

## 2023-2024 Policies and Procedures: Bay (Approved)

### Section E: Participation in State and District Assessments

The school district administers districtwide assessments of academic student achievement.

- Yes  
 No

History

If **yes**, include the name of each districtwide assessment and whether the assessment is administered to students on alternate academic achievement standards. If the districtwide assessment is not administered to students on alternate academic achievement standards, identify the corresponding alternate assessment. (If your school district uses a portfolio as a corresponding district alternate assessment, the data collected should be based on grade-level alternate academic achievement standards. For portfolios, indicate what information is being collected, how the information is being recorded, what type of scoring rubric is being used, and how the school district ensures that all teachers are collecting the same information and scoring the data the same way.)

Bay District School includes data from multiple sources:

Observations, Review available educational data; (MTSS/IEP Goals / Grades / Screeners / Benchmarks / Diagnostics; Informal academic achievement measure; DP-4: 1st percentile or lower on General Development Score

History

#### **Parental Consent Documentation**

In accordance with s. 1003.5715, F.S., and Rule 6A-6.0331(10), F.A.C., the school district may not proceed with a student's instruction in access points and the administration of an alternate assessment without written and informed parental consent unless the school district documents reasonable efforts to obtain parental consent and the student's parent has failed to respond or the school district obtains approval through a due process hearing. The school district shall obtain written parental consent for the actions described above on the Parental Consent Form – Instruction in Access Points – Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AP-AAAS) and Administration of the Statewide, Standardized Alternate Assessment, Form 313181 <https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-14585>.

The school district certifies that it either obtains prior parental consent or due process approval for every student participating in the FAA program. If prior parental consent is not obtained, the school district certifies that it has documentation of reasonable efforts to obtain that approval and consent, or a final order from DOAH.

- Yes  
 No

History

#### **Percentage of Students on Alternate Assessment**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (which can be found at <https://www.ed.gov/essa>), limits the percentage of students that a state may assess with an AA-AAAS to no more than 1 percent of all assessed students in the grades assessed in a state for each subject.

While there is a limit on the percentage of students statewide who may participate in the AA-AAAS, there is no such limit among school districts; however, 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(c)(3)(ii) and (iv) require that a school district submit information justifying the need to assess more than one percent of its students in any subject with an AA-AAAS. The state must make that information publicly available, provided that such information does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

It is understood that school districts have unique circumstances that may contribute to a higher number of students who are in access courses and participating in the FAA program. The purpose of this justification is to ensure that school districts are cognizant of their current processes and procedures to ensure that an IEP team decision to place a student in access courses is in alignment with state requirements and is the most appropriate academic decision for the student.

What is your school district's 2022-23 participation percentage in the FAA in the following areas?

**Reading**

1.5%

History

**Mathematics**

1.5%

History

**Science**

1.4%

History

Is the school district over one percent in any area?

- Yes
- No

History

The criteria for the following statement is outlined in s. 1008.22(3)(d), F.S., and Rule 6A-1.0943, F.A.C., and on the Checklist for Course and Assessment Participation, which can be found at <https://faa.fsassessments.org/-/media/project/client-portals/florida-alt/2023-2024-faa/manuals-and-guides/checklist-for-course-and-assessment-participation.pdf> for use in determining student eligibility for participation in the FAA program.

**If the school district is over one percent in any area, please provide a description of how the school district is ensuring that IEP teams are adhering to the criteria (see above.)**

ESE District Administrators will conduct random audits to review the individual educational plans (IEPs) of students initially found eligible for instruction in Access Points-Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AP-AAAS) and scheduled to take the AA-AAAS as indicated on their IEPs. Training will continue to be shared with schools and teachers as they review student data that students who are eligible must meet the following: Compliance Standard: The student has a most significant cognitive disability. "Most significant cognitive disability" means a global cognitive impairment that adversely impacts multiple areas of functioning across many settings and is result of a congenital, acquired or traumatic brain injury or syndrome and is verified by either:

A statistically significant below average global cognitive score that falls within the first percentile rank (i.e., a standard, full scale score of 67 or under); or

In the extraordinary circumstance when a global, full-scale intelligence quotient score is unattainable, a school district-determined procedure that has been approved by the Florida Department of Education under paragraph (5)(e) of this rule.

