Preface: Historical Definitions

- **DSM I** (p. 18)
  - Chronic Brain Syndrome: These categories are provided for the group of mental disturbance formerly diagnosed as secondary mental deficiency. Clinically, a general developmental defect of mentation is superimposed on the chronic brain syndrome, and when prominent may require the addition of the qualifying phrase, e.g., Mental deficiency. The degree of defective intelligence will be specified as mild, moderate, or severe, and the current IQ rating will be added to the diagnosis (see Mental deficiency).

Sources: American Psychiatric Association (1952)

- **DSM II** (p. 14)
  - Mental retardation refers to subnormal general intellectual functioning that originates during the developmental period and is associated with impairment of either learning and social adjustment or maturation, or both.
    - SB IQ 68-85 = Borderline; 52-67 = Mild

Sources: American Psychiatric Association (1968, 1980)
Preface: Historical Definitions

• DSM III-R (p. 28)
  - The essential features are: (1) significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning, accompanied by (2) significant deficits or impairments in adaptive behavior, with (3) onset before age of 18.

• DSM IV (p. 39)
  - The essential feature of mental retardation is significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning (Criterion A) that is accompanied by significant limitations in adaptive functioning in at least two of the following skill areas: communication, self-care, home living, social/interpersonal skills, work, leisure, health and safety (Criterion B). The onset must occur before age 18 years (Criterion C).


Preface: Historical Age of Onset Criteria

• 1908
  - A state of mental defect from birth, or form an early age, due to incomplete cerebral development (Tredgold, p. 2).

• 1937
  - A state of incomplete mental development (Tredgold, p. 4).

• 1941
  - A state of social incompetence, obtained at maturity, or likely to obtain at maturity, resulting from developmental arrest of constitutional origin (Doll, p. 215).

• 1959
  - ... which originated during the developmental period (i.e., birth through approximately 16 years; Heber, p. 3).

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 9)

Preface: Historical IQ Cutoff Criteria

• 1959
  - Less than one standard deviation below the population mean of the age group involved on measures of general intellectual functioning (Heber, p. 3).

• 1961
  - Greater than one standard deviation below the population mean (Heber, p. 3).

• 1973
  - Two or more standard deviations below the population mean (Grossman, p. 11).

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 10)

Preface: Historical Adaptive Behavior Cutoff Criteria

• 2002
  - Performance that is at least two standard deviations below the mean of either (a) one of the following three types of adaptive behavior: conceptual, social, or practical or (b) and overall score on a standardized measure of conceptual, social, and practical skills (Luckasson et al., p 76).

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 10)
Preface: AAIDD Assessment Framework

- Functions (and questions) of the assessment
  1. Diagnosis
     • Is the student a person with ID?
  2. Classification
     • Does the student require special education?
  3. Planning/development of support system
     • What are the IEP goals and objectives?

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 21-25)

- Function (and methods) of the Assessment
  1. Diagnosis
     • IQ tests
  2. Classification
     • Adaptive behavior scales
     • Age of onset documentation
     • History
     • Social & educational record review

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 21-25)

Preface: AAIDD Assessment Framework

- Function (and methods) of the Assessment
  2. Classification
     • Levels of adaptive behavior
     • IQ range or levels
     • Environmental measures
     • Etiology-risk factors
     • Mental health measures

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 21-25)

Preface: AAIDD Assessment Framework

- Function (and methods) of the Assessment
  3. Planning/development of support system
     • Speech/language, motor, sensory assessment
     • Achievement tests
     • Functional behavioral assessment
     • Functional analysis assessment

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 21-25)

Workshop Objectives

From this workshop it is hoped that participants will increase their ...  
1. understanding of the clinical, Federal (IDEA), and California definitions of criteria for ID.
2. ability to conduct ID eligibility evaluations.
3. understanding of special issues associated with ID eligibility evaluations.

Workshop Outline

1. Intellectual Disability (ID) Defined
2. Identifying ID for Special Education Eligibility Purposes
3. Special Issues
4. The ID Psycho-educational Report Template
Identifying Intellectual Disability:  
Guidance for the School Psychologist  

**Current Terminology**

- On Tuesday, October 5, 2010, President Obama signed into law S. 2781 (“Rosa’s Law”).
- Changed references in Federal statutes (including IDEA) that referred to “mental retardation” to refer, instead, to “intellectual disability.”
- The story behind Rosa’s Law (video)

**APA Definition**

**DSM V proposal:** Intellectual Developmental Disorder

A. Intellectual Developmental Disorder is characterized by deficits in general mental abilities such as reasoning, problem solving, planning, abstract thinking, judgment, academic learning and learning from experience. Intellectual Developmental Disorder requires a current intellectual deficit of approximately 2 or more standard deviations in Intelligence Quotient (IQ) below the population mean for a person’s age and cultural group, which is typically an IQ score of approximately 70 or below, measured on an individually administered IQ test (for infants, a clinical judgment).

