


Alternative Assessment

Roadmap to Determine Eligibility



1 When to Make Eligibility Decisions

Grade 2

Since state assessments begin in the third grade, IEP teams should conduct a formal alternate assessment eligibility process at some point in the second grade. This would ensure teachers and service providers have time to develop an instructional plan, IEP goals, etc., that will best position the student's teachers and the student for success in third grade. Try to avoid waiting to make eligibility decisions in the third grade. It is important the student has as much instructional time as possible aligned to the Dynamic Learning Maps® (DLM®) Essential Elements before taking the DLM® assessments.

Grade 3-12

While there is no deadline for making eligibility determinations, it is important to do this as early in the school year as possible. Students found eligible at any point after the school year has started should take the DLM® assessments for their designated grade level. In addition to all of the IEP updates, registration must also happen in the DLM Kite® Educator Portal. The First Contact Survey and Personal Needs Profile must be completed by the student's teacher prior to the start of testing. Since Kansas participates in the instructionally embedded DLM® assessment, students are required to meet the blueprint requirements in the fall and spring test window. Therefore, IEP teams need to reach a decision in the fall in order for the student to participate in both the fall and spring test windows. Teachers run the risk of not being able to complete the required steps to administer the DLM® assessments if decisions are made after this date.





Understanding the Eligibility Criteria for Alternate Assessment

Required Assessments

If the IEP team determines the student is eligible for the alternate assessments, then the student must participate in the appropriate DLM® alternate assessments in English language arts, mathematics, and science for their current grade level. For the History, Government and Social Studies (HGSS) classroom based assessment, these students will use the [Alternate HGSS Rubric](#).³

The term “most significant cognitive disability” is not a category of disability. It is a designation given to a small number of students with disabilities for purposes of their participation in the state assessment program. For a student to be found as having a significant cognitive disability, each of the five criteria must be true as determined by the student’s IEP team:

1. Cognitive assessment data supports a most significant cognitive disability (intellectual disability).

Review of student records indicates a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact intellectual functioning, typically functioning 2½ or more standard deviations (SD) below the mean.

Regardless of a student’s disability category, evidence collected should show the effect of the student’s disability significantly impacts their ability to function cognitively.

2. Adaptive assessment data supports a most significant deficit 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 2½ or more SD below the mean.

- The student has a significant intellectual disability that will affect their ability to live independently or find employment after they finish school. They may require ongoing support and assistance to secure appropriate housing or employment opportunities that align with their abilities and needs. This statement acknowledges the student may require additional support beyond what is typically required for **other students to achieve similar outcomes**.

3. The student is primarily being instructed (or taught) using the DLM® Essential Elements as content standards.

IEP teams should review the student's present levels of performance, short-term goals and objectives, and the performance targets for the student to ensure the concepts and skills the student is working on not only reflect the skills and concepts in the Essential Elements, but the short-term goals closely align with the learning maps that will lead to grade-level performance targets.

- The short-term goals and objectives reflect the skills and concepts contained in the learning map steps.
- The annual academic goals are closely aligned to the alternate achievement standards for (DLM® Essential Elements) the student's current grade level.

4. The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in ALL grade- and age-appropriate curriculum at a reduced depth, breadth and complexity.

The student requires extensive, repeated, individualized instruction and support that is neither temporary nor limited to specific content areas.

- The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior across settings are significantly below age expectations, even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations. This covers the aspects of learning and what the student needs in order to learn. In other words, the student requires extensive, repeated, individualized instruction and supports from teachers and other professionals. "Temporary" is used to describe a situation that lasts only a short time or is constantly changing. Therefore, the instructional support needed is long-standing and there is a demonstrated history of required support across settings and content areas.

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

- The student's demonstrated cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior across settings are significantly below age expectations, even with program modifications, adaptations, and accommodations. This covers the aspects of learning materials and accessing information. Materials are significantly modified, customized, and adapted in order to facilitate understanding. The student's need for substantial support to access appropriate curriculum requires substantially adapted materials and customized methods of accessing information in alternative ways to acquire, maintain, generalize, demonstrate, and transfer skills across multiple settings.

5. Parent/legal education decision-maker notification includes discussion of ALL of the following areas:

The differences between the alternate achievement standards and academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled. This includes any effects of state and local policies on the student's education resulting from taking an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards.

AND

The student's achievement will be measured based on alternate achievement standards;

AND

How the student's participation in alternate standards and assessment(s) may delay or otherwise affect the student from completing the requirements for a regular high school diploma;

AND

The student will not be prevented from attempting to complete the requirements for a regular high school diploma;

AND

The local education agency (LEA) provided the parent(s)/legal education decision-maker with ALL of the above information in an understandable and uniform format and in a written language or oral translation the parent(s)/legal education decision-maker can understand.

