

Evaluation

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

August 31, 2023

Model operating procedures created by



Student Solutions

and

**Thompson
& Horton** LLP
ATTORNEYS | COUNSELORS

Disclaimer: This information is provided for educational purposes only to facilitate a general understanding of the law or other regulatory matter. This information is neither an exhaustive treatment on the subject nor is this intended to substitute for the advice of an attorney or other professional advisor. Consult with your attorney or professional advisor to apply these principles to specific fact situations.

©2020 by Texas Association of School Boards, Inc.

TASB grants members/subscribers of TASB Student Solutions™ the limited right to customize this publication for internal (non-revenue generating) purposes only.



CONTENTS

Evaluation procedures..... 1

 What Is Required..... 1

 Initiation of Evaluation Process1

 Group of Qualified Professionals1

 Initial Evaluations2

 Timeline for Conducting Initial Evaluations2

 Reevaluations3

 Evaluation Procedures4

 Additional Procedures 5

 Parent Request for Evaluation7

 Initial Evaluations8

 Reevaluations10

 Contracting With Outside Evaluation Providers.....10

Evidence of Implementation 44

Resources 44

Citations 45

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

What Is Required

An evaluation under the IDEA is the collection of information to determine whether a student is a student with a disability, and to determine the educational needs of the student. The District must complete a REED before conducting an initial evaluation of a student, if appropriate, and as part of any reevaluation, provide the parent with a Prior Written Notice regarding the evaluation, and comply with the parental consent requirements. See [REVIEW OF EXISTING EVALUATION DATA] and [PRIOR WRITTEN NOTICE] and [CONSENT].

Initiation of Evaluation Process

A request for an initial evaluation to determine whether a student is a child with a disability may be made by either the parent or the District. If a parent submits a written request to the District or Campus Special Education Administrator or District or Campus Assessment Personnel for a full and initial evaluation of a student, District or Campus Assessment Personnel must, not later than the 15th school day after the date the District received the request, provide the parent with Prior Written Notice of its proposal or refusal to conduct an evaluation and a copy of the *Notice of Procedural Safeguards*. If the District proposes to conduct an evaluation in accordance with the parent, District or Campus Assessment Personnel must also provide the parent an opportunity to provide written consent for the evaluation no later than the 15th school day after the date the District received the request.

Group of Qualified Professionals

The evaluation is conducted by a multi-disciplinary team of qualified professionals. Upon completion of the administration of assessment and other evaluation measures by the evaluators, a group of qualified professionals and the parent of the child determines whether the child is a child with a disability and the educational needs of the child. In Texas, the group of qualified professionals that makes this determination is the student's ARD Committee. The team of qualified professionals, or the ARD Committee, that collects or reviews evaluation data in connection with the determination of eligibility must include but is not limited to an educational diagnostician and/or LSSP, and other appropriately certified persons with experience and training in the area of the disability. Additional professionals may be required as defined under each eligibility category. See *all procedures under* [EVALUATION-DISABILITIES].

For students suspected of having dyslexia or related disorders, the multidisciplinary team conducting the evaluation under the IDEA must include at least one member with specific knowledge regarding the reading process, dyslexia and related disorders, and dyslexia instruction. This individual must either (1) hold a licensed dyslexia therapist license under Chapter 403 of the Texas Occupations Code or (2) hold the most advanced dyslexia-



related certification issued by an association recognized by the State Board of Education, and identified in, or substantially similar to an association identified in, the program and rules adopted under Sections 7.102 and 38.003 of the Texas Education Code. If an individual qualified under (1) or (2) is not available, the individual must meet the applicable training requirements adopted by the State Board of Education pursuant to Sections 7.102 and 38.003 of the Texas Education Code.¹

Initial Evaluations

The District or Campus Assessment Personnel must conduct a full and individual initial evaluation (FIIE) before providing special education and related services to a student with a disability. Before the District or Campus Assessment Personnel conducts an initial evaluation, the District or Campus Assessment Personnel must make reasonable efforts to obtain informed parental consent. If the parent does not provide consent for an initial evaluation, or if the parent fails to respond to a request to provide consent, the District may, but is not required to, pursue the initial evaluation by utilizing the due process procedures. See [CONSENT]. The initial evaluation must consist of procedures to determine:

- Whether the student is a student with a disability; and
- The educational needs of the student.

Timeline for Conducting Initial Evaluations

A written report of an initial evaluation must be completed:

- Not later than the 45th school day following the date on which the District or Campus Assessment Personnel receive written consent for the evaluation from the student's parent. If a student has been absent from school during that period on three or more school days, the period must be extended by a number of school days equal to the number of school days during that period on which the student has been absent; or
- For students under five years of age by September 1 of the school year and not enrolled in public school, and for students enrolled in a private or home school setting, not later than the 45th school day following the date on which the District or Campus Assessment Personnel receive written consent for the evaluation from

¹ By June 30, 2024, the State Board of Education will determine training requirements and credentials for a person with specific knowledge in the reading process, dyslexia and related disorders, and dyslexia instruction to serve on the District's multidisciplinary team who completes evaluations and who attends the ARD Committee meeting when determining the student's eligibility for special education and related services. In the meantime, the District must analyze the current credentials and qualifications of its staff to determine who is most appropriately trained to meet this requirement.

the student's parent; but

If the District or Campus Assessment Personnel receive written parent consent at least 35, but less than 45, school days before the last instructional day of the school year:

- the written report of the FIIE must be provided to the student's parent not later than June 30 of that year; or
- If the student was absent from school during that time three or more days, the written report of the FIIE must be completed not later than the 45th school day following the date on which consent was received plus the number of school days the student was absent.

A student is considered absent for the school day if the student is not in attendance at the school's official attendance taking time or at the alternate attendance taking time set for that student. A student is considered in attendance if the student is off campus participating in an activity that is approved by the school board and is under the direction of a professional staff member of the District or an adjunct staff member who has a minimum of a bachelor's degree and is eligible for participation in TRS.

In determining evaluation timelines, a "school day" does not include a day that falls after the last instructional day of the spring school term and before the first instructional day of the subsequent fall term.

If the student was in the process of being evaluated for special education eligibility by another district and enrolls in the District before the previous district completes the initial evaluation, the District must coordinate with the previous district as necessary and as expeditiously as possible to ensure a prompt completion of the evaluation. See [CHILDREN WHO TRANSFER].

Reevaluations

District Assessment Personnel will complete a reevaluation of a student with a disability:

- if the ARD Committee determines that the educational or related services needs of the student warrant a reevaluation, including improved academic achievement and functional performance;
- if a reevaluation is requested by the student's parents or teacher; or
- before determining that the student is no longer a student with a disability.

A reevaluation must occur not more frequently than once a year, unless the parent and the ARD Committee, through the REED, agree otherwise, and at least every three years, unless the parent and the ARD Committee, through the REED, agree that a reevaluation

is unnecessary. See [REVIEW OF EXISTING EVALUATION DATA]

Evaluation Procedures

When conducting the evaluation, District or Campus Assessment Personnel must use a variety of assessment tools and strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information, including information provided by the parent, that may assist in determining:

- Whether the student is a student with a disability; and
- The content of the student's IEP, including information related to enabling the student to be involved in and progress in the general education curriculum, or for the preschool student, to participate in appropriate activities.

District or Campus Assessment Personnel must use technically sound instruments that may assess the relative contribution of cognitive and behavioral factors, in addition to physical or developmental factors. These assessments and other evaluation materials include those tailored to assess areas of educational need and not merely those that are designed to provide a single general intelligence quota.

The assessments and other evaluation materials used to assess the student must be selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis. In addition, the assessments and other evaluation materials must be provided and administered in the student's native language or other mode of communication and in the form most likely to yield accurate information on what the student knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally (unless it is not feasible to provide or administer in that fashion).

The assessment instruments must be used for the purposes for which the assessments or measures are valid and reliable and must be administered by trained and knowledgeable personnel who administer the assessments in accordance with any instructions provided by their producers.

The assessments used by District or Campus Assessment Personnel must be selected and administered so as best to ensure that if an assessment is administered to a student with impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills, the assessment results accurately reflect the student's aptitude or achievement level, or whatever other factors the test purports to measure, rather than reflecting the student's impaired sensory, manual, or speaking skills (unless those skills are the factors that the test purports to measure). The procedures used will differentiate between language proficiency and disability.

The evaluation must be sufficiently comprehensive to ensure that the student is assessed in all areas of suspected disability, including, if appropriate:

- Health;



- Vision;
- Hearing;
- Social and emotional status;
- General intelligence;
- Academic performance;
- Communicative status and
- Motor abilities.

The evaluation must also be sufficiently comprehensive to identify all the student's special education and related service needs, whether or not commonly linked to the disability category in which the student has been classified.

Once the FIE is completed, the ARD Committee must review the evaluation. If a determination is made that the student has a disability and needs special education and related services, an IEP will be developed for the student. See [FAPE COMPOSITE - DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY]

Additional Procedures

District Assessment Personnel will ensure that all timelines are followed and that evaluations are completed in accordance with federal and state law. In that regard, District Assessment Lead Personnel will track the initiation, assignment, and completion of all initial referrals, initial evaluations, and reevaluations utilizing the District's evaluation tracking system. District Assessment Lead Personnel will monitor and manage all of the evaluations for their area or team and provide weekly and/or monthly progress updates to the Special Education Director or designee in order to ensure that SPP 11 and 12 timelines are met.

For all evaluations, Campus and District Assessment Personnel will ensure that current versions of applicable assessments are used and that those administering the assessments have adequate familiarity with how the test is to be administered. This includes ensuring that the instruments used in an evaluation are valid, reliable, and administered in accordance with the instructions provided by the producer of the assessment. Assessment Personnel will also consider whether any extenuating circumstances exist that might impact the assessment such as the health of the student, environmental factors, absences, or other outside influences.

