DATA-BASED CONSULTING, INC.

FREE FOR SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY FACULTY

School Psychology Training Package

Faculty Guide: teaching Survey Level Assessment, PLAAFP, progress monitoring goals, progress decisions, the SLD inclusionary factors and ecological classroom observation

CBM Progress Monitor · Monthly (Tier 2) and Frequent (Tier 3/IEP) monitoring

R-CBM Narrative Passages, Grades 1–8 · with Technical Manual

Highly Decodable (HD) R-CBM Passages, K–1 · with 2026 Research Report

CBM RTI · Dual Discrepancy decisions for the SLD inclusionary factors

Student-Teacher Interaction Code (STIC) · classroom observation app

MTSS Tiered Resource Planner · systems-level planning

Every free user manual and demo video

Mark R. Shinn, Ph.D. · Emeritus Professor of School Psychology
mark@markshinn.org · (847) 275-7200 · markshinn.org

OVERVIEW

A free package for the people who prepare school psychologists

School psychology graduate students need to practice the decisions they will make in schools: where a student is performing now, what a meaningful goal looks like, whether an intervention is working and what is really happening in the classroom. Many programs teach these skills without access to the commercial platforms students will meet in practice, or with platforms that hide the reasoning behind the result.

This package gives school psychology faculty free training access to my CBM apps and passages so students can do the work themselves, see every step and defend every decision.

What faculty can teach with it

- **Survey Level Assessment (SLA)** to determine a student's Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP), using the R-CBM Narrative Passages and CBM Progress Monitor.
- **Writing meaningful, measurable progress monitoring goals** from the PLAAFP, with a clear time frame, goal material and criterion.
- **Determining progress** with aimlines, trend lines, intervention change lines and decision rules.
- **The SLD inclusionary factors in IDEA** with CBM RTI: documenting inadequate achievement and insufficient response to intervention as a Dual Discrepancy.
- **Ecological, interactive classroom observation** with STIC, comparing a student of concern with classroom peers and capturing student–teacher interactions that many observation tools miss.
- **Systems-level MTSS planning** with the Tiered Resource Planner, connecting the percent of students who need Tier 2 and Tier 3 to intervention groups, staff hours and FTE.

> **Who is eligible.** Full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty who teach in a graduate program that prepares school psychologists, for use in courses, practicum and supervision. The package is for training. It is not licensed for school or district service delivery; practicing teams can use the regular licenses at markshinn.org/products.
> **Devices:** each faculty member gets a Faculty key for up to 3 of their own devices and a Student key for up to 20 graduate students, for CBM Progress Monitor, CBM RTI and STIC.

Alignment with the NASP Practice Model

The activities in this guide support several of the 10 domains of the NASP 2020 Practice Model[1]:

NASP 2020 domain	Where students practice it
1. Data-Based Decision Making	SLA and PLAAFP, goal setting, progress decisions, Dual Discrepancy decisions, STIC peer comparisons
2. Consultation and Collaboration	Team progress reviews and STIC feedback to teachers
3. Academic Interventions and Instructional Supports	Matching intervention intensity to the gap; reviewing intervention changes
5. School-Wide Practices to Promote Learning	Tiered Resource Planner scenarios for Tier 2 and Tier 3
10. Legal, Ethical, and Professional Practice	IDEA SLD inclusionary factors, IEP-ready PLAAFP statements, measurable goals and progress reporting

1. National Association of School Psychologists, NASP 2020 Domains of Practice: https://www.nasponline.org/standards-and-certification/nasp-2020-professional-standards-adopted/nasp-2020-domains-of-practice

WHAT'S INCLUDED

Apps, passages, manuals and demos

Every app in the package has a free user manual and a demo video. Assign them before class so students arrive knowing how the tool works.

