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AGENDA

- Overview of National Survey to State Approaches
- Kansas Approach
- South Carolina Approach
- Utah Approach
- Questions and Comments
STATE APPROACHES TO MONITORING AA-AAAS PARTICIPATION DECISIONS
SEAs must require LEAs that assesses more than 1% of its assessed students in any subject with an AA-AAAS to submit information to the State justifying the need to exceed the 1.0 percent threshold. SEAs must provide appropriate oversight of each LEA that is required to submit such a justification.

SEAs that apply for a waiver must include assurances that it has verified that each LEA that the State anticipates will assess more than 1% of its assessed students in any subject using an AA-AAAS followed the State’s guidelines for participation in the AA-AAAS.
34 CFR § 200.6

(d) State guidelines for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards, the State must -

(1) Establish, consistent with section 612(a)(16)(C) of the IDEA, and monitor implementation of clear and appropriate guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards.
IDEA SEC. 300.320 (A) (6)

- If the IEP Team determines that the child must take an alternate assessment instead of a particular regular state or districtwide assessment of student achievement, the child’s IEP must include a statement of why
  - the child cannot participate in the regular assessment;
  - and the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the child
OVERVIEW

- Survey sent in 2021
- 34 states responded
- 14 questions
- 10 said they do not monitor
- 2 yes did not complete the survey
WHO REVIEWS IEPS FOR PARTICIPATION DECISIONS

- Special Education Monitoring
- Assessment Specialist
- Special Education Specialist
- Other
STUDENTS TARGETED FOR PARTICIPATION
IEP MONITORING

- All Special Education Monitoring
- All Tier 3 LEA
- All LEAs Over 1.0%
- Other
- All State AA-AAAS
- All State IEP
SAMPLING APPROACHES FOR AA-AAAS PARTICIPATION MONITORING

- Specific Factors
- All IEPs
- Percentage
- Numbers
LOCATION OF IEP REVIEW

- Desk Review
- In the LEA
- Other
FORMAT OF REVIEWED IEPS

- LEA Submitted
- Paper Copy
- State Online IEP
- Other
TOOLS USED TO REVIEW IEPS

- State Guidelines: 15
- Checklist: 10
- Questionnaire: 6
- Rubric: 4
- Narrative: 3
- Other: 1
PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF IEP MONITORING TOOL

- No, Internal tool: 9
- Yes, Anyone: 9
- No, Only LEA: 2
- Other: 2
EVIDENCE STATES LOOKS FOR WHEN REVIEWING IEPS

- Decision Making Criteria
- Check Box
- Present Levels of Performance
- Modified Curriculum
- Cognitive Assessment
- Student Disability
- Adaptive Behavior (Summative)
- IEP Team Signatures
- Adaptive Behavior (All Domains)
- Parent Consent
- Decision Date
- Other
- Reading Level
- Service Setting
- Teacher Questionnaire
DOCUMENTATION STATES EXAMINE IN ADDITION TO REVIEWING THE IEP

- Multi-factored Evaluation
- Previous Test Types
- Previous Test Scores
- Other
- Teacher Questionnaire
ACTIONS TAKEN WHEN INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE IS PROVIDED

- Review IEP Together
- LEA Reviews IEP
- Other
- Corrective Action
- Require LEA Training
- Invalidate Results

[Bar chart showing the frequency of each action taken]
DISCUSSION

- Wide range of approaches to monitoring
- Not all states monitor (though they should)
- Practices are evolving
- A scenario of a “typical state” exists
KANSAS

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT MONITORING
## KANSAS – 1% PARTICIPATION RATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>SY 2017-2018</th>
<th>SY 2018-2019</th>
<th>SY 2019-2020</th>
<th>SY 2020-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Less than 1.0%</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>.77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KANSAS – 1% PLAN AND WAIVERS

- June 2019 – letter from USDOE
  - ELA 1.14% Math 1.16%
- August 2019 – submitted first 1% Threshold Waiver Request
- June 2020 and June 2021 1% Threshold Waiver Extension
- 2022 – preliminary data shows KS is under the 1% threshold
DLM JUSTIFICATIONS

