Eligibility Determination: Speech or Language Impairment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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: |

A speech or language impairment means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment, that adversely affects a child's educational performance. (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(11))

**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 speech or language impairment.**

**Document assessment and evaluation data.** The EDT must review and/or complete the following evaluations and/or assessments specific to the type of evaluation being conducted (i.e., speech and/or language) according to the recommendations established in the New Mexico Technical Evaluation and Assessment Manual (NM TEAM 2017):

**Speech Disorders**

[ ]  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: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

[ ]  functional communication assessment

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

[ ]  assessment of intelligibility of speech

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

[ ]  oral mechanism/oral motor exam

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

[ ]  analysis of spontaneous speech sample

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

[ ]  transition assessment, as appropriate

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

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  other \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  individual assessment in areas of suspected disability, including one or more of the following areas:

**Articulation**

[ ]  stimulability assessment Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  standardized and/or nonstandardized inventory(ies) of speech sounds/phonological processes Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Voice**

[ ]  measures of and/or qualitative descriptions of quality, resonance, pitch, and volume Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Fluency**

[ ]  assessment of speech rate Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  observations of oral, laryngeal, and respiratory behaviors Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  qualitative description of non-measurable aspects of fluency Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Language Disorders**

[ ]  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:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

[ ]  functional communication assessment

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

[ ]  standardized and non-standardized assessments of receptive and expressive language in the areas of content (semantics), form (morphology and syntax), and/or use (pragmatics)

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

[ ]  systematic review of individual academic achievement performance

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

[ ]  analysis of spontaneous language sample

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 speech or language impairment according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(11)). The questions below should be answered to help the EDT determine whether or not the child has a disability as defined by IDEA (2004).

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 speech or language impairment category.

1. 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 speech or language impairment category.

1. Has the EDT determined that the assessment and evaluation data demonstrate that the child is a child with speech or language impairment as defined by IDEA (2004) and evidenced by meeting at least one of the following criteria:

* 1. Significant limitations in language abilities demonstrated by valid language assessment scores that are 2 or more standard deviations below the mean considering SEM.

 [ ]  YES [ ]  NO

 Documentation:

* 1. Significant limitations in speech abilities (articulation, fluency, or voice) consistent with information provided by the test authors and other sources that supports the existence of a speech impairment.

[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Documentation:

√ If answered NO to **both** of the above, the child is not eligible under the speech or language impairment category.

1. 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment.

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

[ ]  The child is not eligible under the eligibility category of speech or language impairment.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child does not have speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment. 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.

Reevaluation Eligibility Determination: Speech or Language Impairment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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: |

A speech or language impairment means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment, or a voice impairment, that adversely affects a child's educational performance. (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(11))

**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 speech or language impairment.**

**Review of evaluation data.** The EDT reviewed and/or completed the following evaluations and/or assessments specific to the type of evaluation being conducted (i.e., speech and/or language) as part of the reevaluation process according to the recommendations established in the New Mexico Technical Evaluation and Assistance Manual (NM TEAM 2017):

[ ]  classroom-based observations

 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:

**Speech Disorders**

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

[ ]  functional communication assessment

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

[ ]  assessment of intelligibility of speech

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

[ ]  oral mechanism/oral motor exam

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

[ ]  analysis of spontaneous speech sample

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

[ ]  analysis of spontaneous speech sample

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

[ ]  transition assessment, as appropriate

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[ ]  individual assessment in areas of suspected disability, including one or more of the following areas:

**Articulation**

[ ]  stimulability assessment

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

[ ]  standardized and/or nonstandardized inventory(ies) of speech sounds/phonological processes

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

**Voice**

[ ]  measures of and/or qualitative descriptions of quality, resonance, pitch, and volume

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

**Fluency**

[ ]  assessment of speech rate

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

[ ]  observations of oral, laryngeal, and respiratory behaviors Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

[ ]  qualitative description of non-measurable aspects of fluency

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

**Language Disorders**

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

[ ]  functional communication assessment

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

[ ]  standardized and non-standardized assessments of receptive and expressive language in the areas of content (semantics), form (morphology and syntax), and/or use (pragmatics)

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

[ ]  Analysis of spontaneous language sample

 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 speech or language impairment according to the requirements of IDEA (34 CFR Sec. 300.8(c)(11)). 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 speech or language impairment as defined by IDEA (2004)?

[ ]  YES [ ]  NO

Documentation:

√ If answered NO, the child is no longer eligible under the speech or language impairment category.

1. 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment.

[ ]  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 speech or language impairment as defined by IDEA (2004).

[ ]  The child is no longer eligible under the eligibility category of speech or language impairment.

[ ]  The results of the evaluation indicate that the child no longer has speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment 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 speech or language impairment. 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.