Component	What it does	Manual and demo
CBM Progress Monitor Web app	Monthly (Tier 2) and Frequent (Tier 3/IEP) monitoring for R-CBM (Grades 1–6), HD R-CBM (K–1), S-CBM and WE-CBM. R-CBM starts from a Survey Level Assessment or a cold start. Every measure gets an aimline from the PLAAFP to the goal, a trend line, intervention change lines and a decision guideline.	User Manual (PDF) Demo video Product page
R-CBM Narrative Passages, Grades 1–8 PDF and Word	20 equivalent narrative passages per grade, with Student and Examiner copies. Each examiner page includes the optional five-item Qualitative Features Checklist.	Technical Manual (PDF) Product page
HD R-CBM Passages, K–1 PDF	Reading passages made of phonetically regular words matched to a typical K–1 phonics scope and sequence, so scores reflect decoding rather than memorized sight words. Includes the 2026 Research Report.	Product page
CBM RTI Web app	Applies the Dual Discrepancy / Hybrid Model with R-CBM, Grades K–8. Step 1 tests for a Performance Discrepancy (median WRC below the 10th percentile, with a ±1 SEM band and an optional SLA). Step 2 tests for a Progress Discrepancy over 6, 9 or 12 weeks of intervention. Step 3 writes the Summary Statement for the team report.	User Manual (PDF) Demo video Product page
Student-Teacher Interaction Code (STIC) App for computer, iPad or phone	Compares a student of concern with classroom peers in 30-second intervals: engagement in the first 10 seconds, then critical student–teacher and student–peer interactions in the remaining 20. Builds the summary table and comparison graphs automatically and works offline after activation.	User Manual (PDF) Demo video Product page
MTSS Tiered Resource Planner Browser app	Turns enrollment, the percent of students expected at each tier, group size and intervention minutes into the students, groups, interventionist hours and FTE each tier needs, and shows any staffing gap.	User Manual (PDF) Demo video Product page

> **Practice with simulated or de-identified data.** The demonstration students in the manuals and videos use simulated data. When students practice with real children in practicum, follow your university's and the school's rules for consent and student records. STIC observation data stays on the device where it was recorded.

MODULE 1

Survey Level Assessment and the PLAAFP

An IEP must begin with a statement of the child's present levels of academic achievement and functional performance[2]. Survey Level Assessment answers a practical question that a single grade-level score cannot: **in what level of reading material does this student perform like a typical student?** That level is the PLAAFP, and it becomes the starting point for the goal.

The steps students practice

1. Administer three R-CBM passages at the student's grade placement and record words read correctly (WRC) and errors. Use the median.
2. Compare the median with Hasbrouck and Tindal (2017) norms for the season. A median at or below the 25th percentile is the signal to survey down.
3. Give three passages from each lower grade of the R-CBM Narrative Passages until the median is above the 40th percentile for that grade. That grade is the PLAAFP. The SLA runs inside CBM Progress Monitor, which plots every grade tested against the norms.
4. Complete the Qualitative Features Checklist at each grade, so the PLAAFP includes how the student reads, not only how many words.
5. Write the PLAAFP statement. The app drafts an editable statement; students should be able to explain each number in it.

For students who do not reach the standard in Grade 1 material, the PLAAFP is below Grade 1 R-CBM. The next step is HD R-CBM, rather than inventing a lower-grade norm.

Suggested assignment

> Give each student a case with grade-level and lower-grade R-CBM scores (or have them administer an SLA in practicum). Students enter the scores in CBM Progress Monitor, print the SLA report and write a one-paragraph PLAAFP that a parent could understand. Grade on: correct median, correct PLAAFP grade, accurate norm comparison and use of the qualitative features.

2. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act regulations, 34 CFR §300.320(a)(1): https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/d/300.320

MODULE 2

Writing meaningful progress monitoring goals

IDEA requires measurable annual goals and a description of how progress toward them will be measured[2]. CBM goals meet both requirements because the goal names the measure, the material and the criterion, and the same measure is used every time progress is checked.

The four parts of a CBM goal

Part	What students decide
Time frame	When the goal should be reached, such as the IEP annual review date or the end of the school year.
Goal material	The level of passages the student will read. CBM Progress Monitor monitors R-CBM in grade-level passages, so progress is judged against grade-level expectations.
Behavior	Reading aloud for one minute from a randomly selected passage, scored as words read correctly.
Criterion	The WRC target, with an optional accuracy goal. The default is the estimated Spring 40th percentile for the student's grade (Hasbrouck and Tindal, 2017). In the Frequent app the team can type an individual goal instead.