Data we provide

- Number and percentage of students per subject
- Disability Categories taking the DLM
- Participation by Subject Subgroup – disproportionality using risk ratio
- Percentage of students performing at target or advanced on the DLM by subject

Requirements of the district

- Explain how they will address any disproportionality
- Narrative that includes the data types and processes that the IEP teams utilize to qualify students for the AA
- Districts next steps to ensure that annually the appropriate test is administered to each student
- Whether the district needs additional training
- Whether the district anticipates testing over 1% during the current school year
- DLM Assurances
KANSAS – 1% MONITORING

2019 red flag data based on the DLM first contact survey
- Primary Disability
- Placement
- Reading level with comprehension
- Computation skills
- Writing skills
- Performance level on DLM

2022 red flag data based on DLM first contact survey
- Primary Disability (SLD, ED, SL)
- Reading level with comprehension
- Computation skills
- Writing skills

DLM Red Flags Fact Sheet (PDF)
3 LEVELS OF TECHNICAL SUPPORT

- **Universal**
  - Online training and tools available for all districts; justifications and assurances required

- **Targeted Technical Assistance**
  - Required DLM training, review of what the district’s data shows; student information sheets completed and submitted; development of a plan, possible DLM test observations; justifications and assurances required

- **Intensive Technical Assistance**
  - Requirements of Targeted TA plus onsite folder review
STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

Student Information Sheet - DLM

Please complete the following document for each student in your district who is anticipated to participate in the DLM alternate assessment this school year. Review comprehensive evaluations that include Cognitive scores and adaptive behavior. All of this district's individual student information documents should be submitted to NASDSE together.

District: ____________________________  School: ____________________________

Name of person completing form: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

Teacher: ____________________________  Date: ____________________________

State student ID number: ____________________________  Student Name: ____________________________

Student’s current grade: ____________________________  School Year: ____________________________

Date the IEP team determined the student met the criteria for participation in the DLM: ____________________________

Primary exceptionality listed on IEP: ____________________________

Primary exceptionality includes intellectual/cognitive impairment as a characteristic.  Yes  No

Intellectual (Cognitive) Functioning

Instrument(s) used to determine intellectual functioning: ____________________________

Date of most recent evaluation that included intellectual/cognitive testing: ____________________________

Data obtained from the Instrument(s):

Include full scale and subdomain scores (e.g., Verbal, Non-Verbal, Working Memory, Processing Speed, Fluid Reasoning, ).

If there is no IQ or cognitive testing available, provide examples of the student’s present levels of academic skills (reading, math, writing), ____________________________

Does the student’s IQ meet the criteria of typically 2 ½ or more standard deviations below the mean?  Yes  No

Adaptive Behavior (Daily Living/Functional Skills)

Instrument(s) used to determine adaptive behavior deficits: ____________________________

Date of most recent evaluation that included an adaptive behavior rating scale: ____________________________

Data obtained from the adaptive behavior instrument(s)- include composite and subdomains: ____________________________

If no standardized adaptive behavior assessment testing has been done, provide examples of the student’s present levels as they relate to daily living skills, communication, and community living skills: ____________________________

Does the student’s adaptive behavior fall 2 ½ or more standard deviations below the mean?  Yes  No

Does the student’s IEP address adaptive behavior deficits?  Yes  No

What adaptive behavior deficits are being addressed on IEP: ____________________________

Is the student likely to develop the skills to live independently and function safely in daily life after high school?  Yes  No

Is the student on the waiting list for services with the local CCDP?  Yes  No
IEP FILE REVIEW: ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION MONITORING – CRITERIA 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Rating</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The student's primary disability is associated with a most significant intellectual disability (Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disability, Autism, Traumatic Brain Injury).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Does assessment of intellectual functioning and cognitive ability support evidence of a most significant cognitive disability (2.5 or more SD below the mean or is there evidence that valid cognitive results could not be obtained)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The PAAQEs indicates academic skills which are several grade levels below age appropriate peers for elementary students, 6-8 grade levels below for middle school students, and 7-9 grade levels below for high school students for all content areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria #2: Evidence of Significant Deficits in Adaptive Behavior