B. Concurrent deficits or impairments in present adaptive functioning (i.e., the person’s effectiveness in meeting the standards expected for his or her age by this or her cultural group) in at least two of the following areas: communication, self care, home living, social/interpersonal skills, use of community resources, self-direction, functional academic skills, work, leisure, health, and safety

C. The onset is before age 18 years.

Code based on degree of severity reflecting level of intellectual impairment:
- **317.0** Mild Intellectual Retardation: IQ level 50-55 to approximately 70
- **318.1** Severe Intellectual Retardation: IQ level 25-40 to approximately 50
- **318.2** Profound Intellectual Retardation: IQ level below 25 or 22

Source: American Psychiatric Association (2012)

**WHO Definition**

**ICD 10** (pp. 369-370): Mental Retardation

- A condition of arrested or incomplete development of the mind, which is especially characterized by impairments of skills that contribute to the overall level of intelligence, i.e., cognitive, language, motor, and social abilities. Retardation can occur with or without any mental or physical condition. Degrees of mental retardation are conventionally estimated by standardized intelligence tests. These can be supplemented by scales assessing social adaptation in a given environment. These measures provide an approximate indication of the degree of mental retardation. The diagnosis will also depend on the overall assessment of intellectual functioning by a skilled diagnostician. Intellectual abilities and social adaptation may change over time, and, however poor, may improve as a result of training and rehabilitation. Diagnosis should be based on the current levels of functioning.


**AAIDD Definition: Intellectual Disability**

- **Intellectual Disability** (p. 1)

  - Intellectual disability is characterized by significant limitations both in intellectual functioning and in adaptive behavior as expressed in conceptual, social, and practical adaptive skills. This disability originates before age 18.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010)
IDEA Definition: Intellectual Disability

- According to the Code of Federal Regulations “intellectual disability” (formerly referred to as mental retardation) is a term, used to describe a student with a disability who needs special education and related services.
- More specifically...

Source: CFR, Title 34, Chapter III, Part 300, §300.8 (Child with a disability), (a)(1)

California Definition

- According to the California Code of Regulations intellectual disability is defined behaviorally (no label has been used). More specifically...
  - A pupil has significantly below average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affect a pupil’s educational performance.

Source: CCR, Title 5, Division 1, Chapter 3, Subchapter 1, Article 3.1, §3030(h)

Discussion

- Looking back at the historical definitions and criteria (associated with what we now refer to as intellectual disability)...
  - What are the significant changes that have occurred?
  - Do these changes create any opportunities?
  - Do they create any challenges?
  - The power of words

Workshop Outline

1. Intellectual Disability (ID) Defined
2. Identifying ID for Special Education Eligibility Purposes
3. Special Issues
4. The ID Psycho-educational Report Template

Numbers in Selected Eligibility Categories (U.S. 1991-2010)
Identifying ID: Three Criteria

1. Age of onset
   ▫ “...manifested during the developmental period...”
2. Intellectual functioning
   ▫ “…significantly below average general intellectual functioning...”
3. Adaptive behavior
   ▫ “…deficits in adaptive behavior...”

Sources: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 27-28); CCR, Title 5, §3030[h]

Identifying ID: Age of Onset

• Manifest during the developmental period.
  ▫ Age at which the disability began.
• Purpose is to distinguish ID from other forms of disability that may occur later in life.
  ▫ ID typically originates close to birth.
  ▫ Sometimes, ID may originate later.
  ▫ Thus, ID does not necessarily have to have been diagnosed, but must have begun, during the developmental period.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 27-28)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

• “Although far from perfect, intellectual functioning is currently best represented by IQ scores when they are obtained from appropriate, standardized and individually administered assessment instruments.”
  ▫ “A single dimension of intelligence continues to garner the most support within the scientific community.”

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 31-34)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

• “…an IQ score that is approximately two standard deviations below the mean, considering the standard error of measurement for the specific assessment instruments used and the instruments’ strengths and limitations.”

[Emphasis added]

• Discussion:
  ▫ Why is the word “approximately” used in the AAIDD definition?

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 27)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

• There is no “hard and fast cutoff point/score” for ID.
  ▫ “A fixed point cutoff score for ID is not psychometrically justifiable.”
    ▫ Due to the fact that an individual’s true score is a hypothetical construct.
• Discussion
  ▫ What is the “true score” on a measure of intelligence?

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 36-41)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

• Issues to consider when evaluating an obtained score include:
  ▫ Measurement Error
  ▫ Test Fairness/Differences
  ▫ The Flynn Effect
  ▫ Practice Effect
  ▫ “Although the statistical reliability of most scales, especially intellectual, is well established before the test is published, it is still important ... that professionals carefully consider the possible statistical error in any score, the variability of scores across different tests, and the importance of the testee’s physical limitations, motivation, and cultural background.”

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 36-41, p. 82)
Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- Measurement Error
  - No IQ test is 100% reliable.
  - All psychological tests are associated with some degree of measurement error
  - Standard error of measurement (SEM) is an estimate of this error.
  - SEM is directly related to a test’s reliability

\[ SEM = SD \sqrt{1 - r} \]

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 36)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- Measurement Error
  - No IQ test is 100% reliable.
  - SEM is obtained by multiplying the standard deviation (SD) of the test by the square root of 1 minus the reliability coefficient of the test.
  - For example, the WISC-IV (2003) has a SD of 15 and an internal consistency reliability coefficient of .97, thus...

\[ SEM = 15 \sqrt{1-.97} = 15(0.17) = 2.6 \text{ (round up to 3)} \]

SEM is used to develop confidence intervals (CI).


Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- Measurement Error
  - The formula for a CI is
    \[ \text{Obtained IQ score} \pm z(SEM) \]
  - The “z” in this formula refers to the z score obtained from a normal curve table.
  - 68% of error scores = \[ z \pm 1 \]
    - 1(3) = 3
  - 90% of error scores = \[ z \pm 1.65 \]
    - 1.65(3) = 4.95 (or 5)
  - 95% of error scores = \[ z \pm 1.96 \]
    - 1.96(3) = 5.88 (or 6)

For example, for an obtained IQ score of 70 on an IQ test with a SEM of 3, we are 68% confident that the true score is 70±3 (or 67-73).