3 Gathering Evidence

Using **multiple pieces of evidence** to inform the decision is important for two reasons:

1. It prevents decision-making that relies on one type of evidence, and
2. It provides a complete picture of the student in academic and social settings.

Below is a list of possible evidence IEP teams should gather before the decision if the student meets the participation criteria. **It is important to remember no one piece of evidence should be used to make this decision** and **no one person should be making the decision**; it must be a **decision reached and agreed to by all members of the IEP**.

Curriculum, Instructional and Classroom Evidence

- Example instructional objectives and materials.
- Work samples and data on progress from both school- and community-based instruction.
- Classroom work samples and data.
- Teacher observations.

Assessment Data and Evidence

- Past state assessments to compare with classroom work.
- District-wide alternate assessments.
- Reading assessments.
- Any other academic achievement tests.
- Results of initial or most recent evaluations of the student.

IEP Information

- Present levels of academic achievement and functional performance, goals, and short-term objectives or post-school outcomes from the IEP.
- All goals must have at least two benchmarks or objectives.
- Considerations for students with specific communication needs or modes.

Evaluations

- Adaptive behavior assessments.
- Informal assessments.
- Psychological assessments and evaluations, including information associated with IQ tests.
- Speech and communication assessments.

DO NOT USE THESE FACTORS OR DATA TO INFORM AN ELIGIBILITY DECISION.

The following factors are **NOT** appropriate to include in decision-making because they do not add to the IEP team's understanding of what the student knows and can do. While some of the factors listed below make it difficult for a student to come to school ready to engage and learn, these issues should be addressed with staff who have appropriate expertise and experience in these areas.

The following factors may **NOT** be the sole criteria used to determine participation in the alternate assessment:

1. A specific disability category or label.

There is no disability category that is able to predict 100% of a student's cognitive potential. Disability categories alone are not sufficient evidence to determine eligibility for the alternate assessment.

2. Poor attendance or extended absences.

Some students have medical conditions that prevent them from attending school regularly enough to receive instruction. While this is recognized as a factor that inhibits a child's exposure to educational experiences, it is not evidence of a child's ability or their potential to learn and must be addressed through the appropriate school resources.

3. Native language, social, cultural or economic difference.

It is important for educators to understand and use strategies to help them engage students with native language, social, cultural and economic differences. These differences may impact the student's ability to learn and their knowledge if the content is not connected. A comprehensive adaptive skills assessment is based on a body of evidence that reflects the child's social, linguistic, and cultural background.

4. Expected poor performance on the general statewide assessment.

Most students receiving special education services can and do participate in general education assessments with accommodations and other supports. Poor performance on these assessments is not an appropriate factor to use when making an eligibility decision.

5. Academic and other services the student receives.

Many students receive a variety of related services that address their physical, behavioral or other challenges beyond their cognitive ability. The type of services a student receives does not indicate a significant cognitive disability.

6. Educational environment or instructional setting.

The setting in which a student receives his/her education is not a factor in determining cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior. Districts routinely utilize staff with expertise in the challenges of a specific disability, behavior or mental health issue, either within the school, district or in another setting. Regardless of where a student accesses specialized care or services, meaningful academic instruction should always be given to the student. Because of this requirement, the educational placement of a student is not to be used as a factor for eligibility.

7. Percent of time receiving special education.

Students receive special education services in a variety of ways and in varying degrees of intensity. It is more meaningful to consider the type and intensity of the structures and supports the student requires in order to participate academically and socially in their school than it is to consider the number of hours or days a student requires in order to receive appropriate special education services.

8. English language learner (ELL) status.

It is important to understand a student's ability to learn and their knowledge of the English language is not connected. How well a student understands and speaks English has an impact on his/her ability to learn; however, it does not indicate a learning disability.

Alternative methods of understanding what a student knows and can do may need to be investigated depending on the student's English proficiency level.

9. Low reading level/achievement level.

A student's reading level and achievement level should not be a determining factor in whether a student is eligible for the alternate assessment. Teams need to consider appropriate accommodations to assist these students. Only students with a most significant cognitive disability and most significant deficits in adaptive behavior may take the alternate assessment.

10. Students anticipate disruptive behavior.

Behavior challenges can make learning difficult for some students and should be treated appropriately and professionally. Behavior challenges should not be considered when deciding if a student meets the criteria for an alternate assessment as they are not indicators of cognitive ability.

11. Impact of student score on the accountability system.

How well or poorly a student may perform on any state assessment may not be used as a deciding factor in determining which assessment is appropriate for a student.

12. Administrative decision.


Under no circumstances is it appropriate for a school, district or program administrator to unilaterally make an eligibility decision without the full cooperation and consensus of the IEP team, of which the parents or guardians are equal participants or without following all standard procedures regarding educational decision-making for a student.