Evaluations help ARD Committees identify the specialized instruction and related services students with disabilities need to receive FAPE, in addition to being used for eligibility purposes. It is imperative for staff working directly with the student to share information about the student's progress or lack of progress, or changed circumstances so that an ARD Committee can determine if additional assessment is indicated.

Campus and District Assessment Personnel will ensure that all assessments are



comprehensive and address all concerns and suspected areas of disabilities. Prior to beginning the evaluation, Campus and District Assessment Personnel will communicate with the student's parent(s), teachers, and other relevant Campus Personnel regarding the student to ensure the student is assessed in all suspected areas of disabilities

The following are components of a full and individual evaluation:

- Reason for Referral
- Sources of Data
- Sociological
- Family History
- Educational History
- Test Conditions and Behavior
- Language/Communication
- Physical/Developmental/Medical
- Academic Achievement/Educational Performance Levels
- Intellectual/Cognitive Functioning
- Adaptive Behavior
- Emotional/Behavioral/Social Functioning
- Assistive Technology
- Post-Secondary Transition
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Assurances
- Signatures of multidisciplinary team members

The District or Campus Assessment Personnel will summarize the pertinent findings in all of the above areas, if appropriate, in the FIE and will document the members of the multi-disciplinary team as participants in the FIE. For any related services being considered (i.e., OT, PT, Counseling, AT, School Health Services, etc.), the District or Campus Assessment Personnel will ensure that the FIE includes an assessment and information relevant for the ARD Committee to determine whether that related service is appropriate for the student.

The District or Campus Assessment Personnel will place the final FIE and any relevant supporting data in the student's eligibility folder on the campus. All original protocols or other assessment materials will be maintained in the file of the District or Campus Assessment Personnel and will not be copied. If the parent requests copies of the protocols, the District or Campus Assessment Personnel will instead sit down with the parent at a mutually-agreeable time to review the protocols and information with the parent.

The FIE will be provided to the parent within a reasonable time before the ARD meeting. For an initial evaluation, the District or Campus Assessment Personnel will review the



results of the evaluation prior to the ARD meeting in a face-to-face meeting with the parent, when possible. For reevaluations, a face-to-face meeting may not be necessary; however, the results of the evaluation should be reviewed with the parent prior to the ARD.

Upon completion of the evaluation, each member of the evaluation team should sign the FIE. If the student meets the criteria for one or more of the IDEA eligibilities, a Disability Report in the area or areas will be completed and the FIE will be shared with the ARD Committee to determine eligibility. If a determination is made by the ARD Committee that the student has a disability and needs special education and related services, an IEP must be developed for the student. Or, if the re-evaluation indicates a need for changes to the student's IEP, an ARD Committee will meet to review and revise the student's current program.

If the student does not meet one of the eligibility criteria under the IDEA or does not need special education or related services due to his/her disability, as determined by the student's ARD Committee, Campus Personnel should refer the student to the Campus Personnel responsible for compliance with Section 504 to determine whether the student is eligible for accommodations or services under Section 504. All students who do not qualify for special education under the IDEA and/or Section 504 should be referred back to the Campus Student Support Team for regular education interventions, if needed.

Parent Request for Evaluation

A parent may submit a written request for an initial evaluation to Campus or District Administration by hand delivery or through mail, email, or fax. The request from the parent does not need to include any specific language or magic words. If the parent requests an evaluation or is requesting special education or related services, the District will consider that a request for an initial evaluation.

For requests received via hand delivery, mail, email or fax, District or Campus Special Education Personnel receiving the documents will stamp the request with the school day it was received (or opened). If the request is received after 5pm, the request should be stamped the following school day. If the request is sent on a weekend or on a school staff holiday, the date stamp should reflect the next school day that is not a weekend or a school staff holiday.

Should a parent or guardian make an oral request for an initial evaluation to District or Campus Personnel over the phone or in person, Campus Special Education Administration will promptly advise the parent or guardian regarding how to submit a proper written request. Campus Personnel should be trained to connect the parent to a Campus or District Administrator who can assist the parent with the written request. If a parent does not follow an oral request for an initial evaluation with the written request, the staff to whom the oral request was made will document this information and immediately submit it to the District or Campus Special Education Administration. Follow up to this



request will occur in a timely manner. District or Campus Special Education Administration will train all District staff on this process each year.

District Special Education Personnel will respond no later than fifteen (15) school days after a written request from the parent or guardian is received by the Campus or District Administration whether the District agrees to or refuses to evaluate the student. School day does not include a day that falls after the last instructional day of the spring school term and before the first instructional day of the subsequent fall term (i.e., summer break).

If District Special Education Personnel propose that an evaluation should be completed, the Campus Special Education Personnel will provide the parent with a Prior Written Notice, a copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards and a copy of the Parent's Guide to the Admission, Review, and Dismissal Process and give the parent an opportunity to give written consent for the evaluation no later than 15 school days after the written request was received.

If District Special Education Personnel decide that an evaluation is not warranted at this time, Campus Special Education Personnel shall provide the parent with a Prior Written Notice and a copy of the Notice of Procedural Safeguards by the 15-school day deadline. In addition, Campus Personnel shall refer the student to the Student Support Team and/or Campus Administration to address the parent concerns and monitor student progress.

The Campus Special Education Personnel should ensure that the parent signs written acknowledgement of receipt of the Prior Written Notice, the Notice of Procedural Safeguards, and the Parent's Guide to the Admission, Review and Dismissal Process. Such documentation will be kept in the Referral section of the student's special education eligibility folder if the student is referred for an initial evaluation or, if an evaluation is refused, in the on-line Frontline folder. If written acknowledgement of receipt of the Prior Written Notice and Procedural Safeguards is unable to be attained, the manner in which the Notice and Procedural Safeguards was provided will be documented and kept in the folder. See [PRIOR WRITTEN NOTICE] and [SPECIAL EDUCATION ELIGIBILITY FOLDER]

Initial Evaluations

For initial evaluations, Campus Special Education Personnel (preferably the Special Education Assessment Personnel and/or in consultation with Special Education Assessment Personnel) will meet with parents to explain the evaluation process and attain informed consent to evaluate. Campus Special Education Personnel will communicate with District or Campus Special Education Assessment Personnel regarding the date consent was signed and the date on which the assessment must be completed. A student's absences during the assessment process will be monitored in case the assessment deadline needs to be adjusted due to student absences.



District or Campus Assessment Personnel will collect and review relevant information before deciding what specific assessments will be administered for an initial FIE. This collection of information will include some or all of the following:

- Concerns from parent regarding the student's academic, developmental, emotional, or functional performance, including any suspected disability
- Concerns from teacher(s) or other Campus Personnel regarding the student's academic, developmental, emotional, or functional performance in the classroom, including any suspected disability
- Parent Information Form
- Teacher Observation Form
- Documentation of all interventions or accommodations provided to the student and the result of those interventions or accommodations
- Hearing and vision information
- Report card or other grade reports
- Attendance records
- Student profile information
- State & District assessment results
- Dyslexia screenings/evaluations
- Work samples
- Communication skills documentation
- Behavior logs and/or disciplinary referrals
- LPAC information (if applicable)
- Home language survey
- Section 504 documents (if applicable)
- Information received from outside sources (i.e., medical/psychological reports)

This data will inform the type of formal and informal assessments that will be conducted/utilized. However, District or Campus Assessment Personnel will inform the parent and consent will be obtained to conduct a comprehensive evaluation in all areas of suspected disability and need. The parent may not limit the scope of the evaluation. If during the process of an evaluation, additional information supports expanding the evaluation into an area which was not originally suspected, the multi-disciplinary District or Campus Assessment team that reviews and conducts the evaluation will collaborate regarding the scope of the evaluation and ensure that all areas of suspected disability and need are fully evaluated within the applicable timelines.

Once the initial FIE is completed, the ARD Committee will meet to review the evaluation. The ARD Committee will meet to review an initial FIE within 30 calendar days from the date of the completion of the initial FIE. If the 30th day falls during the summer and the school is not in session, the ARD Committee will have until the first day of classes in the fall to meet unless ESY is recommended, and, then, the ARD Committee should meet as

soon as possible. If the 30th calendar day falls on a weekend, holiday, or teacher workday, the ARD Committee will meet before the 30th day.

Reevaluations

A reevaluation may occur not more than once a year, unless the parent and the District agree otherwise, and must occur at least once every 3 years. Unlike initial evaluations, there is no timeline from the date of parental consent for a reevaluation to be completed. The ARD Committee should determine the evaluation completion date. As part of all reevaluations, the ARD Committee will conduct a REED to determine the scope of the reevaluation. See [REVIEW OF EXISTING EVALUATION DATA]. All REED meetings should be conducted at least 90 days prior to the 3-year reevaluation due date, or sooner, if the student's circumstances warrant an earlier timeframe. If formal assessment is recommended as part of the REED by the ARD Committee, parental consent will be obtained by the District or Campus Assessment Personnel and all components of the FIE will be completed. See [PRIOR WRITTEN NOTICE] and [CONSENT FOR REEVALUATION]. If the ARD Committee determines that no additional formal assessments are needed, the REED becomes the reevaluation report and should then be presented at an ARD Committee meeting (if the REED meeting was not at an ARD meeting) and specific eligibility and need for services should be reviewed. The date that the REED is reviewed and accepted by the ARD Committee will be entered as the new FIE date.

Contracting With Outside Evaluation Providers

The District may contract with outside providers to conduct initial evaluations and reevaluations for District students, if necessary. The District will comply with all procurement policies and procedures regarding these contracts, including solicitation of request for proposals, if required by Board policy.