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 38)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- Test Fairness
  1. Requirements for a verbal response from individuals who have severely limited verbal abilities.
  2. Testing individuals of diverse ethnicity or culture.
  3. Test Differences

Significantly different results can be obtained from different tests.

SBIV yielded significantly higher scores than did the WISC-III for students with mild retardation.

Sources: Lukens & Hurrell (1996); Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 36, 38)

Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- The Flynn Effect
  - IQ scores have been increasing from one generation to the next by about 0.33 point per year.
  - Consequently, Flynn has suggested that obtained IQ scores be adjusted 0.33 points for each year the test was administered after standardization.
  - WISC IV (2003), 9 years = 2.97 (or 3).
  - Hence 2SD below the mean could be 70±3
  - Factoring in the SEM and using CIs we might argue an “obtained” score as high as 76 may be 2SD below the mean.

\[ 73 \pm 3 (70 to 76 = 68\% \text{ CI}) \]

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 37); Flynn (1984; 1987; 2006)
Identifying ID: Intellectual Functioning

- The Flynn Effect
  - Initial student IQ 55-85
  - Retested on same WISC version = +1 IQ pt.
  - Retested on a newer WISC version = +5.6 IQ pts.
  - Initial student IQ borderline
  - More than ⅓ of reclassified at ID upon retesting with a newer version of the WISC

Source: Kanaya et al. (2003, p. 787)

- Practice Effect
  - If a given test is re-administered within a short time interval there is an artificial increase in IQ scores.
  - Thus, established clinical practice is to avoid giving the same IQ test within the same year.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 41)

- Test Selection
  - Should employ an IQ test that yields a measure of \( g \)
  - Should consider sensory/motor limitations; and cultural, social, ethnic, and language differences.
  - For example, the TONI or UNIT may appropriate when there are language differences.
  - The Bailey Scales of Infant Development may be appropriate for profoundly impaired students.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 43-44)

- Discussion
  - What intelligence tests do you use and why do you use them?
Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- For the diagnosis of intellectual disability, significant limitations in adaptive behavior should be established... operationally defined as performance that is *approximately* two standard deviations below the mean.

  [emphasis added]

  - Either one of the three types of adaptive behavior
  - Or an overall score

- Discussion
  - Why is the word “approximately” used in the AAIDD definition?

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 43)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Use standardized measures
  - Common rating scales for use with parents and teachers
    - Adaptive Behavior Scale-School (2nd ed.)
    - Adaptive Behavior Evaluations Scale-Rev. 2nd ed.
    - Scales of Independent Behavior-Rev.
    - Adaptive Behavior Assessment System (2nd ed.)
    - Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales (2nd ed.)
  - Focus on typical performance
  - Use knowledgeable respondents

Source: Harrison & Raineri (2008); Schalock et al. (2010, p. 47)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Discussion
  - What are the Adaptive Behavior scales used in your district?
  - What scale or scales do you use and why do you use them?

Source: Harrison & Raineri (2008)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Strengths of Rating Scales
  - Focus on behaviors in natural settings
  - Obtain information from multiple respondents
  - Provide a developmental reference for adaptive skills
  - Can be used to develop goals and objectives

Source: Harrison & Raineri (2008)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Limitations of Rating Scales
  - Dependent on the rater’s perceptions
    - May reflect rater’s expectations/standards
    - May be influenced by student’s characteristics
  - Reflect a sample of behaviors

Source: Harrison & Raineri (2008)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Best Practices
  - Select rating scales carefully
    - Use measures that are valid for the particular student.
  - Make use of multiple measures
    - Obtain data form multiple raters across setting.
    - Use multiple assessment methods
      - Include naturalistic observations across settings.
      - Conduct semi-structured interview of informants.
      - Review student records (including prior evaluations)

Source: Harrison & Raineri (2008)
Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Best Practices
  - Select rating scales carefully
    - Should have current norms and be developed on a representative sample of the general population.
  - Make sure scales used are technically adequate
    - Reliable, valid, generalizable, developed with the identification of ID in mind
  - Appropriate for the specific student
    - Represented in the normative sample
  - Account for physical conditions
    - The evaluation of individuals with vision, hearing, and motor impairments is complex

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 49-53)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Best Practices (continued)
  - Consider other factors that influence scores
    - Opportunities
    - Relevant context/environments
    - Sociocultural considerations
  - Handout 1: AAIDD guidelines for selecting adaptive behavior scales

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 49-53)

Identifying ID: Adaptive Behavior

- Adaptive Behavior Profile & Genetic Syndromes
  - Prader-Willi was found to have the highest adaptive profile, with marked decreases in motor abilities.
  - The adaptive profiles of Fragile-X and Williams had very similar levels and trends, except for lower communication skills in Williams.
  - Down syndrome showed a flat profile, with limited differences between the areas.
  - Angelman syndrome showed the lowest profile, with strong deficits in socialization and motor skills.

