

2023-2024 Policies and Procedures: KIPP-Miami (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.)

KIPP Miami will administer the Florida Alternative Assessment (FAA) or the Datafolio, following the state's guidelines and assessment procedures.

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

1.3%

History

Mathematics

1.3%

History

Science

.5%

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.)

All decisions for students to be a candidate for Alternative Assessment is an IEP team decision where all factors are considered, including meeting state criteria and obtaining parental consent for taking the alternative assessment. Evaluation, grades, IQ scores, Social awareness, Adaptive Skills, and other factors are taken into account as well.

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).

We are a small district with a small population in an area where programming for students that have the most significant cognitive disabilities is not in close proximity. One student can make our percentage drastically rise.

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

0

History

ELA Hispanic

0

History

ELA Asian or Pacific Islander

| 0

[History](#)

ELA White, non-Hispanic

| 0

[History](#)

ELA Economically Disadvantaged

| 0

[History](#)

ELA English Language Learner

| 0

[History](#)

Math American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0

[History](#)

Math Black, non-Hispanic

| 0

[History](#)

Math Hispanic

| 0

History

Math Asian or Pacific Islander

| 0

History

Math White, non-Hispanic

| 0

History

Math Economically Disadvantaged

| 0

History

Math English Language Learner

| 0

History

Science American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0

History

Science Black, non-Hispanic

| 0

History

Science Hispanic

| 0

History

Science Asian or Pacific Islander

| 0

History

Science White, non-Hispanic

| 0

History

Science Economically Disadvantaged

| 0

History

Science English Language Learner

| 0

History

Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0

History

Social Studies Black, non-Hispanic

| 0

History

Social Studies Hispanic

| 0

History

Social Studies Asian or Pacific Islander

| 0

History

Social Studies White, non-Hispanic

| 0

History

Social Studies Economically Disadvantaged

| 0

History

Social Studies English Language Learner

0

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 Rtl 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.

Determining that a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable in a school setting typically involves considering a variety of factors. These factors can include:

1. Student's Communication Skills:

- Significant language impairments or non-verbal status that prevent the student from understanding or responding to test items.

2. Behavioral and Emotional Factors:

- Severe emotional disturbances or behavioral issues that interfere with the testing process.
- Anxiety or other emotional conditions that make traditional testing environments unsuitable.

3. Physical or Sensory Disabilities:

- Severe physical impairments that restrict the ability to engage with test materials.
- Sensory impairments, such as blindness or deafness, that cannot be adequately accommodated within the testing process.

4. Health Conditions:

- Chronic health issues or medical conditions that limit stamina or concentration.
- Situations where the student is frequently absent due to health problems, making consistent assessment impractical.

5. Cognitive and Developmental Disabilities:

- Profound cognitive impairments that make standardized cognitive assessments invalid.
- Developmental disabilities that severely impact learning and functioning to a degree where traditional cognitive assessments are not applicable.

6. Environmental Factors:

- Unstable home or living conditions that contribute to inconsistent school attendance or engagement.
- Lack of a stable and supportive environment necessary for reliable assessment.

7. Previous Assessment Attempts:

- Documentation of repeated unsuccessful attempts to administer cognitive assessments.
- Evidence from past assessments indicating that valid and reliable results cannot be obtained.

8. Alternative Assessment Data:

- Availability of other assessment data (e.g., observational data, adaptive behavior scales, functional assessments) that provide sufficient information about the student's cognitive functioning.
- Teacher reports, parent interviews, and other qualitative data that suggest cognitive assessment is not feasible.

9. Professional Judgment:

- Recommendations from multidisciplinary team members, including psychologists, special education teachers, and other relevant professionals.
- Consideration of professional expertise and knowledge of the student's unique needs and circumstances.

These factors are assessed collectively by a team of professionals who work with the student, ensuring that any decision made is well-informed and takes into account the student's best interests and educational needs.

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 absence of reliable direct assessment of cognitive functioning, determining if a student has a most significant cognitive disability (MSCD) involves a comprehensive and multifaceted approach. This process typically includes:

1. Review of Existing Records:

- Examination of the student's educational records, including previous assessments, individualized education plans (IEPs), and any relevant medical or psychological reports.
- Analysis of historical performance and any prior identification of disabilities or significant learning needs.

2. Functional Assessments:

- Administration of functional behavior assessments (FBAs) to understand the student's adaptive and functional capabilities in various settings.
- Use of adaptive behavior scales, such as the Vineland Adaptive Behavior Scales or the Adaptive Behavior Assessment System (ABAS), to evaluate the student's practical, daily living skills, and social functioning.