Example from the app (simulated student). "In 35 weeks (by May 15, 2026), when given a randomly selected Grade 2 R-CBM passage, Leo (simulated) will read 89 words correctly in 1 minute with 95% accuracy or better, the 40th percentile for Grade 2 students in the Spring (Hasbrouck & Tindal, 2017 norms). This requires an expected rate of progress of 1.6 words correct per week from the present level of 32 words correct."

What makes a goal meaningful

- **It Reduces the Gap or Significantly Reduces the Gap.** Judge a goal by what meeting it would do to the gap between the student and grade-level peers. There are no fixed cut points; teams use professional judgment, weighing the size of the Performance Discrepancy relative to where the student started. The default end-of-year goal is the Spring 40th percentile for the student's grade.
  - **Reduces the Gap:** Student Will Still Likely Need Appropriately Intensive Intervention.
  - **Significantly Reduces the Gap:** Student May Be Suitable for Less Intensive Intervention.
- **It is tied to the PLAAFP.** The aimline runs from the PLAAFP baseline to the goal, so the expected rate of improvement is visible from the first week.
- **It matches the intensity of the need.** Monthly (Tier 2) monitoring uses 1 to 3 passages once or twice a month; Frequent (Tier 3/IEP) monitoring uses 1 passage once or twice a week.

Suggested assignment

> Using the case from Module 1, students set up the student in CBM Progress Monitor, copy the goal statement the app writes, then rewrite it in their own words and calculate the expected weekly rate of progress by hand to check the app.

MODULE 3

Determining progress

A goal is only useful if the team checks it and acts on what it shows. CBM Progress Monitor graphs every score against the aimline, draws a trend line and applies a decision guideline, so students learn to read a graph the way a team should.

Decision guidelines in the app

Pattern in the most recent scores	Frequent (Tier 3): 4 scores	Monthly (Tier 2): 3 scores
All below the aimline	Consider intervention implementation and/or need to change it	Consider intervention implementation and/or need to change it
Otherwise	Continue the intervention	Continue the intervention
All above the aimline	Consider raising the goal	Consider raising the goal (or consider reducing the intervention)

Teaching points

- **These are guidelines for a team's judgment, not automatic decisions.** When scores fall below the aimline, students should first check implementation: whether the intervention was delivered as planned, for the intended time and intensity, and whether the student attended.
- **Intervention change lines matter.** When the intervention changes, the app draws a vertical line and never connects data across it. Trends are calculated within each phase, because joining phases hides a change in level.
- **Reports carry the reasoning.** The printable report includes the graph, the PLAAFP statement, the goal, the aimline and a table of every score.

Suggested assignment

> Give students 12 to 16 weeks of scores with one intervention change. Students enter the data, add the change line, print the report and write a recommendation for the next team meeting: continue, review implementation and strengthen delivery, change the intervention or raise the goal.

Other measures

The same graphing and decision logic works for HD R-CBM (K–1), S-CBM spelling (Grades 1–8) and WE-CBM written expression (Grades 2–6). These measures use a cold start and a goal set by the team, such as from local norms, because they are not compared with Hasbrouck and Tindal norms.

Recommended reading and viewing

> **Reading.** Germann, G. (2012). Implementing data-based program modification big ideas. In C. A. Espin, K. L. McMaster, S. Rose, & M. M. Wayman (Eds.), *A measure of success: The influence of curriculum-based measurement on education* (pp. 79–88). University of Minnesota Press. Open the chapter · DOI
>
> **Video.** *Stan Deno and Gary Germann* (about 93 minutes, in three parts): Part 1 · Part 2 · Part 3
>
> **Video.** *Iowa Problem Solving, Tape B*, with Caren Wesson, Mark Shinn, Gary Germann and Don Allen (about 93 minutes, in three parts): Part 1 · Part 2 · Part 3
>
> All three are in the **11 Additional Readings and Resources** folder of the package's Google Drive folder.

MODULE 4

The SLD inclusionary factors with CBM RTI

When a team considers a Specific Learning Disability, IDEA first asks two **inclusionary** questions before the exclusionary factors are considered. Beginning school psychologists often learn the exclusionary list well but have little practice building the evidence for the two inclusionary factors. CBM RTI gives students a clear, defensible way to do it in reading.