Source: Nuovo & Buono (2011)

Identifying ID: Concluding Comments

- Clinical Judgment Strategies
  1. Clarify/state the 3 reasons (diagnosis, classification, program planning) for the school psychologist’s evaluation.
  2. Conduct a thorough review of the student’s history.
    - Social, medical, & educational
  3. Make use of broad-based assessments.
  4. Synthesize the obtained data

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 91)

Identifying ID: Concluding Comments

- Avoid common thinking errors
  1. Affective error
  2. Anchoring error
  3. Availability error
  4. Blind obedience
  5. Commission bias
  6. Confirmation bias
  7. Diagnosis momentum
  8. Framing Effects
  9. Premature closure
  10. Representativeness error

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, p. 91)
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Special Issues: Etiology

- Risk factors for ID:
  - Biomedical
  - Social
  - Behavioral
  - Educational

- See Handout 3 for behaviors associated with selected genetic disorders.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 57-72)

Special Issues: Mental Health

- Prevalence
  - Among children/adolescents comorbidity of ID with a mental disorder is between 30 to 50%.
  - While children ages 6/7 yrs. with ID and borderline IQ "account for 15% of the total child population, they account for up to 40% of the total child psychiatric morbidity within their age group."
  - Controlling for socio-economic disadvantage significantly reduced, but did not eliminate this increased prevalence.

Source: Einfeld et al. (2011); Emerson et al. (2010, p. 584); Fletcher et al. (2007)

Special Issues: Etiology

- Etiology represents a multifactorial construct composed of four categories of risk factors (biomedical, social, behavioral, and educational) that interact across time and affect the individual’s functioning.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 57-72)

Special Issues: Etiology

- Reasons for identifying include:
  - May be associated with other health-related problems.
  - May be treatable.
  - Associated with specific behavioral phenotypes.
  - Families can be referred to others with the same etiology for information and support.
  - Facilitates long term planning.

Source: Schalock et al. (2010, pp. 57-72)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
<th>Social</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brain damage</td>
<td>Self-worth</td>
<td>Living in inappropriate environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory impairments</td>
<td>Self-image</td>
<td>Exposure to adverse life events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic conditions</td>
<td>Poor coping mechanisms</td>
<td>Expectations of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>Bereavement and loss</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>Difficulty expressing emotions</td>
<td>Reduced social networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History and expectation of failing</td>
<td>Economic disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence on others</td>
<td>Transitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Legal disadvantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kitchener et al. (2010, pp. 42-43)
Special Issues: Mental Health

- Prevalence
  - Psychiatric disorders among persons with ID while common, are often not appropriately identified.
  - Mental health treatment for students with ID is lacking
  - May be one of the most underserved populations in the U.S.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007)

Special Issues: ADHD

A.(1) Inattentive Type
- When assessing developmentally inappropriate inattention, compare the student to age and intellectual peers.
  - Student may gaze into space, need 1:1 aide, or require constant verbal prompts to stay on task.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 127-131)

B. If an early developmental Hx is not available, the age requirement may be dropped.
D. There must be clear evidence of clinically significant impairment in social or academic functioning that is related to inattention, hyperactivity, or impulsivity and not just the ID.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 127-131)

Special Issues: ADHD

A.(2) Hyperactive/Impulsive Type
- When assessing developmentally inappropriate hyperactivity, compare the student to age and developmental peers (rather than with younger typical children of comparable developmental level).

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 127-131)

Conners Parent Rating Scales-R Cut-off Scores
- CPRS-R may distinguish between student with ID who are ADHD from those who are not.
- CTRS does not do so
- Not applicable to students with severe and profound ID.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Cut-off</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3-9 yrs.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-17 yrs.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Deb, Dhaliwal, & Roy (2016)
Identifying Intellectual Disability: Guidance for the School Psychologist

Stephen E. Brock, Ph.D., NCSP, LEP
California State University, Sacramento

Special Issues: PTSD

A.(1): Stressor
- Within the special needs population, by age 18, 42.5% of girls & 28% of boys have been sexually assaulted.
- The range of potential “extreme traumatic stressors” is greater for students with ID.
  - For example may include residential placement, or developmental crises.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378); Surfas (2012)

A.(2): Response
- Response to stressor more likely to be expressed as disorganized or agitated behavior (as DSM-IV-TR suggests is common among children).

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)

B. Re-experiencing Symptoms
(1) Among students with severe to profound ID symptoms may include behavioral acting out.
  - Self-injury may be a symptom
(2) Distressing dreams may not have recognizable content.
(3) Trauma specific enactments.
  - Caution: Can be symptoms of psychosis in adults

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)

C. Avoidance/Numbing Symptoms
(1) Assessment difficult given difficulty communicating about internal states.
(2) Avoidance may be reported by caregivers as “noncompliance.”
  - These students may have difficulty verbalizing their desire to avoid.
(3) Need to ensure failure to recall important aspects of the traumatic event are not due to ID.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)

(4) Diminished interest/participation may be reported by caregivers as “noncompliance.”
  - These students may have difficulty verbalizing their feelings.
(5) Feelings of “detachment or estrangement” may be viewed by caregivers as self-isolation.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)

(7) Need to account for the fact that many students with ID do not have normative expectations for their future.
  - They may not have the ability to project themselves into their future.
  - They may not have the expectations of age peers due to their ID (and not to trauma exposure).
  - Limited utility with severe/profound ID.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)
Special Issues: PTSD

D. Increased Arousal Symptoms
   • No adaptation.

E. Documenting symptom duration can be challenging as functional impairments can also be associated with the ID (and not just trauma)

F. Documenting “significant distress” and or “impairment” can be challenging as these may appear solely related to the ID.