The IEP team will review address the following questions and to include parental input to determine eligibility for alternate assessment: Alternate Assessment Checklist: In order for a student to participate in the access point/alternate assessment, the response to each of the following questions must be Yes. Provide additional information as necessary: 1. Does the student have a significant cognitive disability 2. Is the student unable to master the grade-level, general state content standards even with appropriate and allowable instructional accommodations, assistive technology, or accessible instructional materials. 3. Does the student require direct instruction in academic areas of English language arts, mathematics, social studies and science based on access points in order to acquire generalize and transfer skills across settings? Once criteria has been established by the team and based on the aforementioned checklist, parental consent for placement on alternate assessment will be obtained via separate document.

#### History

**Provide a justification, with supporting evidence, that identifies specific programs or circumstances within the school district that may contribute to higher enrollment of students in access courses that exceeds one percent (e.g., center schools serving surrounding school districts).**

Bay District Schools has one charter school, Chautauqua Learn and Serve that provides services to students who are identified as working on access points. Our military liaison works closely with our high incident of military personnel within our county to assistance military families who are attracted to our area due to the model of service for students with disabilities that our county offers. The services/programs available to students within Bay District Schools include 45 Autism (ASD) cluster classes that serves students in grades prek-12. There are 10 functional cluster classes which serve Intellectually Disabled students (InD) grades K-12. This model of service for our high military population may create a disproportionately high rate of students who attend Bay District Schools who are identified with ASD and InD disabilities. Additionally. Of those students in the disability categories other than ASD and InD were removed, our overall percent would have been closer to the 1% cap range coming in at 1.1%. This would have resulted in a much closer value to the target 1%. This is therefore an area moving forward that we can concentrate our efforts on in reducing the overall 1% cap and thus contributing to the higher enrollment of students on access points.

#### History

What is your school district's risk ratio for disproportionality in each content area for each subgroup?

**ELA American Indian or Alaskan Native**

| 0

[History](#)

**ELA Black, non-Hispanic**

| 18%

[History](#)

**ELA Hispanic**

| 9.4%

[History](#)

**ELA Asian or Pacific Islander**

| 1.3%

[History](#)

**ELA White, non-Hispanic**

| 63.1%

[History](#)

**ELA Economically Disadvantaged**

| 15%

[History](#)

**ELA English Language Learner**

32%

History

**Math American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Math Black, non-Hispanic**

18%

History

**Math Hispanic**

9.4%

History

**Math Asian or Pacific Islander**

1.3%

History

**Math White, non-Hispanic**

60.1%

History

**Math Economically Disadvantaged**

32%

History

**Math English Language Learner**

33%

History

**Science American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Science Black, non-Hispanic**

18%

History

**Science Hispanic**

9.4%

History

**Science Asian or Pacific Islander**

1.3%

History

**Science White, non-Hispanic**

55%

History

**Science Economically Disadvantaged**

33%

History

**Science English Language Learner**

18%

History

**Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Social Studies Black, non-Hispanic**

18%

History

**Social Studies Hispanic**

9.4

History

**Social Studies Asian or Pacific Islander**

7.7

History

**Social Studies White, non-Hispanic**

55%

History

**Social Studies Economically Disadvantaged**

23%

History

**Social Studies English Language Learner**

18%

History

**If an identified risk ratio is 3 or above in any area, describe the school district's plan to address this disproportionality. This could include examining practices, such as the training and technical assistance provided to personnel on culturally responsive practices; working within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to promote best practices in screening; progress monitoring; and initial eligibility determination. School districts may also refer to their efforts to decrease disproportionality in evaluation, identification and discipline if similar efforts are made in that area.**