The District will maintain documentation requirements of compliance associated with Texas Student Data System (TSDS), Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS), and State Performance Plan (SPP). District staff will provide training, with follow up, to ensure the documentation required is in place and compliant.

FULL AND INITIAL INDIVIDUAL EVALUATIONS

Goose Creek CISD's philosophy regarding full and initial individual evaluations is to ensure all students receive a comprehensive and integrated evaluation delineating the strengths and weaknesses of a student's profile. The analysis derived in these evaluations should inform instruction and ultimately determine whether the child is a child with a disability and specify the educational needs of a child.

Procedures for Planning/Conducting a Full and Individual Evaluation (FIE):

Review all referral information/records

- Contact the parent/guardian to gather information regarding their main concern(s) regarding their child's academic, developmental, and functional performance, including any suspected disability to assist in planning the evaluation
- Gained informed consent from the parent
- Contact teacher(s) and inquire about concerns for the child to plan for the evaluation
- Observe the child in the classroom setting which may include a virtual classroom if child is participating in synchronous instruction. (While not best practice during summer testing, the evaluator may use an observation during testing and/or a classroom observation from the referral packet. This procedure was utilized during the COVID 19 pandemic.)
- Use all aforementioned data to determine what type of formal and informal assessments and other evaluation materials are required to appropriately evaluate the child

Formatting Procedures for the FIIE Template:

All areas of concern addressed in the referral must be noted on page one of the FIIE under the subtitle "OTHER INFORMATION".

Throughout the body of the evaluation in the respective sections of the FIIE, the areas of concern must be assessed through formal and/or informal data.

The conclusion of the FIIE should clearly state and explain for each area/disability suspected if the student meets or does not meet special education eligibility.

The FIIE must be completed within 45 instructional days, and within 30 calendar days for the initial ARD meeting. If the completion date of the FIIE is not within the required initial evaluation timeline and the student is eligible for special education services, the initial ARD committee must discuss the need for compensatory services and document the decision within the deliberations of the ARD and schedule of services to include start and end date.

INITIAL REFERRAL

34 CFR §300.301, INITIAL EVALUATIONS; TEC §29.004 FULL AND INDIVIDUAL INITIAL EVALUATION

The initial evaluation and the resulting report must be completed no later than 45 school days from the day the school receives written consent. Additional information and special circumstances appear below:

- For purposes of these timelines, “School Day” does not include a day that falls after the last instructional day of the spring school term and before the first instructional day of the subsequent fall school term. The commissioner by rule may determine days during which year- round schools are recessed that are not considered school days for purposes of these timelines.
- If a student is absent from school during that 45 School-Day period for three or more days, that period must be extended by the number of School Days equal to the number of School Days during that period that the student was absent. When a student has been absent 3 or more school days, the evaluation case manager will contact the Coordinator of Assessment or Coordinator for Compliance and Accountability to review attendance and upload documentation of state reported absences to the student’s file in Frontline.
- For students under five years of age by September 1 of the school year who are not enrolled in public school and for students enrolled in a private or home school setting, the student’s initial special education evaluation must be completed no later than the 45th School Day following the date on which the school district receives written consent for the evaluation, signed by a student’s parent or legal guardian.
- If a school district receives written consent signed by a student’s parent or legal guardian for a full individual and initial evaluation of a student at least 35 but fewer than 45 School Days before the last instructional day of the school year, the evaluation must be completed and the written report of the evaluation must be provided to the parent or legal guardian no later than June 30 of that year. The student’s admission, review, and dismissal committee shall meet no later than the 15th School Day of the following school year to consider the evaluation.
- Attendance will be reviewed for every student with a FIIE due on June 30th. The absences will be documented and FIIE due dates adjusted accordingly. This documentation will be reviewed by Coordinator of Assessment or Coordinator for Compliance and Accountability and uploaded to student’s electronic file in Frontline.
- If a school district receives written consent signed by a student’s parent or legal guardian less than 35 School Days before the last instructional day of the school year or if the district receives the written consent at least 35 but fewer than 45 School Days before the last instructional day of the school year

but the student is absent from school during that period for three or more days, a written report of a full individual and initial evaluation shall be completed no later than the 45th school day following the date on which the school district receives written consent for the evaluation, signed by the student's parent or legal guardian, except that the timeframe can be extended by the number of school days equal to the number of school days during that period that the student was absent.

- *Please note that a request for a special education evaluation may be made verbally and does not need to be in writing. Districts and charter schools must still comply with all federal prior written notice and procedural safeguard requirements and the requirements for identifying, locating, and evaluating children who are suspected of being a child with a disability and in need of special education. However, a verbal request does not require the district or charter school to respond within the 15-school-day timeline.*

Procedures for Referring a Student Not Yet Identified as Receiving Special Education Services for a Full Individual and Initial Evaluation (FIIIE)

1. Upon the referral/request for evaluation by the Rtl committee, 504 committee, or parent/guardian, the appropriate general ed staff member will complete the Initial Referral packet. The Initial Referral Packet can be found in the Appendix for Section 1.
2. The appropriate general ed staff member will gather the Vision/Hearing Screening, Home Language Survey, and any other supporting/relevant documents that are required and appropriate for the completion of the Full and Individual Evaluation.
3. The completed referral packet will be presented to the Initial Referral Committee every Wednesday by appointment. A decision will be determined by the committee whether we evaluate or refuse the evaluation request. The Coordinator of Assessment will assign the folder to the initial evaluation team for completion.
4. The campus diagnostician will have two weeks, from the date of assignment, to obtain informed consent from the parent/guardian and return the completed referral folder to the Coordinator of Assessment. Prior to returning the referral folder, the campus diagnostician will upload the signed consent form into eSped and put the original in the referral folder. The campus diagnostician will have 3 days to return the referral folder to the Assessment Clerk.
5. Once an initial FIE has been completed in its entirety in eSped, the evaluator will notify the campus team, assessment clerk, and assessment coordinator to update the database indicating the FIIIE is read for review.

6. It is the initial team evaluator's responsibility to review the FIE with the parent prior to the ARD. If the parent is unavailable to review the FIE prior to the ARD, the Initial Evaluator must notify the campus and completed review of assessment via telephone.

*If the evaluation renders an eligibility of AU, ED, or OHI for ADHD, the LSSP must attend the school staffing. It is the responsibility of the LSSP to complete the draft AU supplement, Behavior Intervention Plan, and Behavior/Social goals and objectives for the ARD if recommended.

** If additional forms need to be generated or faxed, such as a physician form or consent to release information, the evaluator conducting the evaluation will complete this task.

RE-EVALUATION

34 CFR §300.301-300.306, 300.122; TAC § 89.1040, ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

Overall Principles

Every evaluation after the initial evaluation is considered a re-evaluation.

Note: If the student transfers from outside the state of Texas, and there is a need to conduct an Evaluation because the out of state evaluation is not appropriate and/or the eligibility condition does not match TEA's eligibility condition, then the new evaluation is considered an Initial Evaluation and must follow the 45 school day initial timeline.

Procedures for Re-Evaluation When No New Eligibility is Suspected

1. As part of the planning process for a re-evaluation, a REED meeting (review of existing evaluation data meeting) must be held to identify the appropriate areas of the re-evaluation.
2. The campus-based evaluator is responsible for the REED meeting (Diagnostician, LSSP, or SLP). The REED meeting can be held in a variety of different ways including face- to- face, phone call, or email. This meeting is not an ARD meeting unless requested by parent. This meeting must include input from the campus diagnosticians, teachers, parents, and other staff members as appropriate.
3. The REED Meeting should be held no earlier than 60-75 days prior to the three-year re-evaluation due date.
4. If any formal testing is deemed necessary based on the REED documents,



parental consent will be obtained and all components of the FIE template will be completed formally and/or informally. A FIE will be completed, compiling current and previous evaluation data into one comprehensive report.

5. The date of the report is the date it is completed. The eligibility report (if applicable) should have the same date. This date becomes the new FIE date.

PROCEDURES FOR CAMPUS RE-EVALUATIONS

(Campus diagnostician is not initially suspecting a different eligibility condition)

1. If while completing a re-evaluation at the campus level, the data indicates the need to evaluate a different eligibility condition (e.g., LD to ID; LD to OHI for ADHD, etc.), the campus diagnostician will evaluate for the suspected area of disability.
2. Once the FIE has been completed in its entirety in ESPED, the evaluator will notify the campus clerk to schedule a review ARD.

PROCEDURES FOR RE-EVALUATION FOR SI ONLY WHEN A SECOND ELIGIBILITY IS SUSPECTED (THIS INCLUDES WHEN DYSLEXIA IS THE SECOND SUSPECTED CONDITION)

(Ex: student who is SI only and there is suspicion of a second eligibility)

1. The SLP, as the case manager, will collect all the necessary documentation needed from the Referral for FIE form (This is the same form used during the Rtl team referral process) and complete the REED meeting to determine needed evaluations. The SLP will consult with the campus diagnostician.
2. The SLP will obtain informed consent from the parent.
3. After consent is obtained for an FIE, the SLP will upload any signed documents by the parent including consent to ESped. Please note that if Dyslexia is suspected the Diagnostician will conduct the evaluation. The Dyslexia Specialist may be consulted but does not conduct the Dyslexia evaluation as the Re-Evaluation will include the appropriate tests to determine if the student has Dyslexia.
4. Once consent is obtained, the campus evaluation staff will conduct the evaluation.
5. Once the evaluation is archived, the campus diagnostician will staff with the parent and campus and schedule the ARD.
6. It is the evaluator's responsibility to review the FIE with the parent prior to the ARD.