Source: Fletcher et al. (2007, pp. 365-378)

Special Issues: Mental Health

• Treatment Options
   • Psychological Interventions
      • The opportunity to explore problems and find practical solutions.
      • May involve the use of charts, pictures, photos, drawings and diaries to help describe feelings and worries

   • Behavioral Interventions
      • To improve the skills and environment of the person

   • Skills Training
      • Social skills, anger management, relaxation and/or assertiveness training

   • Medication
      • With close medical supervision to monitor possible side-effects.

Source: Taylor et al. (2008)

Special Issues: Mental Health

• Treatment Options
   • Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy
      • Exclusion of people in the mild-borderline ranges of intellectual functioning from CBT is probably not warranted.
      • Emerging evidence suggests the majority of people with mild ID have the ability to engage in/benefit from CBT.
      • Clients with mild ID have the skills necessary for CBT’s cognitive component.
      • e.g., emotional labeling/recognition and, to a lesser extent, understanding of the mediating role of cognitions.
      • These skills appear to decline as verbal ability (receptive vocabulary) decreases.

Source: Taylor et al. (2008)

Special Issues: Mental Health

• Recommendations
   • Intellectual Disability and Mental Health First Aid Manual (2nd ed.), by B. Kitchener, A. Jorm, & C. Kelly (2010)

Available:
Special Issues: Pain

- Student’s with severe to profound cognitive impairment experience many episodes of pain.
  - e.g., gastro-esophageal reflux, contractures, epilepsy
- These events can effect test taking.
  - Can be motivating operations for challenging behaviors
- Recognition/assessment of pain in these children is hindered by their limited communication abilities.

Source: McGuire et al. (2010); Terstegen et al. (2003)

Assessment strategies

- Checklist Pain Behavior (23 item)
- Pain Behaviour Checklist (10 item)
- Non-communicating Children’s Pain Checklist
- Paediatric Pain Profile

Sources: Breau et al. (2000); Duivenvoorden et al. (2006); Hunt et al. (2004); McGrath et al. (1998); Terstegen et al. (2003); van der Putten & Vlaskamp (2011)
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Report Template

- See Handout 4
- Review and discuss the template.
- Make specific edits.
  - Do you have better/alternative parent/user friendly language?
  - Offer general suggestions.
  - Are there areas of the report you would exclude?
  - Are there any missing elements?
- Offer any general observations about the process/product of the psychoeducational evaluation of the student with an intellectual disability.
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Handout 1: AAIDD’s (Schalock et al., p. 54) Guidelines for Selecting an Adaptive Behavior Assessment Instrument

• Select an instrument that is a comprehensive measure of conceptual, social, and practical adaptive behavior skills and is applicable to the population in questions. In that regard, one should (a) read the *User’s Manual*; (b) review all components of the instrument; (c) consult with colleagues who may have familiarity with the instrument; and (d) search the literature for research on its usage, particularly as related to validation of its use for the particular setting, population, and purpose in question.

• For the purpose of making or ruling out a diagnosis of ID< the instrument must be normed on the general population, including individuals with and without disabilities. The selected instrument’s norms should be current.

• Determine, based on the publisher’s specifications and state and professional regulations, who is properly trained to administer the instrument (e.g., instruments that require direct interaction with the client require greater expertise than rating scales completed by others, such as teachers or parents).

• Determine that the assessment instrument has acceptable reliability and established validity for its intended purpose. In this regard, one should read review of the instrument in manuals such as the *Mental Measurements Yearbook* or *Test Critiques*.

• Determine whether scoring software has been “error-trapped” to prevent the entering of impossible answers or to control for circumstances such as missing data that may yield errors.
## Handout 2: Risk Factors for Intellectual Disability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Biomedical</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
<th>Educational</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Prenatal | 1. Chromosomal disorders  
2. Single-gene disorders  
3. Syndromes  
4. Metabolic disorders  
5. Cerebral dysgenesis  
6. Maternal illness  
7. Parental age | 1. Poverty  
2. Maternal malnutrition  
3. Domestic violence  
4. Lack of access to prenatal care | 1. Prenatal drug use  
2. Parental alcohol use  
3. Parental smoking  
4. Parental immaturity | 1. Parental cognitive disability without supports  
2. Lack of preparation for parenthood |
| Perinatal | 1. Prematurity  
2. Birth injury  
3. Neonatal disorders | 1. Lack of access to prenatal care | 1. Parental rejection of caretaking  
2. Parental abandonment of child | 1. Lack of medical referral for intervention services at discharge |
| Postnatal | 1. Traumatic brain injury  
2. Malnutrition  
3. Meingoencephalitis  
4. Seizure disorders  
5. Degenerative disorders | 1. Impaired child-caregiver interaction  
2. Lack of adequate stimulation  
3. Family poverty  
4. Chronic illness in family  
5. Institutionalization | 1. Child abuse and neglect  
2. Domestic violence  
3. Inadequate safety measures  
4. Social deprivation  
5. Difficult child behaviors | 1. Impaired parenting  
2. Delayed diagnosis  
3. Inadequate early intervention services  
4. Inadequate special education services  
5. Inadequate family support |

