Eligibility Determination: Deaf-Blindness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Child Name: | DOB: |
| Gender: | Age: |
| School: | Grade: |
| Parent/Guardian: | Address: |
| Parent/Guardian: | Address: |
| Home Phone: | Work Phone: |
| Home Language: | Language Proficiency: |
| Primary Language: | Referral Date: |
| Test Dates: | Report Date: |

Deaf-Blindness means concomitant hearing and visual impairments, the combination of which causes such severe communication and other developmental and educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for children with deafness or children with blindness. (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(2))

**The New Mexico Public Education Department (PED) highly recommends that the Eligibility Determination Team (EDT) use the following information in making an eligibility determination under the category of deaf-blindness.**

**Document assessment and evaluation data.** The EDT must review and/or complete the following evaluations and/or assessments according to the recommendations established in the New Mexico Technical Evaluation and Assessment Manual (NM TEAM 2017):

[ ]  screening data/previously conducted evaluation data (preschool aged children); SAT file documentation (school aged children)

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

᷾[ ]  child’s history, including an interview with the parent(s)/guardian(s)

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  audiological examination

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  eye examination conducted by licensed eye specialist

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  functional visual evaluation

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  speech/ language/communication assessment

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  learning media assessment

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

᷾[ ]  complete multiple direct observations across both structured and unstructured settings and various times

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  systematic review of individual academic achievement performance

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  transition assessment, as appropriate

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Determine the presence of a disability.** The assessment and evaluation data documented above must demonstrate that the child is a child with deaf-blindness according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(2)). The questions below should be answered to help the EDT determine whether or not the child has a disability as defined by IDEA (2004).

**NOTE:** It is imperative that EDTs remember that multiple sources of evaluation data (including standardized and non-standardized) must be used for all eligibility determination decisions. It is essential that teams look at the whole child, not simply test scores. EDTs are strongly encouraged to review the introduction to this manual, particularly sections related to professional judgment (section 3), multilingual assessment issues (section 4), and the use and interpretation of standardized assessments and obtained scores (section 5).

1. Has the EDT eliminated the possibility that either the lack of (a) appropriate instruction in reading or math **and/or** (b) the opportunity to participate in developmentally appropriate early childhood experiences is a determinant factor?

᷾**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

 √ If answered NO, the child is not eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

2. Has the EDT eliminated the possibility that limited English proficiency is a determinant factor?

᷾**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

√ If answered NO, the child is not eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

3. Has the EDT determined that the assessment and evaluation data demonstrate that the child is a child with deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004)?

᷾**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

√ If answered NO, the child is not eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

4. Has the EDT determined that no other eligibility category better describes this child’s disability?

**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

√If answered NO, the child is not eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

**Determine need for specially designed instruction.** The assessment and evaluation data documented above must demonstrate that the child requires specially designed instruction as a result of the disability according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.39(b)(3)). The questions below should be answered to help the EDT determine whether or not the child requires specially designed instruction as defined by IDEA (2004).

1. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum or developmentally appropriate activities, as appropriate?

᷾[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

2. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to participate in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities?

᷾[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

3. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to be educated and participate with other children with and without disabilities?

[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

√Answering YES to one or more of the above statements (1, 2, 3) indicates that the child needs specially designed instruction.

**Determination of eligibility for special education and related services.** The EDT has reviewed the referral and evaluation sources relevant to this child and has made the following determination:

[ ]  The child is eligible under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation documents that the child is eligible for and in need of special education services under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004).

[ ]  The child is not eligible under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child does not have deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), and the child is not eligible for special education and related services under any other eligibility category.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child does not have deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), but the child is eligible for special education and related services under the category of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. (Complete appropriate eligibility determination form for that category.)

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child has deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004); however, the EDT has determined that the eligibility category of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (as defined by IDEA, 2004) better describes the child’s primary disability that results in a need for specially designed instruction. (Complete appropriate eligibility determination form for that category.)

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that although the child has deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), the EDT has determined that the child’s educational needs can be met without specially designed instruction.

[ ]  The EDT is unable to determine eligibility under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness. The following information is needed in order for the EDT to reconvene and make a final eligibility determination decision:

[ ]  Additional information from:

[ ]  Additional assessments in the following areas:

[ ]  Other:

Eligibility Determination Team Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Title/Name** | **Date** | **Signature** |
| **[ ]**  | Parent/Guardian  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Parent/Guardian |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Child |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Special Education Teacher |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | General Education Teacher |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | District Representative |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Person Interpreting Evaluation Results |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Educational Diagnostician |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Speech Language Pathologist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Occupational Therapist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Physical Therapist |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | School Psychologist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Social Worker  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |

Required members of the EDT, as described in IDEA (2004), are parent(s), special education teacher, general education teacher, district representative, and an individual who can interpret evaluation results (this is not necessarily an additional member of the team).

Team members who are serving in more than one role (e.g., district representative and person interpreting evaluation results) should sign in all applicable places.