PROCEDURES FOR RE-EVALUATION WHEN MULTIPLE CHANGES IN ELIGIBILITY ARE SUSPECTED

(Ex: student who has had multiple changes in eligibility categories)



1. The campus diagnostician will collect all the necessary documentation needed from the Referral for FIE form (This is the same form used during the RTI team referral process) and REED documentation.
2. The campus diagnostician will obtain consent from the parent and upload all signed documents by the parent into eSped.
3. Once the evaluation is archived, the campus diagnostician will staff with the parent and campus and schedule the ARD.
4. It is the evaluator's responsibility to review the FIE with the parent prior to the ARD.

Procedures for Re-Evaluation when the Special Education Student is a Transfer from another district *NOTE: An evaluation from another school district within the state of Texas is acceptable if the evaluation is current and appropriate. If the current evaluation is not accepted by GCCISD and a re-evaluation is needed, GCCISD has 20 school days from the date of verification to complete the re-evaluation and conduct the annual ARD 89.1050 (i)(1).*

1. Within the first five days of enrollment, a Transfer agreement must be completed.
2. The campus diagnostician will make their best attempt to obtain the student's FIE and most current ARD from the prior district. If the evaluation is not received at the campus no later than ten calendar days from the date of enrollment, the campus diagnostician will initiate the process for the Re-evaluation to be conducted by the campus staff and the campus diagnostician will obtain consent for the FIE.
3. The campus diagnostician will upload the necessary signed documents by the parents in to eSped and begin the re-evaluation.
4. Upon completion of the evaluation, if the eligibility did not change, the campus diagnostician can archive the FIE once it is complete and then staff and complete the annual ARD.
5. Once the evaluation is archived, the campus diagnostician will staff with the parent and campus and schedule the ARD.
6. It is the evaluator's responsibility to review the FIE with the parent prior to the ARD.

** If for some reason the evaluation from the previous district is received after the ten days, and the evaluation is current, the campus diagnostician can choose to accept that evaluation and not continue the additional evaluation.*

***If while completing the transfer agreement, the campus does have the evaluation from the student's previous district, but it does not meet district standards, then the campus diagnostician will obtain consent and conduct the evaluation. ***

Procedures for Re-Evaluation when the Special Education Student is a Transfer from another State (Ex: student who enrolls in GCCISD from out of state without an FIE, or an FIE with an eligibility that is not TEA recognized or does not match a TEA eligibility area)

NOTE: An evaluation from out of state is acceptable if the evaluation is current and meets all TEA disability condition requirements.

1. Within the first five days of enrollment, a Transfer agreement must be completed. The campus diagnostician will complete the Transfer agreement.
2. The Campus Based Diagnostician will make their best attempt to obtain the student's FIE and most current ARD from the prior district.
3. If the evaluation is not received at the campus no later than ten calendar days from the date of enrollment, the campus diagnostician will initiate the process for the Re-evaluation to be conducted by the campus staff and the campus based evaluator will obtain consent for the FIE.
4. If a Re-evaluation is required for a student transferring from another state, the Re-evaluation is considered an Initial Evaluation and the 45 day timeline is in effect.
5. Once the evaluation is archived, the campus diagnostician will staff with the parent and campus and schedule the ARD.
6. It is the campus diagnostician's responsibility to review the FIE with the parent prior to the ARD. If the parent is unavailable to review the FIE prior to the ARD, the diagnostician must notify the campus and complete the review via telephone.

**If the evaluation renders an eligibility of AU, ED, or OHI for ADHD, the LSSP must attend the school staffing. It is the responsibility of the LSSP to complete the draft AU supplement, Behavior Intervention Plan, and Behavior/Social goals and objectives for the ARD if these are recommended.*

*** If for some reason the evaluation from the previous district is received after the ten days and the evaluation is current and meets TEA guidelines, the campus diagnostician can choose to accept that evaluation and not continue the additional evaluation.*

RE-EVALUATION UTILIZING THE REED PROCESS (CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY)

If a student has had two consistent evaluations and at the REED meeting, the parent and school staff agree no new formal testing is warranted, the REED can serve as the re-evaluation. In this scenario, consent does not need to be obtained.

In addition to two consecutive evaluations with no eligibility changes, the following must be considered:

1. The parent and school staff must agree no new evaluation is needed for programming, eligibility, or dismissal. If any concerns are identified beyond the current eligibility or that warranted additional information for programming, conduct formal testing, a REED should not be used.
2. Student must be progressing on state assessment, IEP Goals & Objectives (academic and behavior).
3. If the REED is utilized, the REED is completed within the ARD document and must be completed prior to the student's 3 Year Re-evaluation date.

WRITTEN EVALUATION REPORTS

34 CFR § 300.311(A-B)

Multidisciplinary Team

A multidisciplinary team will conduct the evaluation. The team includes the child's parents as well as a group that is collectively qualified to conduct and interpret evaluation and intervention data, develop appropriate educational and transitional recommendations based on evaluation data, and deliver and monitor specifically designed instruction and services. Both a special education teacher and a general education teacher should be included on the team. If the student does not have a general education teacher, a general education teacher qualified to teach a child of the child's age should be included. Other professionals should be included as appropriate.

Observation

At least one member of the multidisciplinary team, other than the child's current teacher, who is trained in observation, shall observe the child in the learning environment, INCLUDING the regular classroom setting to document academic performance and behavior in the area of difficulty. If child is participating in synchronous instruction observation may occur in the virtual classroom.

WRITTEN REPORT

The report must include information relevant to these areas:

1. Reason for Referral
2. Educational History
3. Interventions
4. Previous Evaluations, if any
5. Sociological

6. Physical
7. Language Dominance
8. Language Proficiency
9. Speech & Language Testing
10. Emotional/Behavioral
11. Intellectual
12. Achievement
13. Adaptive Behavior
14. Assistive Technology
15. Conclusions
16. Recommendations

***Reports are required to be signed prior to archiving the report and sending to the receiving campus.**

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY

34 CFR §§ 300.5, 300.6, 300.105(a), 300.324(a)(2)(v)

The IDEA defines "assistive technology device" as "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability." The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted or the replacement of such a device.

"Assistive technology service" means "any service that directly assists a child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device."

The ARD Committee must "consider whether the child needs [AT] devices and services" as part of the program development process. The IDEA requires each public agency to ensure that AT devices and services are made available to each child with a disability if required as part of the child's special education, related services, or supplementary aids and services.

Although the need for Assistive Technology (AT) must be considered for every



student within the Full Individual Evaluation and during every ARD/IEP meeting, this does not mean that the Assistive Technology Team needs to be involved in a formal evaluation for every student in Special Education.

Goose Creek CISD has categorized Assistive Technology into three levels: Level One – No Tech/Low Tech; Level Two – Mid Tech; and, Level Three – High Tech.

Decisions regarding the need for assistive technology devices and services are made based on a student's ability to access the curriculum and/or the student's IEP goals and objectives. The ARD committee determines the student's curriculum tasks and then considers whether assistive technology devices and/or services are *required* for the student to accomplish those tasks.

Campus teams should utilize the Assistive Technology Consideration Process Form and the Assistive Technology Resource Guide when considering the need for assistive technology.

(1) Complete the *Assistive Technology Consideration Process Form* (see Appendix). The form provides a step-by-step process for instructional teams to follow when considering the need for assistive technology. Instructional teams review the curricular and classroom expectations for a student outlined in the IEP and information gathered from classroom teachers. If the student is making progress, no assistive technology or additional assistive technology is needed. If the student is not making progress, the team will continue through the consideration process outlined in the form.

(2) If the student is not making progress or is not independently completing required tasks with the supports that are currently in place, utilize the Assistive Technology Resource Guide related to the areas in which the student is experiencing difficulty along with the Assistive Technology Consideration Process Form (see Appendix.) For example, if the student is non-verbal and needs a way to request needed items or make comments, reference the Oral Communication/Language section of the guide. If the student's handwriting is illegible, utilize the Writing/Written Composition section of the guide.

(3) Based on the information gathered through the consideration process, the team will identify possible low and mid tech AT tools or devices to address the areas of concern as outlined in the AT Resource Guide in column D. If the team determines that high-tech solutions may be the best option, a formal AT

evaluation is required.

LEVEL ONE – NO TECH/LOW TECH RECOMMENDATIONS

The FIE may recommend low tech assistive technology. In addition, ARD Committee members may recommend Low Tech AT. Recommendations at this level may include equipment and/or services that are basic in nature, require very little training in terms of use, and are inexpensive and readily available, or easily accessible within the classroom and school environment. These Low Tech devices/equipment should be coded as “Assistive Technology” in the PLAAFP section of ESPED and should be documented within the AT Supplement, accommodations, goals and objectives, and/or supplementary aids and services in the ARD document. All documentation, justification, and implementation are provided on a campus level and little or no training/support is required from the Assistive Technology staff. Examples of Low Tech strategies/devices include: visual schedules, picture communication systems, manual communication boards, single message voice output devices (such as a Big Mack), sequenced messaging devices (such as a Step-by-Step), use of classroom computer, accessibility features built into the Windows operating system on campus computers, and spell checkers.