### Handout 3: Behaviors Associated with Selected Genetic Disorders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syndrome</th>
<th>Behavioral manifestations that are often present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Down**            | Better performance on visuospatial tasks than on verbal/auditory task  
|                     | Adaptive behavior strength relative to intelligence  
|                     | Pleasant sociable personality  
|                     | Depression common in adulthood  |
| **Williams**        | Strength in language, auditory memory, and facial recognition  
|                     | Limitations in visuospatial functioning, perceptual=motor planning, and fine motor skills  
|                     | Strength in theory of mind (interpersonal intelligence)  
|                     | Friendliness with impaired social intelligence  
|                     | Anxiety disorders common at all ages  |
| **Fragile X**       | Verbal skills better than visuospatial skills  
|                     | Relative strengths in daily living and self-care skills  
|                     | Frequent association with inattention, hyperactivity, and autistic-like behaviors  |
| **Prader-Willi**    | Impaired satiety, food-seeking behavior, and obesity  
|                     | Strength in visual processing sand solving jigsaw puzzles  
|                     | Obsessive-compulsive disorders and impulse control disorders common at all ages  
|                     | Occasional psychosis in adults  |
| **Velocardiofacial**| Verbal skills better than nonverbal skills  
|                     | Inattention and hyperactivity common in children  
|                     | Schizophrenia and mood disorders more common in older adolescents and adults  |
| **Rubinstein-Taybi**| Inattention and impulsivity common in children  
|                     | Friendliness and interest in music  
|                     | Occasional association with mood disorders, tics, and obsessive-compulsive disorders  |
| **Smith-Magenis**   | Delayed speech acquisition  
|                     | Relative weakness in sequential processing  
|                     | Sleep disorders common  
|                     | Frequent stereotyped and self-injurious behaviors  
|                     | Impulse control disorders common in children  |
| **Angelman**        | Bouts of inappropriate laughter are characteristic in younger persons  
|                     | Generally happy disposition at all ages  
|                     | Hyperactivity and sleep disorders in younger persons  |

*Note. From Schalock et al. (2010).*  
Handout 4: Psychoeducational Report Template

Psychoeducational Evaluation

[DATE OF REPORT]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>SCHOOL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIRTH DATE:</td>
<td>GRADE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT DATES:</td>
<td>TRACK:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td>TEACHER:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIMARY LANGUAGE:</td>
<td>EXAMINER:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral

Name was referred for testing by the Student Success Team (SST). It was hoped that this evaluation would aid in the determination of his/her special education eligibility. At the time of referral specific concerns included: (From SST data list reasons for referral). From this referring concern, the following suspected area(s) of disability was/were identified and is/are evaluated by this assessment: intellectual disability (List and be sure to assess all other areas related to the suspected disability).

It is important to note that before initiating this evaluation the effects of environmental, cultural, and economic disadvantage on this students’ learning were considered. From the available data it was concluded (Report conclusions regarding the effect of these variables on learning and, if necessary, justify the decision to proceed with a special education evaluation).

Psychoeducational Procedures 1. 2. 3. 4

1 Because Name’s primary language is (Primary language), the assessment team requested that his/her language facility (in both English and (Primary language) be assessed. Using the (Language Fluency Measure) English was found to be Name’s dominant language (Measure score in English was #; Measure score in Primary language was #). These data, combined with the Examiner’s basic awareness of this student’s cultural and ethnic background (State how awareness was obtained.), lead to the conclusion that it was appropriate for this Examiner to conduct this evaluation and to do so in English.

2 Before beginning this assessment the Examiner ensured that the interpreter had received adequate training to act as an interpreter (state qualifications). Experiences within the testing sessions lead the Examiner to conclude that use of this interpreter facilitated attainment of valid test scores.

3 All psycho-educational procedures were selected and administered so as not to be racially, culturally, or sexually discriminatory, and have been validated for the specific purposes for which they were used.

4 This assessment was completed in accordance with a judgment by Federal District Court Judge Robert Peckham (in response to C-71-2270 RFP, Larry P. vs. Riles), which bars the administration of certain tests to this student.
The following procedures were used to obtain a valid estimate of Name's psycho-educational functioning:

[List traditional assessment procedures]

[If there are concerns regarding the validity of tests due to relevant student characteristic (e.g., English language facility, severe physical disabilities, limited vision and/or hearing, limited opportunities), then use the following qualifying validity statement and then specify alternative assessment procedures.] In analyzing these results it needs to be kept in mind that the norm-referenced tests listed above were standardized on (Describe the relevant/important characteristics of the standardization sample that differentiated it from the student, e.g., monolingual English-speaking children). Thus, for the purposes of special education eligibility, the obtained scores are psychometrically invalid. Children with Name's characteristics (i.e., List relevant/important student characteristics that were not included in test standardization samples) were not included in the test's standardization sample. Consequently, the obtained test scores reported below do not necessarily indicate the presence of learning challenges. While the obtained scores may not accurately measure construct the tests purport to measure (for Name), they nevertheless do give information regarding Name's present levels of functioning relative to the standardization sample (and as such can facilitate understanding of Name’s performance in the general education environment). These scores can, for example, be used for baseline and follow-up measures. Regardless of test validity, it is important to acknowledge that test scores alone should never be used to justify placing any student into special education. Alternative assessment procedures used during this assessment included the following:

[List alternative assessment procedures]

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Data obtained from Name’s cumulative folder indicates (Discuss school functioning. Report the student's current academic achievement levels, grade-level changes/retentions, discipline records, work habits, prior special program placements, prior referrals, number of schools attended, attendance record, and learning strengths and weaknesses.)

Program Modifications

Educational interventions already attempted to meet Name's educational needs within a less restrictive environment have included: (e.g., specialist consultations, support services, minimum day, independent study, home teaching, suspension, alternate instructional methods, parent conferences/communication). At this time, these modifications have/have not allowed Name to be successful in the general education program.

