

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

For elementary aged students who are capable of participating in district assessments such as iReady reading and I-ready math, then they are included for progress monitoring purposes. For students who participate in alternate assessments, teachers have the options to use VIZZLE or Unique Learning Systems to monitor and track progress. For secondary students, students are given district assessments using curriculum based assessments through NWEA system to monitor progress. Secondary students on the Alternate Assessment are monitored by VIZZLE or Unique Learning Systems.

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**

Okeechobee County had 57 students with disabilities participate in the ELA FSAA. This is 1.3% of the students tested in FSAA.

History

#### **Mathematics**

Okeechobee County had 46 students with disabilities participate in the Math FSAA. This is 1.4% of the students tested in FSAA.

History

#### **Science**

Okeechobee County had 17 students with disabilities participate in the Science FSAA. This is .6% of the students tested in FSAA.

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.)**

Adhere to more than two standard deviations below the mean when determining the need for FSSA. Assessment Participation Checklist Embedded in PEER is also used to determine if a student will participate in the FSAA. Thus, only students that are significantly cognitively disabled would be considered to participate in the FSAA. Some students have a medical condition, seizure activity, or other degenerative disease and our testing has shown decrease of IQ over time. Okeechobee County School District will utilize IEP Team Guide to Assessment for Students With Disabilities The IEP Team Guide to Assessment for Students With Disabilities flowchart as a visual outline of the process for determining instruction and assessment decisions for students with disabilities. IEP teams are encouraged to use this process and guide in conjunction with their collaborative knowledge and established IEP practices to determine the most appropriate means of assessment. [https://fsaa-training.onlinehelp.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/docs/FlaAlt\\_ResourceGuideIEP.pdf](https://fsaa-training.onlinehelp.cognia.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/8/docs/FlaAlt_ResourceGuideIEP.pdf) History

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).**

In Okeechobee County, 67.9% of mothers received prenatal care during the first trimester, 11.5 percentage points less than Florida overall. In Okeechobee County, 6.3% of mothers received prenatal care beginning in the third trimester, 2.5 percentage points higher than the state of Florida. The Kotelchuck Index, also called the Adequacy of Prenatal Care Utilization (APNCU), uses the initiation of prenatal care and the number of prenatal visits for calculating adequate prenatal care. In Okeechobee County, a total of 400 or 72.3% of births were to mothers that have a high school diploma or higher, while 27.7% were to mothers with less than a high school diploma. Among mothers with a high school diploma or higher, 80 or 20.0% had inadequate prenatal care, while 34.0% of those with less than a high school diploma had inadequate prenatal care. In Okeechobee, 16% of all arrests in 2004 were drug-related, 11% in 2009, 19% in 2014, and 18% in 2019. The Okeechobee County School District continues to monitor data to identify circumstances in the county that may be contributing to higher enrollments of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

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**

| 2.25

[History](#)

**ELA Hispanic**

| .86

[History](#)

**ELA Asian or Pacific Islander**

| 0

[History](#)

**ELA White, non-Hispanic**

| .93

[History](#)

**ELA Economically Disadvantaged**

| 1.01

[History](#)

**ELA English Language Learner**

| .25

[History](#)

**Math American Indian or Alaskan Native**

| 0

[History](#)

**Math Black, non-Hispanic**

| 2.33

[History](#)

**Math Hispanic**

| .78

[History](#)

**Math Asian or Pacific Islander**

| 0

[History](#)

**Math White, non-Hispanic**

| 1.01

[History](#)

**Math Economically Disadvantaged**

| .99

[History](#)

**Math English Language Learner**

.24

History

**Science American Indian or Alaskan Native**

0

History

**Science Black, non-Hispanic**

0

History

**Science Hispanic**

1.23

History

**Science Asian or Pacific Islander**

0

History

**Science White, non-Hispanic**

1.33

History

**Science Economically Disadvantaged**

| 3.42

History

**Science English Language Learner**

| .67

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.**

To address this concern, we will examine our MTSS practices to promote best practices in screening, progress monitoring and initial eligibility determination. We will develop a task force to examine our current evaluation process to identify students with the most cognitive disabilities to ensure that our rubrics are culturally sensitive and unbiased and that all assessment protocols are being followed with fidelity. Following the analysis professional development will be provided to ensure students are evaluated with objectivity and without bias.

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 (RtI) 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 school psychologist will do at least one observation of the student in a learning situation in which the student is expected to respond to questions, complete paper-pencil tasks, and/or complete tasks with manipulatives. The student's parent(s)/guardian(s) and school staff that work with the child will be interviewed in regards to how the child communicates and responds. The observations and interviews will be focused on but not limited to verbal communication skills, nonverbal communication skills including the use of assistive technology if applicable, joint attention, and motor functioning. If there continues to be questions as to whether the student would be responsive to a direct assessment of cognitive functioning, a test chosen to limit the adverse impact of already-identified limitations and impairments (as identified in Rule 6A-1.0943, F.A.C. (5)(c)10) shall be attempted using any applicable modifications or accommodations allowed according to the test manual.

## 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.**

Assessment will include A. Standardized assessment of adaptive behavior completed with or by the parent/guardian and teacher(s). B. A standardized developmental scale administered by the school psychologist which includes cognitive/academic skills. C. An evaluation of communication skills including expressive language, receptive language, and the pragmatic (both verbal and nonverbal) and social interaction components of social communication. D. A social and developmental history compiled directly from the parent(s)/guardian(s) E. A review of educationally relevant medical findings, if applicable.

History

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

The district's staffing specialists, school psychologists, speech and language pathologists, and ESE Director will meet and review the procedures aligned in 1 and 2. As part of our SP&P we will review the process and procedure annually to ensure it is implemented with fidelity. Evaluators (i.e., school psychologists and speech and language pathologists) will be trained annually on the requirements of the procedures outlined in 1 and 2. Staffing specialists will monitor compliance for each event of Extraordinary Circumstance at their assigned school.

History