LEVEL TWO - MID TECH RECOMMENDATIONS

Mid Tech recommendations are generally considered by campus specialists such as Speech/Language Pathologists, Occupational Therapists, Physical Therapists, Vision Specialists, Campus Based Evaluation teams, and classroom teachers in collaboration with the Program Specialist for Assistive Technology. These specialized AT recommendations can be included within the FIE. Based on a student’s PLAAFP and curricular expectations, campus specialists identify the needs of the student and consult with members of the Assistive Technology team for assistance when making recommendations. In addition, the Mid Tech AT must be documented appropriately in the ARD paperwork if the AT is required for a FAPE. The Mid Tech recommendation coded as “Assistive Technology” in the PLAAFP section of ESPED and should be documented within the AT Supplement, accommodations, goals and objectives, and/or supplementary aids and services in the ARD document. AT is documented and maintained on a campus level as it relates to that area of service. The Mid-Tech level Assistive Technology equipment/materials may require more maintenance, more training, and may have more technical or electronic component/features than Low Tech. Mid- Tech level devices/equipment may require a trial period of use and recommendations are based upon this trial. Devices/equipment may be available from the AT specialist. If the equipment is not currently available in the district, it may need to be ordered. When the ARD Committee has determined that mid-level Assistive Technology is necessary for student use, a member of the campus will notify the Program Specialist for Assistive Technology. Equipment will be checked out or ordered in the student’s name. Examples of Mid Tech devices include: a portable word processor

(such as an AlphaSmart), static display voice output communication device (such as a Go Talk 20+™), and word prediction software (such as Co-Writer™)

LEVEL THREE – HIGH TECH RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for High Tech equipment must be addressed within the Full Individual Evaluation. These recommendations should be supported by campus data collected based upon trials, interventions, and previous strategies documented and considered. However, there are no prerequisites for the consideration or provision of assistive technology. The FIE requires the collaboration of a multidisciplinary team which consists of the Assistive Technology Specialist, teachers, campus staff, parents/caretakers, campus-based SLP, Related Service specialists, and other people/specialists that work with this student as deemed necessary. A member of the AT team must be involved in the evaluation process if High Tech AT is being considered. The items considered “High Tech” are often expensive for purchase, not readily accessible, highly technical, and require specialized training and knowledge of the equipment/devices. Assistive Technology at this level is provided, documented, and tracked by the Assistive Technology Specialist. Examples of High-Tech devices include dynamic display voice output devices (such as the Accent 1000) laptop computers with specialized software programs, Eye gaze communication systems, and portable tablets (such as an iPad).

EVALUATION PROCESS FOR LEVEL THREE ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY EQUIPMENT/DEVICES

1. If the team has determined that low- tech and mid-tech options are not appropriate, the Assistive Technology Specialist must be contacted to (a) become a member of the Full Individual team or (b) if AT is the only evaluation being conducted, then the AT evaluation will be a standalone AT evaluation.
2. The following forms need to be completed and sent to the Assistive Technology Specialist. All required forms are included in the appendix.
 - a. Assistive Technology Consideration Process Form
 - b. Parent Consent uploaded into ESPED (if the AT evaluation is a standalone evaluation)
 - c. Parent Questionnaire
3. Based on the information received, additional forms will be sent to key campus-based staff members.

****Note – Do not document Assistive Technology by brand or specific product name. Instead, give a general description of equipment/material type. For questions about how to document equipment in the ARD, contact the Assistive Technology Specialist.**



<p><u>Do Not</u> List Product/Brand Name of AT</p> <p>tools such as:</p>	<p><u>Do</u> List the Generic Description of AT tools</p> <p>such as:</p>
<p>AlphaSmart™, NEO™, DANA™, Fusion™</p>	<p>Portable word processor</p>
<p>Intellikeys™</p>	<p>Alternate Keyboard</p>
<p>PECS™ (Picture Exchange Communication System)</p>	<p>Picture Symbol/Icon Exchange System for Communication, Manual Communication Board with ____ locations</p>
<p>Big Mack™, iTalk2™, SuperTalker™ (1-8 locations), Communication Builder™ (1- 16 locations), Go Talk 4+™, Go Talk 9+™, Go Talk 20+™, Go Talk 32+™</p>	<p>Static Display Voice Output Communication Aid with__locations.</p>
<p>SpringBoard™, Vantage Lite™, Dynavox V- Max™, Accent 1000, iPad with LAMP Words for Life, iPad with Touch Chat HD</p>	<p>Dynamic Display Voice Output Communication Aid with____locations.</p>

DEAF OR HARD OF HEARING

34 CFR §300.8(c)(3), 34 CFR §300.8(c)(5)

Initial Referrals

When a student has a hearing loss, the student is referred for an initial evaluation for special education; there are several evaluation components that must be addressed.

OTOLOGICAL (OTOLARYNGOLOGY) (PART A) EVALUATION

The otological assessment must indicate a serious hearing loss even after corrective medical treatment or use of amplification. The report must be signed by an Otolaryngologist (ENT doctor) or a licensed medical doctor with documentation that an Otolaryngologist is not reasonably available. The diagnostician will send the otological report form to the Otolaryngologist. The diagnostician should follow up with frequent calls to ensure that the completed form, including date and doctor's signature, is returned in a timely manner.

AUDIOLOGICAL (PART B) EVALUATION

The audiological assessment describes the type of hearing loss, with and without amplification, as well as the implications of the hearing loss for the student's hearing in a variety of circumstances. A licensed Audiologist must sign the report. The campus diagnostician will send the audiological report form to the Audiologist. The campus based evaluator should follow up with frequent calls to ensure that the completed form, including date and Audiologist's signature, is returned in a timely manner.

The evaluation data must include a description of the implications of the hearing loss for the student's hearing in a variety of circumstances with or without recommended amplification.

USE OF GOOSE CREEK CISD MEDICAL CONSULTANTS FOR OTOLARYNGOLOGIST OR AUDIOLOGISTS

If the parent is unable to financially access an Audiologist or Otolaryngologist, Goose Creek CISD is required to contract with an outside vendor for this portion of the evaluation and the evaluation will be completed at no cost to the parent. If the contracted Audiologist or Otolaryngologist is required, the campus diagnostician must email or call in the request to the Program Manager of Evaluation. The following information must be submitted: Student Name, DOB, Parent Name, Campus, Type of Evaluation needed (Audiological and/or Otological). The Program Manager will contact the campus diagnostician when the contract is executed and the parent may be notified to schedule the appointment.

USE OF RDSPD AUDIOLOGIST AND RDSPD MEDICAL CONSULTANT FOR OTOLARYNGOLOGIST EVALUATION

If a Deaf or Hard of Hearing student (D/HH) student receives direct RDSPD services (itinerant or site based) and the parent is unable to financially access an Audiologist or Otolaryngologist, the Tri County East RDSPD will conduct the audiological portion of the evaluation utilizing the RDSPD Audiologist. The RDSPD is required to contract with an outside vendor for the portion of the otological evaluation and the evaluation

will be completed at no cost to the parent.

TRANSPORTATION TO THE AUDIOLOGIST OR OTOLARYNGOLOGIST

If a contracted vendor is utilized as part of the Full Individual Evaluation process and the parent is not able to access transportation to the vendor's office, the Coordinator for Evaluation. Services must be notified to assist the parent with transportation arrangements at no cost to the parent.

COMMUNICATION LANGUAGE (PART C) EVALUATION

TEC §30.083(a)(6)

This portion of the evaluation describes the language and communication ability and the method of communication that will meet the individual needs of the student. The student's ability to communicate through a variety of modes of communication such as listening (aural), speech (oral), sign language, speech reading, and finger spelling are addressed. Each area in the Skill Levels of Specific Communication Competencies should be addressed. If the area is not applicable, it should be noted as "not applicable due to ...". Information for the Speech, Audition, Oral Language, Written Language, and Functional Communication Ability areas should be obtained from the Full Individual Evaluation, including standardized and functional assessment, and classroom teacher and parent input. If NO areas of weakness are noted, this may result in no educational need for the eligibility of D/HH or for direct D/HH services. This evaluation is completed by the speech-language pathologist with assistance from the deaf educator, upon request. The Disability Report-Auditory Impairment (DHH) (Part C)-Communication Assessment is located in ESPED, however can be embedded as part of the report in the evaluation in the communication section of the FIE. All components of the communication assessments must be addressed in the report.

Evaluation	Evaluation Specialist	Person Responsible	Report Form
Full Individual Evaluation	Diagnostician/ LSSP	Diagnostician/ LSSP	Full Individual Evaluation
Otological	ENT or Otolaryngologist	Diagnostician/ LSSP	D/HH Part A

Audiological	Audiologist	Diagnostician/ LSSP	D/HH Part B
Communication	SLP & Deaf Educator	SLP	D/HH Part C (full Individual Evaluation)
Speech-Language	Speech-Language Pathologist	SLP	Full Individual Evaluation

TRI-COUNTY EAST REGIONAL DAY SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR THE DEAF (RDSPD) REFERRAL FOR D/HH

If an evaluation is being completed and eligibility of Deaf or Hard of Hearing (D/HH) is being considered, the initial evaluation team should complete the Professional Assistance Request Form (PA) and contact the RDSPD office to have a RDSPD representative assigned to participate with the evaluation team. The RDSPD representative will collaborate and support the evaluation team to review all student information, complete observations, and functional assessments related to hearing loss, and provide a written summary to the evaluation specialist to be included in the FIE. If the eligibility of D/HH is recommended, a RDSPD representative must be present at ARD meetings.

If an evaluation is completed and a RDSPD representative was not included in the evaluation process, contact the RDSPD Coordinator and Coordinator for Evaluation to determine if additional information is needed.

RE-EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS FOR D/HH

As part of the planning process for a re-evaluation for a student who is D/HH, a REED meeting (Review of Existing Evaluation Data) must be held to determine the scope of the re-evaluation. The teacher of the deaf/hard of hearing assigned to work with or monitor the student should be included. The following guidelines should be referenced during the REED meeting:

- Young children through 8th grade—for each re-evaluation a complete audiological, otological, and communication assessment (Part A, B, and

C) should be strongly considered. An aided audiogram provides valuable information as to how a student accesses information in the classroom. Otological (part A) re-evaluation may not be recommended if the evaluations show no evidence of medical changes.