IDEA requirement (34 CFR §300.309)[3]	How CBM RTI provides the evidence
Inadequate achievement, §300.309(a)(1): the child does not achieve adequately for age or State-approved grade-level standards, including basic reading skill and reading fluency, when given appropriate instruction.	**Performance Discrepancy.** The student's median WRC on grade-level R-CBM passages is below the 10th percentile of Hasbrouck and Tindal (2017) or local norms. The ±1 SEM band shows measurement error, and the optional SLA shows how many grades below placement the student reads.
Insufficient progress, §300.309(a)(2)(i): the child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or grade-level standards when using a process based on response to scientific, research-based intervention.	**Progress Discrepancy.** The team sets a short-term goal that reduces the gap over 6, 9 or 12 weeks of intervention. Weekly scores, the aimline and the trend line show whether the student responded.
Documentation, §300.309(b): appropriate instruction by qualified personnel, and repeated assessments of achievement at reasonable intervals shared with parents.	Dated progress scores, the intervention start and determination dates, and a printable report the team can share with parents.

The three outcomes in the Summary Statement

- **Dual Discrepancy.** Both inclusionary factors are documented. The team goes on to consider the need for specially designed instruction and the exclusionary factors in §300.309(a)(3).
- **No significant Performance Discrepancy.** The first inclusionary factor is not met, so progress testing is not needed for this question.
- **Performance Discrepancy, but the student responds to intervention.** The second inclusionary factor is not met; the student is benefiting from general education intervention.

> **Teaching point.** CBM RTI organizes the evidence for the inclusionary factors; it does not decide eligibility. The team still rules out the exclusionary factors (visual, hearing or motor disability, intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, cultural factors, environmental or economic disadvantage and limited English proficiency) and determines need for special education.

Suggested assignment

> Using a simulated referral, students enter benchmark scores, complete an SLA, set a 9-week goal, enter weekly scores and print the Summary Statement. They then write the SLD inclusionary-factors section of an evaluation report and list the information still needed for the exclusionary factors.

3. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act regulations, 34 CFR §300.309, Determining the existence of a specific learning disability: https://www.ecfr.gov/current/title-34/subtitle-B/chapter-III/part-300/subpart-D/subject-group-ECFR6f3d4f9ac2a4f2a/section-300.309

MODULE 5

Ecological, interactive observation with STIC

Many classroom observation tools record whether a behavior happened at least once in an interval for the target student alone. STIC is built on an ecological view: a student's behavior makes sense only next to what peers are doing and how the teacher and the student interact.

How STIC works

- **Target and peer comparison.** In every interval the observer codes both the student of concern and a comparison peer, either one selected typical classmate or a composite of rotating peers, in the same setting with the same teacher and activity. Results are read as discrepancies from peers rather than absolute numbers.
- **Two phases in every 30-second interval.** Engagement is recorded in the first 10 seconds and reported as a percent of intervals. Critical student–teacher and student–peer interactions are recorded in the remaining 20 seconds.
- **Counts, not just occurrence.** Interaction codes allow up to three marks per interval and are reported as total frequency and rate per minute, so repeated events are preserved.
- **Ready-made results.** STIC builds the summary table and comparison graphs and exports CSV and printable reports. It runs on a computer, iPad or phone and works offline after activation.

Suggested assignments

> - **Reliability practice.** Pairs of students code the same classroom video, compare results and discuss disagreements code by code.
> - **Practicum observation.** Students observe a referred student and peers, then write a short summary of the discrepancies and a hypothesis about the classroom conditions involved.
> - **Consultation.** Students present STIC results to a teacher and agree on one change in student–teacher interaction to try and observe again.

MODULE 6

Systems-level planning with the Tiered Resource Planner

School psychologists increasingly help schools design MTSS. The Tiered Resource Planner turns tiered planning into a math problem: enrollment and the percent of students expected at each tier (for example, from screening results) determine how many students need Tier 2 and Tier 3, and group size and minutes determine groups, interventionist hours and FTE. A capacity-gap indicator compares hours needed with staff hours available.

> **Suggested assignment.** Students build two scenarios for a real or simulated elementary school, such as different percents served or group sizes, save each as a PDF and recommend the plan the staff can actually deliver.