The district continues to be over the 1% cap for FSA across all grade levels and content areas, Reading 1.5%, Mathematics, 1.4%, Science 1.7%, for grades 3-10. Based on the data reported from Assessment and Accountability Spring 2019 the disproportionality numbers are Asian/ Pacific Islander 1.3%, Black Non-Hispanic 18.0%, Hispanic 9.4%, Multiracial 7.7%, White Non-Hispanic 63.1%. Our district data on disproportionality was self-assessed using a combination of MIS data and Assessment and Accountability data. When compared to subgroups of overall student population the number of students participation in FSAA by subgroup are similar to subgroup population of student body. The data for ELA showed Asian/Pacific Islander 1.9%, Black Non-Hispanic 11.0%, Hispanic 7.7%, and Multiracial 5.3%, White Non-Hispanic 60.0%. The only area we would further explore is the difference between Black-Non-Hispanic participation in FSAA compared FSA. The data for Math showed Asian/Pacific Islander 1.06%, Black Non-Hispanic 8.2% (grades 3-8), Hispanic 5.8%, Multiracial 3.7%, White Non-Hispanic 55.0%. The district's plan to address any area of identified disproportionality is to require the IEP team to answer yes to three (3) questions below prior to any decision to place a student on alternate assessment. This ensures that there will be no student inappropriately placed on alternate assessment: In order for a student to participate in the access point/alternate assessment, the response to each of the following questions must be Yes. Provide additional information as necessary. Does the student have a significant cognitive disability? Is the student unable to master the grade-level, general state content standards even with appropriate and allowable instructional accommodations, assistive technology, or accessible instructional materials? Does the student require direct instruction in academic areas of English language arts, mathematics, social studies and science based on access points in order to acquire generalize and transfer skills across settings?

## History

### Rule 6A-1.0943, F.A.C., Statewide Assessment for Students with Disabilities

#### District-Specific Procedures

These are the criteria required for participation in the statewide, standardized alternate assessment as per Rule 6A-1.0943(5), F.A.C.:

**Section A:** The decision that a student with a significant cognitive disability will participate in the statewide, standardized alternate assessment as defined in Rule 6A-1.0943(5)(a), F.A.C., must be made by the IEP team and recorded on the IEP.

If the definition of "most significant cognitive disability" is not met according to the criteria set in Rule 6A-1.0943(1)(f)1., F.A.C., then complete Section E of this document, which satisfies Rule 6A-1.0943(1)(f)2., F.A.C.

**Section B:** The provisions regarding parental consent for participation in the statewide, standardized alternate assessment found in Rule 6A-6.0331(10), F.A.C., must be followed.

**Section C:** In order for a student to participate in the statewide, standardized alternate assessment, all of the following criteria must be met:

1. The student must receive exceptional student education (ESE) services as identified through a current IEP and be enrolled in the appropriate and aligned courses using alternate achievement standards for two consecutive full-time equivalent reporting periods prior to the assessment;

Evidence of criteria will be provided through the student's current IEP and student schedule.

2. The student must be receiving specially designed instruction, which provides unique instruction and intervention support that is determined, designed and delivered through a team approach, ensuring access to core instruction through the adaptation of content, methodology or delivery of instruction and exhibits very limited to no progress in the general education curriculum standards;

Evidence of criteria will be provided through MTSS or response-to-intervention (Rtl) documentation.

3. The student must be receiving support through systematic, explicit and interactive small-group instruction focused on foundational skills in addition to instruction in the general education curriculum standards;

Evidence of criteria will be provided through MTSS or RtI documentation.

4. Even after documented evidence of exhausting all appropriate and allowable instructional accommodations, the student requires modifications to the general education curriculum standards;

Evidence of criteria will be provided with \_\_\_\_\_ (the required IEP and school district documentation of services provided—accommodation logs, accommodation logs compared to classroom performance).

