Determination of Eligibility: Specific Learning Disability

# Purpose

This worksheet can be completed during the evaluation process to support teams in documenting eligibility requirements for specific learning disability.

**LEGAL Name of Student:**  **DOB:**

**Student ID (SAID):**  **Date:**

# Per IDEA 34 C.F.R. §§ 300.304(c)(6); 300.306(b); 300.309(a)(3); ECEA 2.08(8); the team has addressed each of the following statements and has determined:

* The child’s performance:
	+ is due to a lack of appropriate reading instruction/intervention (delivered in a manner that is highly consistent with the design, closely aligned to student need, culturally appropriate and includes the essential components of reading instruction)
	[ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ is due to a lack of appropriate math instruction/intervention (delivered in a manner that is highly consistent with the design, closely aligned to student need, and culturally appropriate) [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ is due to limited English proficiency. [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

(All answers must be “no” for the student to be eligible for services.)

* That the student’s performance is:
	+ Primarily the result of Intellectual Disability [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of a Serious Emotional Disability [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of a Visual Impairment, including Blindness [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of a Hearing Impairment, including Deafness [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of an Orthopedic Impairment [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of Cultural Factors [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ Primarily the result of Environmental or Economic Disadvantage [ ]  Yes [ ]  No
	+ due to a lack of educational opportunity (e.g., attendance/access losses when compared to same age peers) [ ]  Yes [ ]  No

(All answers must be “no” for the student to be eligible for services.)

# (IDEA 34 C.F.R. § 300.309; ECEA 2.08(8)(b)

# The student is determined to have a Specific Learning Disability that prevents the child from receiving reasonable educational benefit from general education if a body of evidence demonstrates the following criteria are met:

• The child does not achieve adequately for the child’s age or to meet state-approved grade-level standards and exhibits significant academic skill deficit(s) in one or more of the areas identified below when provided with learning experiences and instruction appropriate for the child’s age or state-approved grade-level standards, **and**

• The child does not make sufficient progress to meet age or state-approved grade-level standards in the area(s) identified when using a process based on the child’s response to evidence-based intervention.

Check all areas that meet **both** conditions:

[ ]  Basic Reading Skills [ ]  Reading Comprehension [ ]  Mathematical

[ ]  Calculation [ ]  Oral Expression [ ]  Reading Fluency Skills

[ ]  Written Expression [ ]  Mathematical Problem-Solving [ ]  Listening Comprehension

[ ]  Functional Skills[[1]](#footnote-2)

# (IDEA 34 C.F.R. § 300.311)

# In order to be eligible for a SLD the comprehensive evaluation must contain documentation of the following:

[ ]  A body of evidence that demonstrates,

* Academic Skill deficits, and
* Insufficient progress in response to evidence-based intervention in the area(s) identified above.

And the Evaluation includes,

[ ]  An observation of the student’s academic performance in the area(s) of difficulty in the learning environment, including the relevant behavior and relationship of that behavior to the student’s academic functioning.

[ ]  Parent Input

[ ]  The instructional strategies used

[ ]  The student-centered data collected including documentation of repeated assessments or achievement at reasonable intervals

[ ]  Assessment information, which includes the assessment used (e.g., Curriculum-based, standardized, criterion-referenced) and the Evaluator for the Assessment (name/title).

The educationally relevant medical findings: [ ]  exist and are described, or [ ]  do not exist

The documentation that the parents were notified about:

[ ]  Student performance data collected, and general education services provided (what was collected, its purpose, and if the LEA has rules about collection of data (i.e., frequency, interventions used, EST, MTSS)

[ ]  Strategies for increasing the student’s rate of learning

[ ]  Results of repeated assessments of student’s progress

[ ]  The right to request an evaluation

List the area(s) of concern in the box below (e.g., reading fluency, math calculation, and reading comprehension).

For each area of concern listed, check “Yes” or “No” to indicate.

(1) Inadequate classroom achievement,

(2) Insufficient progress, **and**

(3) Exclusionary factors as a primary reason DO NOT apply.

If all three are checked “Yes” for **at least one area of concern**, then the student meets eligibility criteria for SLD.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Area(s) of Concern Considered | Inadequate Classroom Achievement | Insufficient Progress | Exclusionary Factors DO NOT apply |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |
|  | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No | [ ]  Yes [ ]  No |

*If there are more areas of concern, add rows to this chart*

**Statements of Assurances:**

[ ]  The student has been provided with explicit and systematic instruction in the essential components of scientific, research-based and/or evidence-based reading instruction or math from a qualified teacher, including regular assessments of achievement to document the student’s response to scientific, research-based and/or evidence-based intervention as a part of the evaluation procedures.

[ ]  The IEP team decision of whether the child has a specific learning disability was based on information from a variety of sources and not on any single measure or assessment as the sole criterion. The evaluation is sufficiently comprehensive to appropriately identify all the child’s special education and related service needs, whether commonly linked to the disability category.

[ ]  The IQ/discrepancy (ability/achievement) model was not used to determine eligibility.

[ ]  The team agrees that this student has a Specific Learning Disability as defined in the State Board of Education Rule (SBE Rule) 2362.2.5, as well as with IDEA Regulations 34 CFR §§300.307-300.311 and is eligible for special education.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Multidisciplinary Team Members (as defined by IDEA 300.306(a)(1) and 300.308; ECEA 4.02(6)(b) | Title | Indicate Agreement with Team Decision and Add Initials Beside Choice |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |
|  |  | [ ]  Agree [ ]  Disagree |

See: [IDEA: Identification of SLD](https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/Identification_of_SLD_10-4-06.pdf)

If this report does not reflect a team member’s conclusion s/he/they must indicate her/his/their reasons and conclusion.

Name:

Title:

Reason(s) and conclusion:

1. EPTs should consider functional (nonacademic) performance for all students with disabilities, including SLD. However, IDEA and VT SBE Rules do not list Functional Skills as one of the areas assessed to determine adequate achievement. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)