ADDITIONAL READINGS AND RESOURCES

Recommended readings, by module

Every reading is in the **11 Additional Readings and Resources** folder of the package's Google Drive folder. Links to a DOI or a free online copy are given where they exist. Posts marked Substack are from Mark Shinn's newsletter, *Peculiar Observations About MTSS Implementation*.

Module 1: Survey Level Assessment and the PLAAFP

- Shinn, M. R. (2008). Best practices in using curriculum-based measurement in a problem-solving model. In A. Thomas & J. Grimes (Eds.), Best Practices in School Psychology V. NASP. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2005). Identifying and validating academic problems in a problem-solving model. In R. Brown-Chidsey (Ed.), Assessment for Intervention. Guilford. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R., Good, R. H., Knutson, N., Tilly, W. D., & Collins, V. L. (1992). Curriculum-based measurement of oral reading fluency: A confirmatory analysis of its relation to reading. School Psychology Review, 21(3). Google Drive · DOI
- Fuchs, L. S., Fuchs, D., Hosp, M. K., & Jenkins, J. R. (2001). Oral reading fluency as an indicator of reading competence. Scientific Studies of Reading, 5(3), 239-256. Google Drive · DOI
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, July 15). Some stuff that might help understand curriculum-based measurement (CBM) and "indicators of basic skills." Mark R. Shinn's Peculiar Observations About MTSS Implementation [Substack]. Substack
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, May 20). The problem of comprehension: A barrier to R-CBM as a progress monitoring and screening instrument [Substack]. Substack

Module 2: Writing progress monitoring goals

- Fuchs, L. S., & Shinn, M. R. (1989). Writing CBM IEP objectives. In M. R. Shinn (Ed.), Curriculum-Based Measurement: Assessing Special Children. Guilford. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R., & Shinn, M. M. (2000). Writing and evaluating IEP goals and making appropriate revisions to ensure participation and progress in the general curriculum. Google Drive

Module 3: Determining progress

- Germann, G. (2012). Implementing data-based program modification big ideas. In C. A. Espin, K. L. McMaster, S. Rose, & M. M. Wayman (Eds.), A Measure of Success: The Influence of Curriculum-Based Measurement on Education (pp. 79-88). University of Minnesota Press. Google Drive · DOI
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. What is scientifically-based research on progress monitoring? National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. Google Drive · Free online
- Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2008). Best practices in progress monitoring reading and mathematics at the elementary grades. In Best Practices in School Psychology V. NASP. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2013). Progress monitoring methods and tools for academic performance. In H. M. Walker & F. M. Gresham (Eds.), Handbook of Evidence-Based Practices for Emotional and Behavioral Disorders (pp. 173-191). Guilford. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2013). Measuring general outcomes: A critical component in scientific and practical progress monitoring practices (white paper). Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, June 13). Frequent CBM progress monitoring: Reflections on interpreting PM graphs, ROI, and more [Substack]. Substack
- Video: *Stan Deno and Gary Germann* (about 93 minutes): Part 1 · Part 2 · Part 3
- Video: *Iowa Problem Solving, Tape B*, with Caren Wesson, Mark Shinn, Gary Germann and Don Allen (about 93 minutes): Part 1 · Part 2 · Part 3

Module 4: The SLD inclusionary factors with CBM RTI

- Shinn, M. R. (2007). Identifying students at risk, monitoring performance, and determining eligibility within response to intervention. School Psychology Review, 36(4), 601-617. Google Drive · DOI
- Fletcher, J. M., & Miciak, J. (2019). The identification of specific learning disabilities: A summary of research on best practices. Texas Center for Learning Disabilities. Google Drive · Free online
- Fletcher, J. M., Barth, A. E., & Stuebing, K. K. (2011). A response to intervention (RTI) approach to SLD identification. In D. P. Flanagan & V. C. Alfonso (Eds.), Essentials of Specific Learning Disability Identification. Wiley. Google Drive
- Gresham, F., Reschly, D., & Shinn, M. R. (2010). RTI as a driving force in educational improvement: Research, legal, and practice perspectives. In M. R. Shinn & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Interventions for Achievement and Behavior Problems in a Three-Tier Model Including RTI. NASP. Google Drive