Social/Emotional interventions attempted have included: [As indicated list interventions (e.g., counseling) and their duration. Describe the outcome of these interventions].

Specific behavior interventions attempted have included: (As indicated list behavioral interventions and their duration. Describe the outcome of these interventions).

Developmental and Health History

Pregnancy and birth history. During the parent interview Name's mother/father/step-mother/step-father (Parent's Name) indicated that Name's prenatal biomedical risk factors for intellectual disability included (List documented chromosomal disorders, single-gene disorders,
syndromes, metabolic disorders, cerebral dysgenesis, maternal illness, parental age). Other prenatal risk factors reported were (As indicated specify student exposure to poverty; maternal malnutrition; domestic violence; lack of prenatal care; parental drug use, alcohol use, smoking, immaturity).

Name was born at term/premature at (Number of weeks gestation) weeks gestation. Labor lasted (Length of labor) hours. Birth weight was (Birth weight). Problems reported to have occurred during the delivery included (Problems during delivery. In particular note anoxia during birth.). Birth weight was (Birth Weight). One and five minute Apgar scores were (1 Min. Score) and (5 Min. Score) respectively.

**Major developmental milestones.** Developmental milestones are reported to have been (Report milestones to help document that onset of the intellectual disability occurred within the developmental period).

**Health history.** According to (Data source), postnatal biomedical risk factors for intellectual disability include (As indicated describe traumatic brain injury, malnutrition, meingoencephalitis, seizure disorders, degenerative disorders). Other postnatal risk factors include (As indicated specify lack of adequate stimulation, familial poverty, chronic illness in family, institutionalization, child abuse/neglect, domestic violence, inadequate safety measures, social deprivation, difficult child behaviors. NOTE: if age of onset cannot be documented during the prenatal or perinatal stages of development, and intellectual disability is suspected, one should find one or more of these postnatal risk factors to be present).

Prior to his/her diagnosis with (as indicated specify chronic or acute health problems), Name’s health history was (Describe history). Recent school screenings (Date) suggest (Vision) vision and (hearing) hearing.

**Family history.** During the parent interview it was reported that there was no history of family members with biomedically based learning or behavior difficulties. –OR– During the parent interview it was reported that there was a history of other cases of intellectual, behavioral, and/or learning disabilities within the family. Specifically, (specify the family history of intellectual disability and whenever possible report the specific biomedical risk factor, and any other learning or behavioral disability).

**Previous Assessment Findings**

Name was previously assessed on (Date or dates of previous testing) by (Examiner). Prior intelligence test suggested (List prior IQ tests, and provide overall scores, with associated confidence intervals). Prior assessment of adaptive behavior has suggested (List prior adaptive behavior scores. Include overall composite scores, as well as specific scores measuring conceptual, social, and practical behaviors). NOTE: This would be another part of the report wherein onset of the intellectual disability maybe documented as having occurred within the developmental period.

**Behavioral Assessment**

**Adaptive Behavior Ratings**

**Measurement validity.** Validity of the (Adaptive behavior measure used) is considered to be good/adequate/poor. (In addition to ensuring that relevant student characteristics are represented in the measure's standardization sample, as indicated discuss how knowledgeable individual raters were about the behaviors being quantified. For example, what behaviors rated may have not been
directly observed by the respondent, or influenced a specific rater’s perceptions of the student. Also, specify the extend to which the student may have had limited opportunities to engage in the behaviors being measured.)

**Conceptual/Language Abilities.**

**Social functioning.**

**Practical/Daily Living Skills.**

Social/Emotional Ratings

Behavioral Observations

*Classroom.* (Include observations of level of conceptual/language development, and social skills.)

*Playground.* (Include observations of social skills.)

*Home.* (Include observations of practical/daily living skills.)

**Test Taking Behavior.** (Emphasize behaviors that lead to conclusions about the idiosyncratic validity of test results for the student on the days tested. Include any observations relevant to conclusions about the student’s level of adaptive behavior.)

**INDIVIDUAL PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL TESTING**

Validity Statement

(NOTE: Depending upon the previously discussed need for alternative assessment, this validity statement may need to be modified.) The standardized tests administered were appropriate for Name and the purposes for which they are used. Name is representative of the norm group, and the tests were administered following standardized procedures. This fact, along with Name’s **(describe test taking behaviors that supported testing)** test taking behavior, suggests that the following test scores represent a reasonable estimate of Name’s current levels of functioning. However, as is the case with all standardized measures, obtained test scores include a degree of measurement error. Consequently, it is best to consider a score as falling within a range, which is referred to as a “confidence interval.” A confidence interval of **(specify either 68% or 90% confidence interval)** was used for this assessment. Throughout this report, all confidence intervals are noted in parentheses.

**Intellectual Ability**

**Academic Functioning**

**Language Functioning**

**SUMMARY AND EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS**
Name is a (CA), (Grade) grade (Gender), who has been assessed to help determine his/her eligibility for special education assistance. At the time of referral specific concerns included (List reasons for referral).

Educationally relevant health and developmental findings include (Specify all biomedical risk factors and as indicated report age of onset of intellectual disability.)

Environmental, cultural, and/or economic disadvantage have (Discuss how these variables effect educational performance, test validity, and may or may not be related to a possible intellectual disability.)

Name’s second language acquisition has affected his/her learning (If appropriate discuss how language acquisition has influenced performance and may or may not be related to a possible intellectual disability.)