- High School student re-evaluation—if hearing has remained consistent and there are no significant academic changes, the audiological, otological, and communication assessment (part A, B and C) are not required. Communication Assessment (part C) may be recommended if there have been changes to or questions concerning the student’s mode of communication. The parent may have updated audiological information from routine visits for hearing aid or cochlear implant maintenance that can be shared with the assessment team upon request. If updated audiological information is not received, it is recommended
- Change in services- if service providers feel a service is no longer needed, a REED meeting should be held to discuss which portions of the evaluation may be needed in order to discontinue the service.
- Suspected change in hearing ability- if a service provider or teacher suspects a change in the student’s hearing ability or speech production, a conference/ REED meeting should be held to determine if new evaluation/services are needed. A parent conversation may reveal new information from the student’s private audiologist that may also provide helpful information for service providers.

PROCEDURES TO FOLLOW IF A STUDENT REFUSES TO WEAR AMPLIFICATION/LISTENING DEVICE OR THE STUDENT IS NOT WEARING A LISTENING DEVICE

If a student refuses to wear his/her amplification/listening device, talk to the student and contact the parent to discuss the issue. If a resolution is not found, an ARD should be held, including the parent, to discuss the issue, develop interventions and supports to make sure the aids/listening device are being used.

- If behavior is causing the student to not wear the amplification/listening device, the LSSP should be consulted and a Functional Behavior Assessment (FBA) and Behavior goals and objectives and a Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) may be warranted.
- If the student is not wearing the hearing aids/listening device for other reasons such as a lost or broken device, talk to the student and contact the parent to discuss the issue. If a resolution is not found, an ARD should be held, including the parent, to discuss the issue, discuss supports that may be available to assist the parent with the broken device. The ARD should also consider alternatives for the student to have access to information, such as an assistive listening device with headphones,

written or picture communication, etc.

If the student is not making adequate progress, document why the student is not making progress (e.g., student does not wear listening device; therefore, is not hearing the sounds/oral directions correctly). The classroom teacher should keep a daily log documenting the use of amplification. (see Amplification Monitoring Record form found in the Appendix)

While personal care items such as hearing aids and cochlear implants or other listening devices are not provided by the district, the district can give recommendations for possible resources. Contact the campus nurse or campus social worker representative first. If additional support is needed, contact the Coordinator for the Tri County East RDSPD.

Assistive Listening Device (ALD)

- An Assistive Listening Device (ALD) such as a FM unit may be recommended by an Audiologist. An ALD is equipment that increases the functionality of a hearing aid or cochlear implant by helping the student separate the teacher's voice from background noise. When the school district provides an ALD, it should be documented on the Assistive Technology page of the student's ARD paperwork and daily documentation kept by the student's teacher on the Amplification Monitoring Record (see Appendix) if a student identified as receiving special education services is **not** receiving direct weekly services from a RDSPD Teacher, contact the Program Specialist for Assistive Technology to assist with determining the need for an ALD.
- If a student identified as receiving special education services **does** receive direct, weekly RDSPD services, contact the RDSPD Teacher for the provision of an ALD.
- If the student is not identified with a Special Education eligibility and receives 504 services due to hearing loss, and an ALD has been recommended, the ALD is provided through the 504 committee.
- Assistive Technology Device (ATD) does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such a device.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Referrals

1. *When should the district/ECL agency refer a student for consideration of the eligibility of Deaf or Hard of Hearing (D/HH)?*

When a certified audiologist has determined the student has a significant

hearing loss.

2. What is the process for making a referral for the consideration of eligibility of Deaf or Hard of Hearing (D/HH) for school age students, 3-21 year olds?

- Once a certified audiologist has determined a student to have a significant hearing loss and the district determines a referral for special education services is needed, a Full Individual Evaluation should be requested by the district.
- Complete the Professional Assistance Request (PA) and contact the RDSPD office for a representative to be assigned to collaborate with the assessment team (PA return to TCE RDSPD secretary Nichelle.nichols@gccisd.net).
- The RDSPD representative will collaborate with the assessment team to review all student information, complete observations and functional assessment related to hearing loss, and provide a written summary to be included in the FIE.
- If the eligibility for D/HH is recommended, a RDSPD representative must be present at ARD meetings.

If an evaluation is completed and a RDSPD representative was not included in the evaluation process, contact the RDSPD Coordinator and Coordinator for Assessment to determine if additional information is needed.

3. What is the process for making a referral for the consideration of parent-infant services from the RDSPD for a birth-2 year old?

- Once a certified audiologist has determined a child to have a hearing loss, the student is referred to an ECI agency, or referred to the RDSPD if already receiving ECI services. An otological evaluation should be obtained and information sent to the RDSPD Office Clerk/Secretary (phone 281-707-3664 or fax/scan 281-420-4367).
- The RDSPD Parent Infant Advisor will send a “Referral for D/HH Services” form outlining any information that is needed.
- The RDSPD Coordinator or Parent Infant Advisor will review the data and a RDSPD teacher will complete a Communication Assessment if hearing loss is confirmed.
- If D/HH services are recommended, services must be added at an Individual Family Service Plan (IFSP) meeting with the RDSPD representative present, and the student must be registered in GCCISD if a GCCISD student (Campus to register--Clark Elementary) or home district that the child resides in.

4. When should the district NOT refer a student for consideration of the eligibility for D/HH?

When a certified audiologist has determined the student has a significant hearing loss that is conductive in nature. If the loss is conductive, the student should be treated medically. Following medical treatment, the student should have a follow-up hearing test to document the current hearing status. The student's hearing may have returned to normal.

5. What if the conductive loss cannot be treated medically? Or medical treatment will be on-going or delayed indefinitely?

A referral for evaluation or ECI services should be made for students who have a conductive loss that is untreatable medically or for whom such treatment will be delayed indefinitely.

6. Who should the district/ECI agency contact regarding the status of D/HH assessment?

RDSPD Office Clerk/secretary, at 281-707-3664. Parents should contact their neighborhood school/district or ECI agency.

7. When should a referral to Texas State School for the Deaf (TSD) in Austin be made?

If the ARD/IEP committee determines the school district cannot provide a free and appropriate public education (FAPE) for the student in question. TSD is always an option for the parent to pursue. Parents should be informed at every annual ARD/IEP meeting that TSD is not being recommended by the district, but it is an option in the state of Texas for students who are deaf or hard of hearing and use ASL as their mode of communication.

ASSESSMENT

8. What assessment is needed to determine the eligibility of Deaf and Hard of Hearing?

- An otological evaluation to be completed by an Otolaryngologist (Ear, Nose, and Throat Physician). This assessment must be completed on the district form to make sure that all required information is provided.
- An audiological assessment (unaided and aided) to be completed by a certified Audiologist. (A hearing screening by a school nurse is inadequate.) This assessment is recommended to be completed on the district form to make sure that all

required information is provided. Implications of the hearing loss are required on the audiological evaluation.

- A speech and language assessment including a communication assessment to be completed by the Speech-Language Pathologist. A certified teacher of the deaf may assist with the communication assessment for school age students or assist in completing the communication assessment for birth to two year olds.
- A Full Individual Evaluation, including cognitive, functional and academic information to be completed by an Educational Diagnostician or LSSP. Data must be reviewed to determine if the student's educational performance is adversely affected by the loss of hearing.

9. *What if the student is not currently being served by the Speech-Language Pathologist?*

The district Speech-Language Pathologist should still complete the speech and language assessment and communication assessment. The communication assessment may also be completed in conjunction with a certified teacher of the deaf. The receptive and expressive language and listening information is very important information to be included in the FIE.

10. *Can a Diagnostician/LSSP or Speech-Language Pathologist test a student who is not wearing amplification?*

Yes, if the student has never worn amplification before or has not used amplification for a significant amount of time.

ELIGIBILITY

11. *What information is needed to determine the eligibility of Deaf and Hard of Hearing?*

- All items listed in #8 above.
- Grades and state or local assessment information.
- Previous ARD/IEP documentation, as appropriate to the situation.

12. *Can a student be determined to meet the guidelines for the eligibility of a Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH) and learning disabled (LD)?*

- No, if the learning disability is in the area of language development. It is typically very difficult to determine that a language disorder is unrelated to the hearing loss.
- Yes, if the learning disability can be shown to be unrelated to the hearing loss such as with a learning disability in the area of math

calculation but not math reasoning.

13. When should a student be determined to meet the guidelines for the eligibility of deaf blind (DB)?

- If the student meets the guidelines for the eligibility criteria for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH) and visual impairment (VI);
- If the student meets the guidelines for the eligibility criteria visual impairment (VI) and has a suspected hearing loss that cannot be demonstrated conclusively, but a certified speech-language pathologist indicates there is no speech at an age when speech would normally be expected;
- If the student has documented hearing and visual losses that, if considered individually, may not meet the requirements for D/HH or VI, but the combination of such losses adversely affects that student's educational performance; or
- If the student has a documented medical diagnosis of a progressive medical condition that will result in concomitant hearing and visual losses that without special education intervention, will adversely affect the student's educational performance.

14. When does a student meet the guidelines for the eligibility of Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH)?

- When the loss of hearing, whether permanent or fluctuating, is so severe that it adversely affects educational performance but is not included in the definition of deafness. This is the federal definition for "hearing impairment."
- When the loss of hearing is so severe that the student is impaired in processing linguistic information through hearing with or without amplification and the impairment adversely affects educational performance. This is the federal definition for "deafness."
- When the documented hearing loss creates an educational need for special education and related services.

15. When does a student meet the guidelines for membership in the RDSPD?

When a student who is eligible as D/HH has an educational need for services from a teacher of the deaf on a weekly (itinerant) or daily (site location) basis.

16. Can a student be determined to meet the guidelines for the eligibility for Deaf and Hard of Hearing (D/HH) and not be a member of the RDSPD?

Yes. In this case, the documented hearing loss creates an educational need for special education and related services and the needs of the student can be met by the local campus and district.