Review of student records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact adaptive behavior (those skills and behaviors essential for someone to live independently and to function safely in daily life). Typically functioning 2.5 - 3 SD below the mean and/or extensive information documentation of most significant deficits in adaptive functioning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Rating</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Assessment of adaptive behavior functioning indicates significant deficits in adaptive behavior (2.5 or more SD below the mean)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The student's IEP includes goals for conceptual skills, social skills, and practical skills. Conceptual skills are needed to communicate, apply academic skills, and manage and accomplish tasks. Social skills are needed to engage in interpersonal interactions, act with social responsibility and use leisure time. Practical skills are needed to address personal and health needs: take care of home, classroom or work settings; and function in a school or community daily living skills: eating, dressing, toileting, community living skills: preparing meals, housekeeping; using a phone, ability to access and use transportation, job skills.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Even with additional time, the student will likely unable to develop the skills needed to live independently or to function safely in their daily life at home, school and community. (Student is on the waiting list with the local CCDO for adult services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEP FILE REVIEW: ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION MONITORING – CRITERIA 3-4

Criteria #3: Primarily Instructed Using the DLM Essential Elements as Content Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Rating</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>The student's IEP references PLAAAP and goals aligned to the DLM essential elements. (ALL goals must have at least 2 benchmarks/objectives)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td>Previous assessment score reports support taking an alternate assessment. Situations that do not support taking the AA are receiving target and/or advanced levels on the DLM indicating the task is no longer ambitiously challenging; obtaining a score on the general assessment indicates the student is capable of taking a general assessment with accommodations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria #4: Evidence of Extensive Direct Individualized Instruction and Substantial Supports to Achieve Measurable Gains in All Grade- and Age-Appropriate Curriculum

a. Requires extensive, repeated, individualized instruction and support that is neither temporary nor limited to specific content areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Rating</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>The student's IEP indicates direct special education support for the majority of the school day (moderate to maximum levels of support) to make adequate progress on the Essential Elements that are at a reduced depth, breadth, and complexity as compared with general education curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
<td>The student requires extensive accommodations and modifications (layers of supports, scaffolding, and/or assistive technologies—low or high tech) to communicate, follow directions, complete daily routines and/or complete instructional activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Uses substantially adapted materials and individualized methods of accessing information in alternative ways to acquire, maintain, generalize, demonstrate and transfer skills across multiple settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Rating</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
<td>The student's IEP outlines accessibility supports beyond those allowed on the Kansas Assessment Program (KAP) to meet the cognitive and physical task demands of instruction and assessment. Refer to the Kansas Accessibility Manual of Tools and Accommodations Available for the KAP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEP FILE REVIEW: ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT PARTICIPATION MONITORING - SCORING

### General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>The IEP included the Participation Guidelines and/or the Rubric for Determining Eligibility on the DLM.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The IEP includes a statement of why the student cannot participate in the general state assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The IEP includes a statement of why the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the student.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Evidence of parent/legal education decision maker notification of participation in the alternate assessment and its implication in the parent’s native language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score: 17/17**

### Score Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13-17</td>
<td>Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-12</td>
<td>Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 or fewer</td>
<td>Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Criteria Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Clarifying Examples</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A specific disability category or label</td>
<td>The IEP does not suggest or provide evidence that the decision was based on any of the considerations listed above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cary Rogers
Education Program Consultant
Special Education and Title Services Team
(785) 296-0916
crogers@ksde.org
SOUTH CAROLINA’S JOURNEY
FOR ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT MONITORING
KRYSSTEN DOUGLAS, SPECIAL POPULATIONS TEAM LEAD
THE PURPOSE OF THIS SEGMENT...

