

## 2023-2024 Policies and Procedures: Flagler (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.)

The district uses iReady to assess student achievement including those students on alternate achievement standards. When it is not possible to assess a student who is on alternate achievement standards using the iReady, the district progress monitors the student using the student's IEP goals and objectives.

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**

1.0

History

**Mathematics**

1.0

History

**Science**

1.6

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.)**

The district implemented a "FSAA Checklist and Instructions" document that must be completed prior to a student being considered for Alternate Assessment. The committee that will review the data presented for consideration, and the results of the checklist is comprised of school psychologists, staffing specialists, ESE service providers, and school administrators. Once the committee completes the review a consideration of FSAA may be made for the IEP team to consider during their eligibility meeting. In addition, the district has brought Project Access to conduct both district and school trainings on the eligibility requirements for consideration

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).**

Our Science participation percentage may be due to the cohort of students taking the alternate assessment this year.

Flagler's large percentage of group homes that only accept students with significant cognitive disabilities should also be a consideration. One agency has nine established group homes within our school district, with each home providing services for 4-6 students. Additionally, there are several other private group homes providing support for students with significant disabilities. Flagler has also experiences a higher percentage of students with significant disabilities transferring into the district, already placed on alternative assessment, both from within the state of Florida and from outside the state.

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**

1.1

History

**ELA Hispanic**

1.23

History

**ELA Asian or Pacific Islander**

.97

History

**ELA White, non-Hispanic**

.87

History

**ELA Economically Disadvantaged**

1.8

History

**ELA English Language Learner**

.71

History

**Math American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Math Black, non-Hispanic**

.83

History

**Math Hispanic**

1.23

History

**Math Asian or Pacific Islander**

1.09

History

**Math White, non-Hispanic**

.958

History

**Math Economically Disadvantaged**

1.53

History

**Math English Language Learner**

.73

History

**Science American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Science Black, non-Hispanic**

1.48

History

**Science Hispanic**

1.67

History

**Science Asian or Pacific Islander**

.70

History

**Science White, non-Hispanic**

.80

History

**Science Economically Disadvantaged**

2.84

History

**Science English Language Learner**

1.38

History

**Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native**

n/a

History

**Social Studies Black, non-Hispanic**

n/a

History

**Social Studies Hispanic**

n/a

History

**Social Studies Asian or Pacific Islander**

n/a

History

**Social Studies White, non-Hispanic**

n/a

History

**Social Studies Economically Disadvantaged**

n/a

History

**Social Studies English Language Learner**

n/a

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.**

n/a

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.**

The evaluator will attempt to build rapport with the student prior to attempting the direct assessment of cognitive function. Once rapport has been established, the evaluator will make an attempt to administer a standardized individualized cognitive measure to the student. The evaluator will attempt to engage the student in verbal and nonverbal components of a standardized cognitive measure. If there is a situation where the student is unable to respond to either the verbal or nonverbal measure in any way, alternative methods of assessment will be considered. Some examples of student-focused factors that would lead the evaluator to consider alternative assessment methods include; the student is unable to maintain eye contact or gaze, he/she babbles at assessment attempts, or the student does not respond to attempted modeling. The evaluator will consult with the student's teacher and or other service providers to determine if the behaviors/responses are typical of the student, or if he/she is capable of a different method of responding.

The process the district will use to determine if a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable with a student:

1. Interact with the student and attempt to build rapport in a non-evaluative way,
2. Once rapport has been established, attempt to administer components of a standardized cognitive measure to include verbal and nonverbal skills,
3. If the student does not engage/unable to engage, attempt accommodations and/or model skills. This would further support the need for an alternative measure.
4. The evaluator will consult with the teacher and/or other service providers to determine if the behaviors/responses are typical of the student.
5. If the student still is unable to engage, inform the parent/guardian and move toward indirect measures.

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.**

In the case where a student is unable to respond to a verbal or nonverbal cognitive measure, the evaluator will document the attempt and the student's response(s) to the standardized measure. The evaluator will review additional data that may include medical, language, motor development data and/or clinical observation notes by trained professionals in their area of expertise. The evaluator will, then, complete the following components to identify the cognitive levels of the student in an indirect manner: direct observation of the student in a classroom activity, conduct the Developmental Profile 4 (DP4) interview with the parent to assess cognitive functioning, and attempts will be made to interview both the parent and teacher for additional input. The final step is to compile the information collected and complete a report to share with the IEP or the MTSS team.

The assessment process the district will use when a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not attainable:

1. Document the attempt to conduct a direct cognitive measure,
2. Conduct a historical review and document any additional data that may include medical, language, motor development data and/or clinical observation notes by trained professionals in their area of expertise,
3. Complete a direct observation of the student in a classroom activity,
4. Conduct the DP4 interview with the parent to assess cognitive functioning,
5. Interview both the student's parents/guardian and teacher(s) for additional information,
6. Compile the information collected and complete a report to share with the IEP or MTSS team.

History

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

Flagler Schools will develop a checklist for evaluators to use as they go through the steps of determining when a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not attainable. The checklist will include:

- Date rapport with student was attempted/established and direct standardized cognitive measure to include verbal and nonverbal skills was attempted,
- Documentation of student responses to direct assessment that outlines engage/unable to engage, attempt accommodations and/or modeled skills,
- Date(s) consultation with the parent/guardian, teacher and/or other service providers took place that supports if the behaviors/responses are typical of the student. Compiled information will be documented.

- Date and findings of historical review and documentation of additional data review that may include medical, language, motor development data and/or clinical observation notes

by trained professionals in their area of expertise,

- Date and findings of direct observation of the student in a classroom activity,
- Date the DP4 interview with the parent to assess cognitive functioning was completed.

Upon completion of the procedures, the evaluator will compile the information collected and complete a report. The evaluator will meet with the lead school psychologist and the ESE Director to review the procedures. Once all steps are completed and the procedures are reviewed, the evaluator will share the results with the IEP or MTSS team.

This process and procedures will be shared with the school psychologists, staffing specialist and other applicable IEP Team members through an in-service training. Follow up will take place through quarterly School Psychologist and Staffing Specialist meetings. Monitoring of compliance will occur during the meetings through hands-on file reviews.

[History](#)