- Zirkel, P. A. (2026). Lessons in legal literacy: State laws for SLD identification. Focus on Exceptional Children, 50(2). Google Drive · DOI
- Vaughn, S., Miciak, J., Clemens, N., & Fletcher, J. M. (2024). The critical role of instructional response in defining and identifying students with dyslexia. Annals of Dyslexia. Google Drive · DOI
- Dombrowski, S. C., Benson, N. F., & Maki, K. E. (2024). A systematic review of the PSW diagnostic accuracy evidence for SLD identification: Is it time to abandon PSW? School Psychology Review. Google Drive · DOI
- Shinn, M. R. An RTI approach consistent with IDEA 2004 requirements to determine a specific learning disability within a social justice perspective (presentation handouts). Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, July 24). Mark's perspective on special education reading assessment and decision-making practices [Substack]. Substack

Module 5: Ecological observation with STIC

- Tindal, G., Shinn, M. R., & Rodden-Nord, K. (1990). Contextually based school consultation: Influential variables. Exceptional Children, 56(4), 324-336. Google Drive · DOI
- Shinn, M. R., Ramsey, E., Walker, H. M., Stieber, S., & O'Neill, R. E. (1987). Antisocial behavior in school settings: Initial differences in an at risk and normal population. Journal of Special Education, 21(2). Google Drive · DOI

Module 6: Systems-level planning and MTSS

- Gersten, R., et al. (2009). Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades (NCEE 2009-4045). IES What Works Clearinghouse. Google Drive · Free online
- Walker, H. M., & Shinn, M. R. (2010). Systemic, evidence-based approaches for promoting positive student outcomes within a multitier framework. In M. R. Shinn & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Interventions for Achievement and Behavior Problems in a Three-Tier Model Including RTI. NASP. Google Drive
- Germann, G. (2010). Thinking of yellow brick roads, emerald cities, and wizards. In M. R. Shinn & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Interventions for Achievement and Behavior Problems in a Three-Tier Model Including RTI. NASP. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. Basic skills screening and proactive intervention design (handouts). Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, June 2). Tiers? Or tears? [Substack]. Substack
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, August 6). My own set of MTSS misunderstandings #1: The wrong focus of change [Substack]. Substack
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, August 14). My own set of MTSS misunderstandings #2: A tiered model is not a prescription, but a heuristic for thinking [Substack]. Substack

The profession of school psychology

- Reschly, D. J. School psychology revolution. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R., & McConnell, S. School psychologists as general educators. School Psychology Review. Google Drive
- Shinn, M. R. (2026, October 30). Musings about Project Follow Through, Zig Engelmann and the critical role of Wes Becker [Substack]. Substack

GETTING STARTED

How to request your free training package

1. Email mark@markshinn.org from your university email address with the subject **School Psychology Training Package Request**.
2. Include your name and title, university and program, a link to your program's faculty web page, the courses or practicum where you will use the package, and about how many graduate students you train each year.
3. You will receive a welcome email with a Faculty key (up to 3 of your devices) and a Student key (up to 20 students) for CBM Progress Monitor, CBM RTI and STIC, a Google Drive link to the passages, manuals, Tiered Resource Planner and the recommended readings and videos, and links to every demo.
4. Give your students the Student keys and the Google Drive link. Keep the Faculty keys for yourself. Access is renewable each academic year.

Suggested sequence across a program

Course	Modules
Academic assessment	1 (SLA and PLAAFP), 2 (goal writing)
Academic intervention	2 (goals), 3 (determining progress)
Special education law and SLD identification	4 (CBM RTI and the SLD inclusionary factors), 1 (SLA)
Behavior assessment or consultation	5 (STIC)
MTSS or systems change	6 (Tiered Resource Planner), 3 (team decisions)
Practicum and supervision	1–5 with real cases, following site rules for student data

Questions

I'm glad to talk with faculty about how to fit these tools into a course, or to join a class by video. Write to mark@markshinn.org or call (847) 275-7200.

Mark R. Shinn, Ph.D.
Emeritus Professor of School Psychology
Data-Based Consulting, Inc. · 1576 Tara Lane, Lake Forest, IL 60045
markshinn.org

2. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act regulations, 34 CFR §300.320(a)(2)–(3): https://sites.ed.gov/idea/regs/b/d/300.320