3. Observational Data:

- Systematic observations by teachers, special education professionals, and other school staff to gather qualitative data on the student's behavior, learning processes, and social interactions.
- Documentation of the student's performance in different contexts, including classroom activities, recess, and other school routines.

4. Parent and Caregiver Interviews:

- Conducting structured interviews with parents, guardians, or caregivers to gain insights into the student's developmental history, behavior at home, and overall functioning.
- Gathering information on the student's abilities and challenges from the perspective of those who interact with them daily.

5. Teacher Reports and Input:

- Collecting detailed reports from teachers and other school personnel who work closely with the student.
- Considering teacher observations on the student's academic progress, engagement, social skills, and any notable strengths or weaknesses.

6. Multidisciplinary Team Evaluation:

- Convening a team of professionals, including special education teachers, school psychologists, speech and language therapists, occupational therapists, and other relevant staff.
- Reviewing all collected data collaboratively to form a comprehensive understanding of the student's cognitive and functional abilities.

7. Alternative Assessments:

- Utilizing alternative assessment methods, such as curriculum-based assessments, dynamic assessments, and performance tasks, to gauge the student's abilities in a non-traditional testing format.

- Applying informal assessment tools that are tailored to the student's specific needs and abilities.

8. Developmental History:

- Reviewing the student's developmental milestones and any documented delays or abnormalities in their developmental trajectory.
- Considering medical evaluations and reports that provide context on any underlying conditions affecting cognitive and functional abilities.

9. Contextual Factors:

- Taking into account the student's cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic background to ensure assessments are fair and unbiased.
- Ensuring that the assessment process is sensitive to any factors that might influence the student's performance.

10. Professional Judgment and Consensus:

- Relying on the professional judgment of the multidisciplinary team to interpret the data and make an informed determination about the presence of a significant cognitive disability.
- Striving for consensus among team members to ensure a holistic and accurate understanding of the student's needs.

The goal of this comprehensive assessment process is to gather a complete picture of the student's abilities and challenges, ensuring that decisions are based on a thorough understanding of the student's unique profile rather than on incomplete or unreliable data.

History

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

Ensuring that staff are well-trained and compliant with the determination and assessment process for identifying students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (MSCD) involves several key steps. The school district will typically implement a comprehensive training and monitoring program, which includes the following elements:

Training

1. Role-Specific Training:

- **Specialized Training for Different Roles:** Providing targeted training for different roles, such as special education teachers, school psychologists, speech and language therapists, and other relevant staff. Each group receives training pertinent to their specific responsibilities within the assessment process.
- **Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** Training on effective collaboration strategies among multidisciplinary team members to ensure comprehensive evaluations.

2. Ongoing Professional Development:

- **Regular Workshops and Seminars:** Offering ongoing professional development opportunities, including workshops, seminars, and webinars, to keep staff updated on best practices, new assessment tools, and changes in legal requirements.
- Reaching out to State Discretionary Projects such as ACCESS & FDLRs for technical assistance

Monitoring

1. Regular Review Meetings:

- **Scheduled Check-Ins:** Holding regular meetings to review the progress of assessments and ensure that procedures are being followed correctly.
- **Case Review Sessions:** Conducting case review sessions where the multidisciplinary team discusses specific student cases, shares findings, and ensures compliance with the assessment process.

2. Compliance Audits:

- **Internal Audits:** Conducting periodic internal audits of assessment records, reports, and procedures to ensure compliance with district policies and legal requirements.
- **External Reviews:** Arranging for external audits or reviews by independent experts to provide an objective assessment of the district's compliance and effectiveness.

3. Performance Evaluations:

- **Staff Evaluations:** Incorporating the assessment process into staff performance evaluations, with specific criteria related to adherence to procedures, accuracy of assessments, and collaboration with the multidisciplinary team.
- **Feedback and Improvement Plans:** Providing constructive feedback to staff and developing improvement plans for those who need additional support or training.

4. Documentation and Reporting:

- **Comprehensive Record-Keeping:** Ensuring that all assessments, observations, and related documentation are thoroughly recorded and stored in compliance with district and legal standards.

- **Regular Reporting:** Requiring regular reporting on the assessment process, including summaries of findings, compliance checks, and any identified issues or areas for improvement.

By implementing a robust training and monitoring system, the school district can ensure that staff are well-equipped to carry out the assessment process accurately and consistently, ultimately leading to better identification and support for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

[History](#)