17. Can a student have a hearing loss or deafness and not be in special education?

Yes. If there is no educational need for special education and/or related services, the student may not be referred to special education. If a student has been in special education and no longer exhibits an educational need for services, he/she can be dismissed from special education and/or the D/HH eligibility may be removed. The Full Individual Evaluation must support the removal of the D/HH eligibility. The student continues to have a hearing loss and may receive accommodations through 504 services.

18. Can a student who is dismissed from special education still receive services through the Texas Offices of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services upon graduation?

Yes, if the requirement for their services are met.

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) – CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE (CLD) STUDENTS FOR SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY, INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY, AND OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRMENT

The following information is a guideline for evaluating CLD students for Specific Learning Disability and/or Intellectual Disability and/or Other Health Impairment Evaluation. Determination of the evaluation battery is to be done on an *individualized* basis.

GOAL OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS

To determine the level of academic skills and eligibility for CLD students in order to show benefit from the educational process.

DEFINITIONS

1. Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Students with language, cultural, and dialectical differences. Students who vary in languages and modality of communication (i.e. regional dialects, augmentative communication, language differences) and whose culture varies from the mainstream of the community.
2. Native language: The term “native language,” when used with respect to an individual who is limited English proficient, means the language normally used by the individual or, in the case of a child, the language normally used by the parents of the child.
3. Specific Learning Disability: Is a disability that affects the child’s

ability to learn. Exposure to two languages is not the cause of the disability.

FULL INDIVIDUAL AND INITIAL EVALUATION

The evaluation shall be conducted using procedures that are appropriate for the student's most proficient method of communication when possible.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

Additional Requirements (in Evaluation, Eligibility Determination section)

Evaluations and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under this section:

- (i) Are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis;
- (ii) Are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is not feasible to provide or administer.

SPECIAL RULE FOR ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION

In making a determination of eligibility, a child shall not be determined to be a child with a disability if the determinant factor for such determination is

Limited English proficiency:

- Monolingual Language Learner: A student who uses one language for communication purpose.
- Simultaneous Bilingual Language Learner: A student who uses two or more languages for functional purposes before the age of three.
- Sequential Bilingual Language Learner: A student who used one language for functional purposes before the age of three and after the age of three was introduced to a second language as a means of communication.

Dynamic Evaluation: Dynamic evaluation refers to a method involving a process of testing, teaching, and retesting a skill that was not demonstrated correctly in the evaluation process in order to measure the student's modifiability. If he/she learns the skill with minimal difficulty and minimal assistance from the teacher/clinician, a disorder in that particular area is questionable.



Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS): This is the face-to-face communication in daily discourse situations such as the student's level of conversation skills. (Cummins, 1984) Cummins suggests that it may take one to two years for an individual to become proficient in a language at the BICS level.

Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP): This is the language proficiency used in the development of literacy skills or language needed to perform in the academic areas within the classroom. (Cummins, 1984) Cummins suggests that it may take 5 to 7 years for an individual to become proficient in a language at the CALP level. Poor academic performance may reflect limited English proficiency rather than cognitive/ linguistic deficits.

EVALUATION OF SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY, INTELLECTUAL DISABILITY, AND OTHER HEALTH IMPAIRMENT

A comprehensive history of response to intervention and the Profile of Language Dominance and Proficiency sheet should be completed on each child during the RTI process.

Monolingual Language Learners: Evaluation should be conducted in their home/native language if possible.

Simultaneous or Sequential Bilingual Language Learners will be tested first in English and then in their second language if possible as needed.

Generally, students in Spanish (bilingual) classes will need a Spanish evaluation if the majority of their instructional language is in Spanish. Students in English classes and identified as LEP will need to be evaluated in Spanish and English. Students in English classes and not identified as LEP, generally will need to be evaluated in English. If an EL student appears to be dominant in English and no longer proficient in Spanish, the evaluation staff may have an interpreter have a conversation with the student in Spanish. If the student does not appear to comprehend Spanish, testing in English may be warranted.

PROCEDURES FOR CLD EVALUATIONS

Languages other than Spanish: Bilingual evaluations for languages other than Spanish are to be conducted with the assistance of an interpreter, if determined to be needed. To schedule the interpreter, call or email appropriate person to secure the interpreter, with the date, time, campus, and language needed for the evaluation. Please allow a two week notice prior to the date you wish to do the evaluation.

*** If a translator / interpreter is used for the administration of a test,

remember the test is not normed in this fashion and may alter the validity of the results of the test administered --- use extreme caution when using interpreters. In addition, when using an interpreter, consideration should be made regarding the reporting of standard REEDs. ***

SPANISH RE-EVALUATION

The campus diagnostician facilitates the REED meeting. English testing that is needed should be completed by the campus diagnostician or LSSP. If Spanish testing is needed, contact the Assessment Coordinator and a bilingual evaluator will be assigned to the case. The bilingual evaluator's role will be to complete testing in areas that require Spanish and the bilingual evaluator will be responsible for writing up those respective sections. The campus diagnostician will write the majority of the report and the campus evaluation staff will work in collaboration with the bilingual evaluation staff to determine conclusion and recommendations.

The campus diagnostician is responsible for taking the lead on the collaborative FIE.

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATIONS CONDUCTED USING ALTERNATE FORMS OF COMMUNICATION

Any accommodations that are used during the evaluation process should be reported in the Full Individual Evaluation (i.e. accepted signed responses, utilized an augmentative communication device to respond). Criterion referenced scores may be used.

****IF THE A STUDENT IDENTIFIED AS AN EL IS BEING EVALUATED FOR A SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY THE EVALUATION STAFF MUST USE THE CROSS BATTERY APPROACH (USE THE CROSS BATTERY CD ACCOMPANIED BY THE XBASS)***

LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP) – CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE STUDENTS SPEECH EVALUATION PROCESS

Goal of the Evaluation Process

To determine the level of communication skills and eligibility for CLD students in

order to show benefit from the educational process.

DEFINITIONS

1. Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students: Students with language, cultural, and dialectical differences. Students who vary in languages and modality of communication (i.e. regional dialects, augmentative communication, language differences) and whose culture varies from the mainstream of the community.
2. Native language: The term “native language,” when used with respect to an individual who is limited English proficient, means the language normally used by the individual or, in the case of a child, the language normally used by the parents of the child.
3. Definition of Speech/language Impairment: Speech or language impairment means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, language impairment, or a voice impairment, that adversely affects the child’s educational performance.
4. Communication Disorders and Variations (ASHA, 1993): “A communication disorder is an impairment in the ability to receive, send, process, and comprehend concepts or verbal, nonverbal, and graphic symbol systems.” “Communication difference/dialect is a variation of a symbol system used by a group of individuals that reflects and is determined by shared regional, social, or cultural/ethnic factors. A regional, social, or cultural/ethnic variation of a symbol system should not be considered a disorder of speech or language.”
5. Language-Learning Disability: A language disorder is a disability that affects the child’s ability to learn any language. Exposure to two languages is not the cause of the disability. Bilingual children with language disorders will have difficulty learning English, Spanish, or any other language. Students should not be considered to have language learning disabilities if “problems” are observed only in the English language. If a student is truly language- disordered, problems in communication should be evident in BOTH ENGLISH AND THE PRIMARY LANGUAGE (Roseberry-McKibbin 1995).

FULL INDIVIDUAL INITIAL EVALUATION

The evaluation shall be conducted using procedures that are appropriate for the student’s most proficient method of communication.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY

- (3) Additional Requirements (in Evaluation, Eligibility Determination section)
 - (A) Evaluations and other evaluation materials used to assess a child under this section—

- (i) Are selected and administered so as not to be discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis;
 - (ii) Are provided and administered in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information on what the child knows and can do academically, developmentally, and functionally, unless it is not feasible to provide or administer.
- (5) Special Rule for Eligibility Determination—In making a determination of eligibility under paragraph (4) (A), a child shall not be determined to be a child with a disability if the determinant factor for such determination is-- (C) Limited English proficiency

- **Monolingual Language Learner:** A student who uses one language for communication purpose.
- **Simultaneous Bilingual Language Learner:** A student who uses two or more languages for functional purposes before the age of three.
- **Sequential Bilingual Language Learner:** A student who used one language for functional purposes before the age of three and after the age of three was introduced to a second language as a means of communication.
- **Dynamic Evaluation:** Dynamic evaluation refers to a method involving a process of testing, teaching, and retesting a skill that was not demonstrated correctly in the evaluation process in order to measure the student's modifiability. If he/she learns the skill with minimal difficulty and minimal assistance from the teacher/clinician, a disorder in that particular area is questionable.
- **Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS):** This is the face-to-face communication in daily discourse situations such as the student's level of conversation skills. (Cummins, 1984) Cummins suggests that it may take one to two years for an individual to become proficient in a language at the BICS level.
- **Cognitive/Academic Language Proficiency (CALP):** This is the language proficiency used in the development of literacy skills or language needed to perform in the academic areas within the classroom. (Cummins, 1984) Cummins suggests that it may take 5 to 7 years for an individual to become proficient in a language at the CALP level. Poor academic performance may reflect limited English proficiency rather than cognitive/linguistic deficits.

LANGUAGE OF EVALUATION

A comprehensive language history interview should be completed on each child during the Campus Intervention process. Analysis of the answers to the questions



on the language history flow chart will determine if the child is a monolingual, simultaneous, or sequential language learner.

- Monolingual Language Learners: Evaluation should be conducted in their home/native language. No language proficiency testing is needed.
- Simultaneous Bilingual Language Learners should be tested in both languages learned before age three. Language proficiency testing should be completed in both languages.
- Sequential Bilingual Language Learners should be tested in the native (first learned) language. Language proficiency testing should be completed if significant changes in L1 have been noted and performance in L2 is not as expected.

As a general rule, students in Spanish (bilingual) classes will need a Spanish evaluation. Students in English classes and identified as LEP will need to be evaluated in Spanish and English. Students in English classes and not identified as LEP, generally will need to be evaluated in English.