13. Anticipated emotional duress.

Anticipation that a student will have emotional distress or anxiety due to state assessments is not a deciding factor for placing a student on an alternate assessment.

4 Documenting the Decision

If the decision is:



If the IEP team determines the student **is eligible**, they must document the decision using the **Participation Guidelines¹** or **Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM®)²** form and include it with the IEP. This must be completed each year at the time of the IEP annual review for students.

This must be done regardless of grade level. For example, ninth-grade students do not take an alternate assessment but the **Participation Guidelines¹** or **Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM®)²** form should be completed and kept with the student's IEP since most IEPs will carry over to the next school year.



If the IEP team determines the student is **not eligible**, then the following must happen:

1. The student must participate in the state assessments for their current grade level with appropriate accommodations as determined by the IEP team.
2. The student's instruction must be aligned with Kansas Curricular Standards via the general education curriculum. Without access to the general education curriculum, students will not be able to learn the academic skills and knowledge for their grade level which will be assessed through state assessments.
3. Record of the decision must be recorded on the **Participation Guidelines¹** or **Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM®)²** form, and placed in the student's file.



Review of Eligibility Determinations

The Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) Special Education and Title Services Team will conduct targeted monitoring and review data on eligibility determinations to ensure students are appropriately identified for the alternate assessment. KSDE will use the percent of participation in an alternate assessment and the percent of DLM® red flags to identify schools and districts that may need additional support and guidance to use the eligibility criteria to make valid and appropriate determinations.



Endnotes

1 Kansas State Department of Education [KSDE].(2023). *Dynamic Learning Maps® Participation Guidelines for Kansas*. [PDF]: <https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/SES/DLM/DLM-ParticipationGuidelines.pdf>

2 KSDE.(2024). *Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM®) for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities*. [PDF]: <https://www.ksde.org/Portals/0/SES/DLM/DLM-Rubric.pdf>

3 KSDE. (2023). *History, Government and Social Studies Alternate Rubric*. [PDF]: [https://www.ksde.org/portals/0/csas/content area \(f-l\)/history, government, and social studies/hgss assessment/hgss-alt-rubric.pdf](https://www.ksde.org/portals/0/csas/content area (f-l)/history, government, and social studies/hgss assessment/hgss-alt-rubric.pdf)

MISSION

To prepare Kansas students for lifelong success through rigorous, quality academic instruction, career training and character development according to each student’s gifts and talents.

VISION

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

MOTTO

Kansans Can

SUCCESS DEFINED

A successful Kansas high school graduate has the

- Academic preparation,
- Cognitive preparation,
- Technical skills,
- Employability skills and
- Civic engagement

to be successful in postsecondary education, in the attainment of an industry recognized certification or in the workforce, without the need for remediation.

OUTCOMES

- Social-emotional growth
- Kindergarten readiness
- Individual Plan of Study
- Civic engagement
- Academically prepared for postsecondary
- High school graduation
- Postsecondary success



900 S.W. Jackson Street, Suite 600
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1212
(785) 296-3203
www.ksde.org/board

DISTRICT 1



Danny Zeck
dzeck@ksde.org

DISTRICT 2



Melanie Haas
Chair
mhaas@ksde.org

DISTRICT 3



Michelle Dombrosky
mdombrosky@ksde.org

DISTRICT 4



Ann E. Mah
Legislative Liaison
amah@ksde.org

DISTRICT 5



Cathy Hopkins
chopkins@ksde.org

DISTRICT 6



Dr. Deena Horst
Legislative Liaison
dhorst@ksde.org

DISTRICT 7



Dennis Hershberger
dhershberger@ksde.org

DISTRICT 8



Betty Arnold
barnold@ksde.org

DISTRICT 9





Jim Porter
Vice Chair
jporter@ksde.org

DISTRICT 10



Jim McNiece
jmcniece@ksde.org



900 S.W. Jackson Street, Suite 102
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1212
(785) 296-3201
www.ksde.org



COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION
Dr. Randy Watson



DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
Division of Fiscal and Administrative Services
Dr. Frank Harwood



DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
Division of Learning Services
Dr. Ben Proctor

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.

The Kansas State Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, disability or age in its programs and activities and provides equal access to the Boy Scouts and other designated youth groups. The following person has been designated to handle inquiries regarding the nondiscrimination policies: KSDE General Counsel, Office of General Counsel, KSDE, Landon State Office Building, 900 S.W. Jackson, Suite 102, Topeka, KS 66612, (785) 296-3201.



For more information, contact:

Cary Rogers

Education Program Consultant
Special Education and Title Services

(785) 296-0916

crogers@ksde.org



Kansas State Department of Education
900 S.W. Jackson Street, Suite 102
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1212

<https://www.ksde.org>