- To provide information about how South Carolina meets the 1% Monitoring expectation.
- This segment will be successful if...
  - As a facilitator, I provide you with details about SC 1% monitoring to inform your state’s work towards 1% monitoring.
  - As a participant, you find relevant information to inform your state’s work towards 1% monitoring.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC-ALT Monitoring Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Participation Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline of implementation monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Monitoring Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting LEAs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COLLABORATION

Intra-agency collaboration between **Special Education Services** (Compliance support) and **Assessment and Standards** (Instructional and Assessment support)

- Roberta E Turner-Ford, SC-Alt Assessment Ed Associate
- Carmen Willm, OSES Compliance Ed Associate
- Victoria Tanaka, Psychometrics Ed Associate
- Krysten Douglas, Team Lead for Special Populations
21-22 Monitoring Cycle:
- 81 Districts
- 2 Districts were over 1%
- Overall SC Participation Rate = 0.44 %
CALCULATING THE 1%

- Partnered with our Psychometrics Team to develop the calculation logic
- Show the numerator/denominator (PowerSchool)

Number of students taking the alternate assessment (grades 3-8 and HS)
Total Number of tested students (grades 3-8 and EOCEP)
1% MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

2011-2012
• 1.3%
• Need for guidance

2022
• 0.44%
• Lowest on record
LEA REQUIREMENTS

- If your district exceeds 1%, districts are required to write a justification for exceeding 1%
- The justification is required to be posted publicly
- The district then enters “monitoring status”

*[collaborative monitoring between Special Education Services and Assessment & Standards]*
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

- First introduced in 2012
- SC had a drastic reduction in students taking the alternate assessment
- Updated in 2015, 2018, 2021
SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION TOOLS

- Worksheets and checklists designed to assist teams in collecting and reviewing evidence to determine if participation in alternate assessment is appropriate for an individual student.

- The decision regarding how students will participate in state and district-wide testing must be made annually.

- **Initial Determination of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation** document existing data from various sources to facilitate the initial determination of alternate assessment participation.

- **Review of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation Checklist**, may be used both during initial determination and at annual IEP reviews to document that the alternate assessment is the appropriate assessment for a student.

- **Review of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Checklist for Students who are Multilingual (ML) Learners** with Significant Cognitive Disabilities may be used with students who are ML with significant cognitive disabilities.
Initial Determination of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment Participation Worksheet

Individual Cognitive Ability Test: __________________________ Date of Assessment: ____________
Name of Examiner: __________________________ Title of Examiner: __________________________
Total Battery Score: ____________ Verbal Scale Score: ____________ Non-Verbal Scale Score: ____________
Additional Cognitive Test (if administered): Date: ____________
Total Battery Score: ____________ Verbal Scale Score: ____________ Non-Verbal Scale Score: ____________

Adaptive Behavior Skills Assessment: __________________________ Date of Assessment: ____________
Name of Examiner: __________________________ Title of Examiner: __________________________
Parent Scale:
Total Battery Score: ____________ Highest Area Domain: ____________ $SS^*$

Three Lowest Area Domains:
Area Domain: ____________ ____________ ____________

Teacher Scale:
Total Battery Score: ____________ Highest Area Domain: ____________ $SS$

Three Lowest Area Domains:
Area Domain: ____________ ____________ ____________

$SS^* = standard score to be reported for all standardized tests.

District Alternate Assessment
Test: __________________________ ____________ Results: __________________________
Comments Summary: __________________________

Individual Reading Assessments
Test: __________________________ ____________ Results: __________________________
Comments Summary: __________________________

Language Assessment:
Test: __________________________ ____________ Results: __________________________
Comments Summary: __________________________

MAP Reading:
Date: __________________________ RIT Score: ____________ Percentile: ____________ $SS^*$: ____________ GE: ____________

MAP Math:
Date: __________________________ RIT Score: ____________ Percentile: ____________ $SS^*$: ____________ GE: ____________

SC Ready ELA:
Gender: ____________ Achievement Level: ____________ Scale Score: ____________ Level Range: ____________

SC Ready Math:
Gender: ____________ Achievement Level: ____________ Scale Score: ____________