Notes:

Reevaluation Eligibility Determination: Deaf-Blindness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Child Name: | DOB: |
| Gender: | Age: |
| School: | Grade: |
| Parent/Guardian: | Address: |
| Parent/Guardian: | Address: |
| Home Phone: | Work Phone: |
| Home Language: | Language Proficiency: |
| Primary Language: | Referral Date: |
| Test Dates: | Report Date: |

Deaf-blindness means concomitant hearing and visual impairments, the combination of which causes such severe communication and other developmental and educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for children with deafness or children with blindness. (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(2))

**The New Mexico Public Education Department (PED) highly recommends that the Eligibility Determination Team (EDT) use the following information in determining continued eligibility under the category of deaf-blindness.**

**Review of evaluation data.** The EDT reviewed and/or completed the following evaluations and/or assessments as part of the reevaluation process according to the recommendations established in the New Mexico Technical Evaluation and Assistance Manual (2017):

[ ]  current classroom-based, short-cycle, and/or state assessments

 Date:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  complete multiple direct observations across both structured and unstructured settings and various times

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  observations and information provided by teachers and related service providers Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  observations, information, and/or evaluations provided by the child’s parents Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other assessment information included:

 [ ]  audiological evaluation

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  eye examination

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  functional visual evaluation

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  speech/ language/communication assessment

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  learning media assessment

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  systematic review of achievement

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  transition assessment, as appropriate

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 [ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Determine the continued presence of a disability.** The assessment and evaluation data documented above must demonstrate that the child continues to be a child with deaf- blindness according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(2)). The questions below should be answered to help the EDT determine whether or not the child continues to have a disability as defined by IDEA (2004).

1. Has the EDT determined that the assessment and evaluation data demonstrate that the child continues to be a child with deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004)?

**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

√ If answered NO, the child is no longer eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

2. Has the EDT determined that no other eligibility category better describes this child’s disability?

᷾**[ ]** YES **[ ]**  NO

Documentation:

√If answered NO, the child is no longer eligible under the deaf-blindness category.

**NOTE:** There are no specific reevaluation eligibility criteria, therefore, it is up to the EDT to determine whether or not the child continues to have a disability based on the REED process. However, if upon review of existing and newly gathered evaluation data (as appropriate), there is consideration of a change or addition of eligibility, the EDT must follow the guidelines and procedures for initial eligibility for the newly considered eligibility category.

Determine continued need for specially designed instruction. The assessment and evaluation data documented above must demonstrate that the child continues to require specially designed instruction as a result of the disability according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.39(b)(3)). The questions below should be answered to help the EDT determine whether or not the child continues to require specially designed instruction as defined by IDEA (2004).

To answer the following questions, the EDT should consider (a) the child’s present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, (b) the child’s educational needs, and (c) any necessary changes to the child’s educational program.

1. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to be involved in and make progress in the general education curriculum or developmentally appropriate activities, as appropriate?

 **[ ]**  YES **[ ]**  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

2. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to participate in extracurricular and other nonacademic activities?

**[ ]**  YES **[ ]**  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

3. As a result of the disability, does the child require specially designed instruction in order to be educated and participate with other children with and without disabilities?

**[ ]**  YES **[ ]**  NO

Rationale/Documentation:

√Answering “yes” to one or more of the above statements (1, 2, 3) indicates that the child needs specially designed instruction.

**Determination of continued eligibility for special education and related services.** The EDT has reviewed the referral and evaluation sources relevant to this child and has made the following determination:

[ ]  The child continues to be eligible under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation documents that the child continues to be eligible for and in need of special education services under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004).

[ ]  The child is no longer eligible under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child no longer has deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), and the child is not eligible for special education and related services under any other eligibility category.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child no longer has deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), but the child is eligible for special education and related services under the category of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. (Complete appropriate eligibility determination form for that category.)

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child continues to have deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004); however, the EDT has determined that the eligibility category of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (as defined by IDEA, 2004) better describes the child’s primary disability that results in a need for specially designed instruction. (Complete appropriate eligibility determination form for that category.)

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that although the child continues to have deaf-blindness as defined by IDEA (2004), the EDT has determined that the child’s educational needs can be met without specially designed instruction.

[ ]  The EDT is unable to determine continued eligibility under the eligibility category of deaf-blindness. The following information is needed in order for the EDT to reconvene and make a continued eligibility determination decision:

[ ]  Additional information from:

[ ]  Additional assessments in the following areas:

[ ]  Other:

Reevaluation Eligibility Determination Team Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Title/Name** | **Date** | **Signature** |
| **[ ]**  | Parent/Guardian  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Parent/Guardian |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Child |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Special Education Teacher |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | General Education Teacher |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | District Representative |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Person Interpreting Evaluation Results |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Educational Diagnostician |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Speech Language Pathologist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Occupational Therapist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Physical Therapist |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | School Psychologist  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Social Worker  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |
| **[ ]**  | Other  |  |  |

Required members of the EDT, as described in IDEA (2004), are parent(s), special education teacher, general education teacher, district representative, and an individual who can interpret evaluation results (this is not necessarily an additional member of the team).

Team members who are serving in more than one role (e.g., district representative and person interpreting evaluation results) should sign in all applicable places.