IEP File Review

Alternate Assessment Participation Monitoring

		-	
Student Last Name:		Student First Name:	State Student ID#
School District:		School Building:	
Student Age:	Student DOB:	Student Grade Level on [Date of Record Review:
Name of KSDE Representative Completing Record Review:		Date of Record Review:	

Legislation/Regulation Authority

Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015 (ESSA) [ESEA §111(b)(2)(D) and 34 CFR 200.6(c) and (d)], modifies the provision that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may participate in alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards (alternate assessments). ESSA places a 1.0% threshold on the number of students in the State who may participate in alternate assessments. States that anticipate exceeding the 1.0% threshold must submit a waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education. Pursuant to approval of the Kansas Alternate Assessment Participation Extension Waiver of the 1.0% threshold KSDE assured that it would:

- Verify that each LEA that is required to submit such information to the State is following all State guidelines in 24 CFR 200.6(d) and address any subgroup disproportionality in the percentage of students taking the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Alternate Assessment;
- Implement, consistent with the plan submitted in the KSDE extension waiver request, the steps to support and provide appropriate oversight to districts anticipated to exceed 1.0 percent

support and provide appropriate oversight to districts articipated to exceed 1.0 percent		
Alternate Assessment Participation Criteria IEP Record Review Rubric		
IEP Date:		
Criteria #1: Eviden	ce of Significant Cognitive Disabilities	
Review of student	records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly im	npact intellectual functioning.
Typically functioning 2 ½ or more Standard Deviations (SD) below the mean.		
Criteria Rating	Clarifying Examples	Notes
☐ Yes	The student's primary disability is associated with a most significant	
□ No	intellectual disability (Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disability, Autism,	
	Traumatic Brain Injury).	
☐ Yes	Does assessment of intellectual functioning and cognitive abilities support	
□ No	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)	
☐ Yes	The PLAAFPs indicates academic skills which are several grade levels below	
□ No	age appropriate peers for elementary students, 5-6 grade levels below for	
	middle school students, and 7-9 grade levels below for high school	
	students for all content areas.	





Criteria #2: Evidence of Significant Deficits in Adaptive Behavior		
Review of student re	ecords indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly im	pact adaptive behavior (those
skills and behaviors	essential for someone to live independently and to function safely in	n daily life). Typically functioning
2 ½ - 3 SD below the	e mean and/or extensive information documentation of most sign. D	Deficits in adaptive functioning.
Criteria Rating	Clarifying Examples	Notes
	Assessment of adaptive behavior functioning indicates significant deficits in adaptive behavior (2.5 or more SD below the mean)	
□ No	The student's IEP includes goals for conceptual skills, social skills, and /or bractical 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)	
□ Yes □ No	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 CDDO for adult services)	

Criteria #3: Primarily Instructed Using the DLM Essential Elements as Content Standards		
Present levels and	measurable goals listed in the IEP for this student are linked to the en	nrolled grade level DLM
Essential Elements	and address knowledge and skills that are appropriate and challengi	ng for this student.
Criteria Rating	Clarifying Examples	Notes
☐ Yes	The student's IEP references PLAAFPs and goals aligned to the DLM	
□ No	essential elements. (ALL Goals must have at least 2 benchmarks/objectives)	
☐ Yes	Previous assessment score reports support taking an alternate assessment.	
□ No	Situations that do not support taking the AA are receiving target and/or	
	advanced levels on the DLM indicating the test is no longer ambitiously	
	challenging; obtaining a score on the general assessment indicates the	
	student is capable of taking a general assessment with accommodations.	





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.
- 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.

Criteria Rating	Clarifying Examples	Notes
☐ Yes	The student's IEP indicates direct special education support for the majority	
□No	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.	
☐ Yes	The student requires extensive accommodations and modifications (layers	
□No	of supports, scaffolding and/or assistive technologies- low or high tech) to	
	communicate, follow directions, complete daily routines and/or complete	
	instructional activities.	
☐ Yes	The student's IEP outlines accessibility supports beyond those allowed on	
□No	the Kansas Assessment Program (KAP) to meet the cognitive and physical	
	task demands of instruction and assessment. Refer to <u>The Kansas</u>	
	Accessibility Manual or Tools and Accommodations Available for the KAP.	

The following aren't allowable (or acceptable) considerations for determining participation in the DLM Alternate Assessment.

- 1. A specific disability category or label.
- 2. Poor attendance or extended absences.
- 3. Native language/social/cultural or economic difference.
- 4. Expected poor performance on the general education assessment.
- 5. Academic and other services student receives.
- 6. Educational environment or instructional setting.
- 7. Percent of time receiving special education.
- 8. English Language Learner (ELL) status.
- 9. Low reading level/achievement level.
- 10. Student's anticipated disruptive behavior.
- 11. Impact of student scores on accountability system.
- 12. Administrator decision.
- 13. Anticipated emotional duress.
- 14. Need for accommodations (e.g., assistive technology/AAC) to participate in assessment process.

Criteria Rating	Clarifying Examples	Notes
	The IEP does not suggest or provide evidence that the decision was based on any of the considerations listed above.	





Yes	General		
□ No assessment. □ Yes □ The IEP includes a statement of why the particular alternate assessment selected is appropriate for the student. □ Yes □ Evidence of parent/legal education decision maker notification of participation in the alternate assessment and its implication in the parent's native language. Score /17 Score Scale □ Interpretation 13-17 □ Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. 8-12 □ Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer □ Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.		,	
□ No appropriate for the student. □ Yes □ No Evidence of parent/legal education decision maker notification of participation in the alternate assessment and its implication in the parent's native language. Score /17 Score Scale Interpretation 13-17 Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. 8-12 Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.			
Score Scale Interpretation Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.			
Score Scale Interpretation 13-17 Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. 8-12 Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.			
13-17 Complete and Consistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance Check. 8-12 Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.	Score /17		
8-12 Partial or Inconsistent Evidence Present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.	Score Scale Ir	nterpretation	
Guidelines Compliance check. 7 or fewer Little or No Evidence present. IEP file review has not passed the Participation Guidelines Compliance check.			
Guidelines Compliance check.			
Signature of KSDE Reviewer Date			
Signature of KSDE Reviewer Date			
	Signature of KSDE Reviewer Date		
For more information, contact:	For more inform	nation contact:	

Cary Rogers
Education Program Consultant
Special Education and Title Services
(785) 296cary.rogers@ksde.gov



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

The Kansas State Department of Education does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, 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.