Revised December 2011

NASDSE
### Review of Eligibility for Alternate Assessment

#### Participation Check List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Category of Disability:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled Grade:</td>
<td>Date of Review:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student must meet all eligibility criteria descriptors in order to meet the criteria for alternate assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria</th>
<th>Eligibility Criteria Descriptors</th>
<th>Sources of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates a significant cognitive disability and adaptive skills that result in performance that is substantially below grade-level achievement expectations even with the use of accommodations.</td>
<td>The student has significant limitations in intellectual functioning as evidenced by cognitive ability test scores on both verbal and non-verbal scales that are at least 2 ½ – 3 standard deviations below the mean. AND The student has significant deficits in adaptive behavior as evidenced by adaptive behavior scale scores that are at least 2 ½ – 3 standard deviations below the mean in at least two adaptive skill domains. AND The student has academic skills that are on the emerging, readiness (prerequisite), foundational level and/or functional (real life) application of the general curriculum.</td>
<td>Results of Individual Cognitive Ability Test Results of Adaptive Behavior Skills Assessment Results of individual and group administered achievement tests Results of informal assessments Results of individual reading assessments Results of district-wide alternate assessments Results of language assessments including English Language Learners (ELL) language assessments, if applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTICIPATION AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY**
QR REQUEST FOR RESOURCES SHARED
SOUTH CAROLINA DEFINES ELIGIBILITY & DISABILITY CATEGORIES

- Significant cognitive disability is characterized by ability scores on both verbal and nonverbal scales that are at least 2½–3 standard deviations below the mean.

- Students with ability scores in the average range are NOT considered to be students with significant cognitive disabilities.
Some disability categories, as defined by the State Board of Education Criteria for Entry into Programs of Special Education for Students with Disabilities (43–243)1, may **NOT** meet the necessary criteria for participation in an alternate assessment.
PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT – STEP 1

- SCDE calculates participation rate
- Informs districts who are above 1%
PROCEDURES FOR MONITORING ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT – STEP 2

- SCDE will monitor SC-Alt testing in that district along with the following:
  - Student’s IEP, school psychological report, and progress monitoring data
  - Red Flag Sampling
  - Full IEP Reviews, if necessary
SUPPORT FOR LEAS IDENTIFICATION AND MONITORING

- Universal Supports
  - Developed an independent study module on Identification
- Targeted and Intensive Supports
  - Facilitated Module on Identification
  - Targeted professional development on using data for identification (using the Participation Checklist)
  - Intensive support on IEP development
WHERE TO NEXT IN SC?
LOOKING AHEAD AND PLANNING FORWARD

- Increasing monitoring Multilingual Learners (ML) with significant cognitive disabilities (Peer Review)
- Added a new ML Participation Checklist to assist IEP Teams
- Assessment monitoring of SC-Alt and ACCESS for ELLs-Alt
- Instructional Supports/Training
Purpose-is to provide information about how South Carolina meets the 1% Monitoring expectation.

This segment will be successful if…

- As a facilitator, I provide you with details about SC 1% monitoring to inform your state’s work towards 1% monitoring.
- As a participant, you find relevant information to inform your state’s work towards 1% monitoring.
What are your key take-aways from this section?

What questions do you still have?
CONTACT INFORMATION

Krysten Douglas
Special Populations Team Lead
803.734.1289
kjdouglas@ed.sc.gov

Roberta E. Turner-Ford
SC-Alt Assessment Ed Associate
803.734.0564
reford@ed.sc.gov
UTAH

ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT MONITORING

TRACY GOOLEY, SPECIAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local Education Agencies (LEAs) over 1% Threshold must submit a justification letter.

50% of LEAs who submit a justification letter will receive monitoring.

Review student Individual Education Program (IEP) and Eligibility.

Any non-compliance identified triggers written findings and corrections.
MONITORING

LEAs chosen for monitoring:

1. Justification letter not submitted
2. Red Flags
   - Primary Disability Specific Learning Disability (SLD) or Emotional Disturbance (ED)
   - Concern within the justification letter
3. Randomly (LEA that has not received previous monitoring)

Prior to Covid-19:
onsite monitoring

Current:
desk monitoring with virtual debrief
WHY ARE SLD AND ED RED FLAGS?

