ENGLISH LEARNER WITH SPECIAL NEEDS RECLASSIFICATION WORKSHEET

Name: ___________________ D.O.B.: __________ Grade: _____ Date of Meeting: ________

Primary Disability: ___________________ Secondary Disability: ___________________

Summary of English language development services received: ____________________________

1. **Assessment Results of Language Proficiency**
   (Note: The CDE regulations allow the IEP team to designate that a student take an alternate assessment to CELDT if appropriate)

   **Language Proficiency Assessment Take:**  □ CELDT or □ Alternate Assessment

   **Current School Year Data**
   Date: _______________
   □ CELDT  Overall Score: ______ Listening: ______ Speaking: ______ Reading: ______ Writing: ______
   □ Alternate Assessment (ALPI)  Overall Score: ______ Listening: ______ Speaking: ______
   □ Other Alternate Assessment: ______ Listening: ______ Speaking: ______ Reading: ______ Writing: ______

   **Previous School Year Data**
   Date: _______________
   □ CELDT  Overall Score: ______ Listening: ______ Speaking: ______ Reading: ______ Writing: ______
   □ Alternate Assessment (ALPI)  Overall Score: ______ Listening: ______ Speaking: ______
   □ OtherAlternate Assessment: Listening: ______ Speaking: ______ Reading: ______ Writing: ______

   Student met language proficiency level criteria as assessed by CELDT? □ Yes □ No

   Note: Overall proficiency level must be early advanced or higher, listening must be intermediate or higher, speaking must be intermediate or higher, reading must be intermediate or higher, and writing must be intermediate or higher.

   If student’s overall proficiency level was in the upper end of the intermediate level, did the reclassification team review other informal measures of proficiency and determine that it is likely the student is proficient in English? □ Yes □ No

   **If student took alternate assessment(s), answer the following questions:**
   Does the reclassification team feel the student’s disability impacts the ability to manifest English proficiency? □ Yes □ No
   If so, in what areas: □ Listening □ Speaking □ Reading □ Writing

   Note: Possible indicators: Student has similar academic deficits and error patterns in English as well as primary language, or error patterns in speaking, reading, and writing are typical of students with that disability versus students with language differences, etc.

   Comments: _________________________________________________________________

   _________________________________________________________________

   Does the reclassification team feel it is likely the student has reached an appropriate level of English proficiency? □ Yes □ No

2. **Teacher Evaluation**
   Note: Having incurred deficits in motivation & academic success unrelated to English language proficiency (i.e. disability) do not preclude a student from reclassification.
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Evaluation was based on: □ Classroom performance  □ District-wide assessments
   □ IEP Goal Progress  □ Other: ____________________________

Comments: ________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Does the Reclassification Team feel teacher input/evaluation warrants possible reclassification?
□ Yes  □ No

3. **Parent Opinion and Consultations** was solicited through: □ Letter to Parent  □ Parent Conference
   □ Other: __________________________________________________

Comments: ________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Does the Reclassification Team feel parent input warrants possible reclassification at this time?
□ Yes  □ No

Comments: ________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

4. **Comparison of Performance in Basic Skills**

   **Note:** “Assessment of language proficiency using an objective assessment instrument; CST or CMA score in English/language arts (ELA) must be at least beginning of basic level to midpoint of basic - each district may select exact cut point; for pupils scoring below the cut point, determine whether factors other than English language proficiency are responsible and whether it is appropriate to reclassify the student. For students that do not take CMS or CST, the team may use other empirical data to determine if the student has acquired English based on their ability level.”

Assessment taken: □ CST  □ CMA  □ CAPA  □ Other  □ Other: ____________________________

Date: ____________________________

English/Language Arts Score/results of assessment: ______________________________________

Student met the Performance of scoring at the beginning to mid point of basic? □ Yes  □ No

If performance in basic skills LEA/district criteria based on CST/CMA/CAPA or other assessment was not met, answer the following questions to help determine if “factors other than English language proficiency are responsible for limited achievement in ELA” (CDE CELDT: Understanding and Using 2009-10 Individual Results)?

□ Student’s Basic Skills assessment scores appear to be commensurate with his/her intellectual ability due to a disability such as an intellectual disability, language & speech impairment, etc., versus a language difference and primary language assessments indicate similar levels of academic performance (if available and applicable) or,

□ Error patterns noted mirror the patterns of errors made by students with a particular disability versus a peers with language differences and student has manifests language proficiency in all other areas

Does the Reclassification Team feel analysis of Performance in Basic Skills (ELA) warrants reclassification? □ Yes  □ No

Does the reclassification team (this may be the IEP team) feel the student should be reclassified at this time based on analysis of the four criteria above? □ Yes  □ No
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