5. Even after documented evidence of accessing a variety of supplementary instructional materials, the student requires modifications to the general education curriculum standards;

Evidence of criteria will be provided with \_\_\_\_\_ (the required IEP and school district documentation of the provision of supplementary instructional materials—may be a summary from teacher, speech-language pathologist (SLP) or other service providers).

6. Even with documented evidence of the provision and use of assistive technology, the student requires modifications to the general education curriculum standards;

Evidence of criteria will be provided with \_\_\_\_\_ (the required IEP and school district documentation of the provision assistive technology services provided).

7. Even with direct instruction in all core academic areas (i.e., ELA, mathematics, social studies and science), the student is exhibiting limited or no progress on the general education curriculum standards, and requires modifications;

Evidence of criteria will be provided with \_\_\_\_\_ (the required IEP and school district documentation of the provision of supplementary instructional materials—may be a summary from teacher, SLP or other service providers).

8. Unless the student is a transfer student, the student must have been available and present for grade-level general education curriculum standards instruction for at least 70 percent of the school year prior to the assessment;

Evidence of criteria will be provided through the student's attendance report.

9. Unless the student is a transfer student, the student must have been instructed by a certified teacher for at least 80 percent of the school year prior to the assessment; and

Evidence of criteria will be provided through the teacher's certificate and teacher's attendance record.

10. The assessment instrument used to measure the student's global level of cognitive functioning was selected to limit the adverse impact of already-identified limitations and impairments (e.g., language acquisition, mode of communication, culture, hearing, vision, orthopedic functioning, hypersensitivities and distractibility).

Evidence of criteria will be provided through available evaluations, medical reports or screeners provided in the past.

11. The student has a most significant cognitive disability.

**Section D:** A student is not eligible to participate in the statewide, standardized alternate assessment if any of the following apply:

1. The student is identified as a student with a specific learning disability or as gifted;

Evidence of criteria will be provided through IEP and applicable evaluation results.

2. The student is identified only as a student eligible for services as a student who is deaf or hard of hearing or has a visual impairment, a dual sensory impairment, an emotional or behavioral disability, a language impairment, a speech impairment, or an orthopedic impairment; or

Evidence of criteria will be provided through IEP and applicable data.

3. The student scored a level 2 or above on a previous statewide, general education curriculum standardized assessment administered pursuant to Section 1008.22(3)(e), F.S., unless there is medical documentation that the student experienced a traumatic brain injury or other health-related complications subsequent to the administration of that assessment that led to the student having the most significantly below-average global cognitive impairment.

Evidence of criteria will be provided through statewide standard assessment results, if applicable.

**Section E:** In the extraordinary circumstance when a global, full-scale intelligent quotient score is unattainable, a school district will comply as follows:

More specifically, in the event when a student cannot be directly assessed, the student who has a suspected most significant cognitive disability for whom assessment via the FAA may be appropriate as defined in Rule 6A-1.0943(1)(f)1., F.A.C., will be identified through the following detailed procedure:

**List the factors the school district will use to determine that a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable.**

Bay District School includes data from multiple sources:

Observations, Review available educational data; (MTSS/IEP Goals / Grades / Screeners / Benchmarks / Diagnostics; Informal academic achievement measure; DP-4: 1st percentile or lower on General Development Score

History

**Describe the assessment process the school district will use to determine if a student has a most significant cognitive disability in the absence of reliable direct assessment of cognitive functioning.**

Bay District School includes data from multiple sources:

Observations, Review available educational data; (MTSS/IEP Goals / Grades / Screeners / Benchmarks / Diagnostics; Informal academic achievement measure; DP-4: 1st percentile or lower on General Development Score

History

**Describe how the school district will train and monitor staff with compliance of the determination and assessment process.**

Bay District Schools provides ongoing training for Instructional Specialist, Staffing Specialist, School Psychologist, and teachers regarding criteria and documentation needed to ensure compliance for the assessment process. District Staff provides guidance and training on completing the assessment protocol. All assessment protocols / documentation / evaluations completed are reviewed by district staff to ensure all criteria is met prior to eligibility meetings.

History