Utah State Board of Education
SER II.J.10 definition states: **Specific learning disability** does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing, or motor disabilities; of intellectual disability; …

Utah State Board of Education
SER II.J.4 definition states: **emotional disturbance** means a condition…that adversely effects a student’s educational performance:

(1) an inability to learn that can not be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors
What to do next?

Does the student’s data reflect the components of a student with a significant cognitive disability?

- **YES**
  - The IEP team will need to start the re-evaluation process; re-evaluate the student’s current data, get more data if necessary, to determine which classification is appropriate.

- **No**
  - The IEP Team will need to re-evaluate participation in the appropriate assessment.
Utah is working to incorporate 1% Participation Threshold Monitoring forms into the same system used for other special education monitoring.

1. File Review Form
2. Special Education Director Questionnaire
3. Special Education Teacher Questionnaire
IEP COMPLIANCE AREAS

1. A description of benchmarks or short-term objectives for each annual goal (all goals) II.J.2.c.(2) page 66

2. Alternate Assessment is how the student will participate in the year end state-wide assessment II.J.2.g.(2)(a)(b) page 66-67

3. A statement of why: (a) The student cannot participate in the regular assessment; and (b) The particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the student; II.J.2.g.(2)(a)(b) page 67

4. Any other non-compliance under general supervision

Utah's Special Education Rules
ELIGIBILITY COMPLIANCE AREAS

1. Formal assessment for both **cognitive and adaptive behavior** must be present in the eligibility documentation
   - Utah guides teams to determine significant deficits based upon the formal assessments protocol. As those assessments will be norm referenced as to what is considered significantly below normal

2. Any other non-compliance under general supervision
Any non-compliance identified during the monitoring process triggers written findings and corrections in alignment with all other special education monitoring processes.

LEAs have 1 year to complete any necessary corrections.

Required training may also be issued.
SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER QUESTIONS

- What type of student participates in alternate assessments (DLM)?
- Do you use the alternate assessment participation guidelines during the IEP meeting?
- What are the main factors the IEP team needs to consider when determining if a student qualifies to participate in alternate assessments (DLM)?
- What are the schools' procedures if a student has the alternate assessment (DLM) indicated as the assessment in the IEP but the school does not find that the student qualifies to participate in the alternate assessments (DLM)?
SPECIAL EDUCATION DIRECTOR QUESTIONS

- Does the IEP team need to consider the student's cognitive score and adaptive score when qualifying the student to participate in alternate assessments (DLM)?
- Does your LEA/District have specific guidelines for a student's cognitive and adaptive scores the IEP team needs to consider to qualify a student to participate in alternate assessments (DLM)?
- What training does your LEA/District provide to teachers about how to implement the alternate assessment participation guidelines?
- What are your LEA/Districts procedures for IEP teams when deciding if a student qualifies to participate in alternate assessments (DLM)?
Utah has updated our full monitoring visit questionnaires to incorporate more assessment and alternate assessment specific questions.

That team will look for students participating in the alternate assessment and review those files.

- Added the same compliance areas in the IEP and Eligibility that the 1% monitoring looks for.
“As much as I don't like to admit it, this audit has been helpful. Thanks for your patience as we strive to improve our compliance with the guidelines.”
Special Education Director

“Thanks guys!! We know you have our backs, and we will take any and all education we can get.”
Special Education Director

“To be honest I questioned some of these students. They all have pretty low cognitive scores, but the adaptive behaviors on one of the student's scores are relatively old.”
Special Education Teacher
UTAH RESOURCES

- Utah's Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines
- Who is a student with a significant cognitive disability?
- DLM Administration Padlet
  - Alternate Assessment IEP Compliance PPT
WHAT'S NEXT?

Teachers are asking for:

- Flow Charts
- Decision Making Tools

It Depends!
Tracy Gooley
Utah State Board of Education
Special Education Assessment Specialist
tracy.gooley@schools.utah.gov
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