If an EL student appears to be dominant in English and no longer proficient in Spanish, the SLP may have an interpreter have a conversation with the student in Spanish. If the student does not appear to comprehend Spanish, testing in English may be warranted.

PROCEDURES FOR CLD EVALUATIONS

1. Languages other than Spanish: Bilingual evaluations for languages other than Spanish are to be conducted with the assistance of an interpreter. To schedule the interpreter, call or email the Program Manager for Evaluation with the date, time, campus, and language needed for the evaluation. Please allow a two week notice prior to the date you wish to do the evaluation.
2. Spanish Evaluations (initial): The campus SLP will gather all of the RTI referral information, obtain consent, and complete a Ready for CLD Testing form. The campus SLP will include the Ready for CLD Testing form in the intervention/referral folder and send the referral folder with signed consent to the Program Manager for Evaluation and Related Services. The folder will then be assigned to a district-wide evaluation specialist who will then send the Ready for CLD Testing form to the bilingual evaluation team.
3. Spanish Re-evaluation: Speech checklist, ROWPVT-4, EOWPVT-4, and classroom observation are completed by the campus SLP with the interpreter assigned to the campus. English testing that is needed should be completed by the campus SLP. The Ready for CLD Testing form should be completed and emailed to the bilingual evaluation team when consent is obtained. Spanish testing is to be completed by the bilingual



SLP who is assigned to the evaluation. The campus SLP is responsible for completing the evaluation report.

Procedures for Evaluations Conducted using alternate Forms of Communication: Any accommodations that are used during the evaluation process should be reported in the Full Individual Evaluation (i.e. accepted signed responses, utilized an augmentative communication device to respond). Criterion referenced scores may be used.

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATING CLD STUDENTS (SPEECH-LANGUAGE EVALUATION)

Determination of the evaluation battery is to be done on an *individualized* basis

The following information is a guideline only.

The instruments listed in this section are not a comprehensive list of instruments on the market. These instruments are available in Goose Creek CISD. When selecting evaluation instruments the student should be matched with the standardization sample based on sex, cultural factors, age, and linguistics.

ALL INITIAL EVALUATIONS

1. Developmental history
2. BICS/CALP Teacher checklist
3. Pragmatic checklist
4. Oral Peripheral examination
5. Dynamic evaluation (see definition section)
6. Language sample

Monolingual Students	Use evaluation instruments in the student’s native language. (I.e. if the child speaks only English, use English tests. If the child speaks only Spanish, test in Spanish.)
ECSE Age	(Simultaneous language learner) Test in both languages. (L1 and English)
ECSE Age	(Sequential language learner) Test in native language. Test in L2 as a supplement. Language Proficiency testing is recommended.

FOR SPANISH SPEAKING STUDENTS, THE FOLLOWING INSTRUMENTS ARE AVAILABLE.

Language

- EOWPVT- 4 Bilingual edition; 2;0 to 70+
- ROWPVT- 4 Bilingual edition; 2;0 to 70+
- PLS5 Spanish Birth; Birth–7:11
- CASL-2 or CELF-4 Spanish, CELF-5 English are recommended for English language testing when testing in English and Spanish.

Articulation

- PLS5 Articulation Screener
- Arizona Articulation Test IV (use Fort Bend adaptation scoring form) 1.5-18
- SAM (Spanish Articulation Measure) 3 and up; Informal Data Gathering
- *Contextual Probes of Articulation Competence-Spanish* (CPAC-S) ; 3.0 and up
- Goldman Fristoe Test of Articulation; 2 - 21.11

*School Age: (Sequential language learner)

Test in native language. Test in L2 (second language) as a supplement. Establish eligibility based on native language or by analyzing characteristics common to both languages.

- Portfolio evaluation
- LPAC scores

Guidelines for Determining Eligibility Language

1. Sequential language learners—eligibility should be determined based on the language skills in the native language. Communication deficits in L2 must also be present in L1.
2. Simultaneous language learners—eligibility should be determined based on the development of the languages learned before the age of three. Eligibility is not determined based on the student’s language proficiency level. The student’s communication competence should be derived through careful analysis of the case history and evaluation data.

ARTICULATION

1. Sequential language learners—eligibility should be determined based on the articulation skills in the native language. (Not based on their English sound production). If articulation errors in the primary language do not exist, articulation impairment does not exist.
2. Simultaneous language learners—eligibility should be determined based on the sound development of the languages functionally used before age three.

STUTTERING

1. Sequential language learners—determination of a stuttering disorder is based on the evaluation results from the native language.
2. Simultaneous language learners—determination of a stuttering disorder is based on the evaluation results in all languages learned before the age of three.

LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY (SPEECH-ONLY REFERRALS)

Language proficiency testing should be completed for:

1. Initial evaluations of simultaneous language learners (simultaneous—meaning students who functionally used two languages before the age of three).
2. Sequential language learners who appear to exhibit minimal use of L1 and L2.
3. Proficiency testing is not necessary for articulation (only) referrals.

Language proficiency testing instruments may include:

1. Woodcock Munoz Language Survey-III
2. Woodcock Johnson Tests of Achievement - IV

Reliability for the younger-aged children is typically poor; therefore, these instruments should be completed in conjunction with the parent and teacher interview of language development. Parent and teacher interview should also be factored in the determination of proficiency for school age children as well.

For children who are too young for standardized proficiency testing, report the parent and teacher report of the percentages of usage of L1 and L2.

Speech CLD Re-Evaluations

Goal

To determine continued eligibility and/or present levels of academic and functional performance.

REPORTING PROGRESS

Standardized testing is NOT completed for the purpose of measuring progress. Progress cannot be measured w/ standardized REEDs. Measuring progress is done through criterion referenced testing, grades, weekly performance, therapy data, and the student's ability to access his/her curriculum.

STANDARDIZATION SAMPLE POPULATION

Be cognizant of matching the student to the standardization sample of the instrument. If the student does NOT match the standardization sample, standardized REEDs should not be reported. ONLY report criterion references.

ARD MEETINGS TO REVIEW EVALUATIONS

SCHEDULING ARD MEETING

1. The Educational Diagnostician notifies the campus that the Full Individual Evaluation is complete.
2. The campus special education clerk schedules the ARD/IEP meeting, sends the Notice of ARD/IEP Meeting to the parent, and notifies other required participants.
3. It is recommended that a staffing be held prior to the ARD/IEP meeting to review the Full Individual Evaluation, draft IEP goals/objectives, and prepare for the Initial ARD meeting.
4. The campus should send the draft IEP goals/objectives to the parent at least 5 days prior to the ARD meeting to gather input or parent input can be gathered during the ARD process.

TIMELINE FOR ARD MEETING

1. From the date the evaluation is completed, the district has **30 calendar days** to conduct the Initial ARD meeting unless...
2. The school district receives written consent signed by a student's parent or legal guardian for a full individual and initial evaluation of a student at least 35 but fewer than 45 school days before the last instructional day of the school year, then evaluation must be completed and the written report of the evaluation must be provided to the parent or legal guardian no later than June 30 of that year and **the student's ARD committee shall meet not later than the 15th school day** of the following school year to consider the evaluation.



IF A SCHOOL DISTRICT RECEIVES WRITTEN CONSENT SIGNED BY A STUDENT'S PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN LESS THAN 35 SCHOOL DAYS BEFORE THE LAST INSTRUCTIONAL DAY OF THE SCHOOL YEAR OR IF THE DISTRICT RECEIVES THE WRITTEN CONSENT AT LEAST 35 BUT FEWER THAN 45 SCHOOL DAYS BEFORE THE LAST INSTRUCTIONAL DAY OF THE SCHOOL YEAR BUT THE STUDENT IS ABSENT FROM SCHOOL DURING THAT PERIOD FOR THREE OR MORE DAYS, A WRITTEN REPORT OF A FULL INDIVIDUAL AND INITIAL EVALUATION SHALL BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN THE 45TH SCHOOL DAY FOLLOWING THE DATE ON WHICH THE SCHOOL DISTRICT RECEIVES SIGNED, PARENTAL CONSENT AND EXCEPT THAT THE TIMEFRAME CAN BE EXTENDED BY THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL DAYS EQUAL TO THE NUMBER OF SCHOOL DAYS DURING THAT PERIOD THAT THE STUDENT WAS ABSENT. IN ADDITION, THE INITIAL ARD MEETING MUST BE HELD WITHIN 30 CALENDAR DAYS FROM THE DATE OF THE COMPLETED REPORT.

Evidence of Implementation

- Referral Packet
- Assessment Plan
- Notice of FIE
- Consent for FIE
- REED
- FIE
- ARD/IEP
- Graduation ARD Document
- Frontline forms

Resources

[The Legal Framework for the Child-Centered Special Education Process: Evaluation Procedures Framework - Region 18](#)

[Technical Assistance: Child Find and Evaluation- Texas Education Agency](#)

[OSEP Letter to Mintz \(Feb. 10, 2011\) - U.S. Department of Education](#)

[OSEP Letter to Blodgett \(Nov. 12, 2014\) - U.S. Department of Education](#)



[OSEP Letter to Unnerstall \(Apr. 25, 2016\) - U.S. Department of Education](#)

[Letter to Zirkel \(Dec. 11, 2008\) - U.S. Department of Education](#)

[Letter to Zirkel \(Jan. 6, 2011\) - U.S. Department of Education](#)

[Evaluation and Reevaluation - SPEDTEX](#)

CITATIONS

Board Policy EHBAA; 34 CFR 300.8(a)(1), 300.301, 300.303, 300.304(b)–(c), 300.305(e), 300.306(a)(1); Texas Education Code 29.004; 19 TAC 89.1011, 89.1040(b)–(c), 89.1050(a), 89.1070, 89.1230