Intelligence test results suggest that Name’s present level of intellectual functioning is in the (provide the test’s appropriate qualitative descriptor) range. Taking into account measurement error, this result is (use the appropriate term, e.g., “not,” “approximately,” “just over,” “over,” or “well over”) two standard deviations below the mean. Prior testing data (if available discuss how prior estimates of global intelligence are, or are not, consistent with the current obtained scores.) Behavioral data consistent with this observation include (discuss behavioral observations and/or caregiver reports that are consistent with the obtained intelligence test score). These findings are consistent/inconsistent with the presence of an intellectual disability.

Evaluation of Name’s adaptive behavior suggests that Name’s global skill level is (use the appropriate qualifier, e.g., “not,” “approximately,” “just over,” “over,” or “well over”) two standard deviations below the mean. –OR– Evaluation of Name’s adaptive behavior is (use the appropriate qualifier, e.g., “approximately,” “just over,” “over,” or “well over”) two standard deviations below the mean in the following areas: (specify which of the areas is deficient: conceptual, social, practical). His/Her adaptive behavior is not two standard deviations below the mean in the following areas: (specify which of the areas is not two standard deviations below the mean: conceptual, social, practical). Behavioral data consistent with this observation include (discuss naturalistic observations across settings and/or caregiver reports that are consistent with the obtained intelligence test score). These findings are consistent/inconsistent with the presence of an intellectual disability.

Qualitatively, these data suggest that Name’s intellectual disability is mild/moderate/severe/profound. This level of intellectual disability is typically associated with the need for (report the level of support typically associated with the estimated level of intellectual disability, i.e., Mild = “intermittent supports provided on an as-needed basis. Name would not appear to require continuous or daily support.” Moderate = “limited supports provided over a period of time. Name would appear to require at least intermittent support.” Severe = “extensive supports on a daily basis across many different settings.” Profound = “pervasive supports provided continuously in all settings.”

For instructional planning purposes it is important to note that Name’s learning strengths would appear to include (List assets to be used in recommendations). Learning weakness include (discuss challenges to be addressed in recommendations).
Name’s academic functioning would appear to be affecting his/her social functioning in the following ways: **(Describe this relationship and as indicated make appropriate social/emotional recommendations).**

From the current battery of tests the following recommendations are made:

1. From this assessment it would appear that Name meets eligibility criteria as an individual with exceptional needs, and that these needs cannot be corrected without special education assistance. Specifically, Name has significantly below average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior. These deficits were manifested during the developmental period and adversely affect a his/her educational performance.

2. Name does not appear to meet eligibility criteria as an individual with an intellectual disability [according to the California Code of Regulations - Title 5, Division 1, Chapter 3, Handicapped Children, Article 3.1, Section 3030 (h)]. This conclusion is based upon the following assessment finding(s):

   (a) Name was not found to have significantly below average general intellectual functioning.

   (b) Name was not found to have significantly below average adaptive behavior in one or more of the areas that define this construct.

   (c) The effect of the documented disability would not appear to limit Name’s ability to benefit from general education program instruction.

   (d) Name’s learning difficulties appear to be primarily due to environmental disadvantage.

   (e) Name’s learning difficulties appear to be primarily due to cultural disadvantage.

   (f) Name’s learning difficulties appear to be primarily due to economic disadvantage.

   (g) Name’s learning difficulties appear to be primarily due to a lack of English proficiency.

   (h) The available data suggests that a lack of instruction in (reading and/or math) plays a primary role in Name’s learning difficulties.

2. Additional areas of suspected disability not addressed in by the current assessment include the following: From this observation the following additional assessments are recommended: **(List additional assessments that are judged required to address all areas of suspected disability, e.g., physical therapy, occupational therapy, recreational therapy, psychotherapy, etc. NOTE: the IEP meeting should not be held until these areas are assessed).**

3. From Name’s learning strengths, the following specific interventions are recommended to address Name’s anticipated learning needs:
4. Additional recommendations for the development of Name’s individualized educational program include:

a) 

b) 

c) 

5. 

6. 

The final decision as to whether or not Name meets special education eligibility will be made by the individualized education program (IEP) team, including assessment personnel, and will take into account all relevant material available on Name. No single score or product of scores, test, or procedure should be used as the sole criterion for the decision of the IEP team as to his/her eligibility for special education, the development of goals and objectives, or the least restrictive special education placement.

_________________________________
Stephen E. Brock, Ph.D., NCSP
Licensed Educational Psychologist
5 CCR 3030 - Eligibility Criteria

A pupil shall qualify as an individual with exceptional needs, pursuant to Section 56026 of the Education Code, if the results of the assessment as required by Section 56320 demonstrate that the degree of the pupil's impairment as described in Section 3030 (a through j) requires special education in one or more of the program options authorized by Section 56361 of the Education Code. The decision as to whether or not the assessment results demonstrate that the degree of the pupil's impairment requires special education shall be made by the individualized education program team, including assessment personnel in accordance with Section 56341(d) of the Education Code. The individualized education program team shall take into account all the relevant material that is available on the pupil. No single score or product of scores shall be used as the sole criterion for the decision of the individualized education program team as to the pupil's eligibility for special education. The specific processes and procedures for implementation of these criteria shall be developed by each special education local plan area and be included in the local plan pursuant to Section 56220(a) of the Education Code.

a. A pupil has significantly below average general intellectual functioning existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, which adversely affect a pupil's educational performance.