of severity of ID (Mild, Moderate, Severe, or Profound) is based on the level on-going support required and not overall Intelligence/cognitive ability score
 - b. Deficit area of adaptive functioning has to be directly related to intellectual impairments defined above. This is often taken to mean that adaptive behavior measures should be approximately as low as intellectual/cognitive ability measures.
3. Manifested during the developmental period in all sources refers to before the age of 18. This is because ID is a developmental disorder and support services for such a disability would necessitate it's identification prior to age 18.

4. Educational performance is defined by The US State Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) in a March 8th, 2007 Letter to Clarke, (<https://www2.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/letters/2007-1/clarke030807disability1q2007.pdf>)

The letter states: “the Department’s position that the term “educational performance” as used in the IDEA and its implementing regulations is not limited to academic performance...in conducting an evaluation, the public agency must use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental and academic information. Therefore, IDEA and the regulations clearly establish that the determination about whether a child is a child with a disability is not limited to information about the child’s academic performance.”

Therefore, a comprehensive definition of “educational performance” includes all aspects of how a child functions at school with respect to: academic, cognitive, communication, independent living, social/emotional and vocational skills.