

2023-2024 Policies and Procedures: Putnam (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.)

District Assessments are completed once each nine weeks for progress monitoring. These assessments are administered to both students on regular and alternative assessments. I-Ready Assessments, Performance Matters Assessments, OLS Benchmark Assessments, and District Alternative Assessments are given depending on the grade level and level of student development. Students learning on alternate achievement standards to the general education standards are monitored through pre and post tests and benchmark assessments built into supplemental curriculums of Unique Learning Systems, ULS, or Teach Town. Brigance Inventory of Early Development, Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills, and Brigance Transition Skills Inventory may also be used for progress monitoring purposes.

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

3.0

History

Mathematics

3.3

History

Science

4.0

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 Exceptional Student Education Department has developed a form to be used internally for the documentation of data regarding participation in Access courses and the Alternative Assessment. Data collected on these forms include a review of the student's psychological testing including IQ, adaptive scores, academic history, etc. Other data includes accommodations to the general education program to ensure success in school and a documentation of modifications needed to the general education program to help the student be successful in achieving benchmark standards. For students determined to learn on access standards, documentation of the need for modification through district and curriculum assessments is collected. A committee comprised of the the Alternative Assessment Coordinator, School Psychologist, ESE Director and ESE Operations Management Specialist review this data of students taking the Alternative Assessment. These forms are completed annually at each students IEP meeting.

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).

Putnam County's low socio-economic ranking in the state is evidence of a higher enrollment of students on Access courses. Due to the county's low socio-economic ranking there are a greater number of resources and available programs for families of students with disabilities. The school District also operates a center school that attracts families of students with severe disabilities who are eligible for Access courses. These resources include food pantries and church food drives to support the community: Catholic Charities, Palatka Christian Service Center, Goodwill, Habitat for Humanity, Heart of Putnam, Interlachen Soup kitchen, Episcopal Children's Services, and EPIC Food distribution locations. Our district also has expanded resources available through the county health department including multiple locations of medical and dental services for those that qualify run by Azalea Health which offers health care and dental services where patients are charged on a sliding scale based on their income. There is also community outreach from civic organizations to support low income areas of the community, Title One resources for the entire district including free breakfast and lunch without application, 21st Century program for free after school care and family support, and large availability of low cost housing. These resources, and a lower cost of living, draw families to our district, resulting in a higher number of students qualifying for Access coursework. From 1998 to 2019, the drugs and narcotics-related offenses have accounted for 9 to 28 percent of Putnam County's arrests. (source <https://www.fdle.state.fl.us/FSAC/Documents/2019-County-Reports/Putnam/7-ADULT-ARR-Putnam.aspx>) The prevalence of Opioid Use Disorder continues to be of high concern at the regional, state, and national levels. The most recent available data from the Florida Department of Health show that in 2018 Putnam County experienced ten (10) opioid overdose deaths. The ten (10) deaths translate to an age-adjusted death rate of 15.0 in Putnam County. By comparison, the state rate of opioid deaths was 18.7 per 100,000 population in 2018 (Table TA 35, Technical Appendix). Overall drug overdose deaths have seen an uptick as well. In 2015, there were three (3) drug overdose deaths in Putnam County, a rate of 5.8 deaths per 100,000. By comparison, the state rate of drug overdose deaths was 13.1 per 100,000 in the same year (Table TA 35, Technical Appendix). Neonatal Abstinence Syndrome (NAS) describes a combination of clinical symptoms in infants less than 28 days old who were exposed to opioid prescription or other illicit drugs during pregnancy. The syndrome is most associated with opioids, but other substances, including nicotine, can be implicated. Due to ambiguities in diagnosis, there are challenges to the standardization of screening in newborns. Thus, although rates of NAS are considered an important marker of opioid use disorder in the community, reported data may underestimate the true prevalence of the syndrome. In the time between 2015-2018, Putnam County had high rates of documented NAS compared to the state. Between 2015-2018, Putnam County had an average of 22.5 documented cases of NAS for the period (Table TA 35, Technical Appendix). Other markers of drug use in Putnam County, including nonfatal opioid drug overdoses and drug arrests are presented in the technical appendix and demonstrate relatively stable rates (Tables TA 35-36, Technical Appendix). OTHER SUBSTANCE USE INDICATORS Other substance use indicators included in the 2021 Putnam County Community Health Assessment

Technical Appendix relate to alcohol use disorder. The effects of excessive alcohol use have been highlighted in recent years due to the relation of alcohol with the burden of chronic disease, particularly liver disease, and mental health illness. In 2016, 15.3 percent of Putnam County residents reported engagement in heavy or binge drinking, lower than the state rate of 17.5 percent (Table TA 32, Technical Appendix). Still, rates of chronic liver disease and cirrhosis, which can be a consequence of chronic alcohol use disorder, were higher in Putnam County compared to the state. In 2019, Putnam County had 19.0 cases of alcoholic liver disease per 100,000 population of selected liver deaths. This was higher than the state rate of 6.3 per 100,000 in the same time (Table TA 33, Technical Appendix). In 2019, Putnam County had 27.4 cases of chronic liver disease and cirrhosis per 100,000 population of selected liver deaths. This was also higher than the state rate of 11.3 per 100,000 in the same period (Table TA 33, Technical Appendix). (Source: http://putnam.floridahealth.gov/programs-and-services/community-health-planning-and-statistics/data-and-reporting/_documents/putnam-cha-01-21-2021.pdf) The district believes that these are contributing factors to the increase in students with the most significant cognitive disabilities entering the public school system in Putnam County, thus exceeding the one percent threshold of participation in the Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA). The district will continue to monitor such data and consider other factors that may contribute to this population.

History

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

ELA American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0.0

History

ELA Black, non-Hispanic

| 2.03

History

ELA Hispanic

| 0.63

History

ELA Asian or Pacific Islander

0.0

History

ELA White, non-Hispanic

0.8

History

ELA Economically Disadvantaged

1.85

History

ELA English Language Learner

0.58

History

Math American Indian or Alaskan Native

0.0

History

Math Black, non-Hispanic

1.84

History

Math Hispanic

0.69

History

Math Asian or Pacific Islander

0.0

History

Math White, non-Hispanic

0.83

History

Math Economically Disadvantaged

1.52

History

Math English Language Learner

0.42

History

Science American Indian or Alaskan Native

0.0

History

Science Black, non-Hispanic

2.16

History

Science Hispanic

0.68

History

Science Asian or Pacific Islander

0.0

History

Science White, non-Hispanic

0.72

History

Science Economically Disadvantaged

1.4

History

Science English Language Learner

0.54

History

Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native

NA

History

Social Studies Black, non-Hispanic

NA

History

Social Studies Hispanic

NA

History

Social Studies Asian or Pacific Islander

NA

History

Social Studies White, non-Hispanic

NA

History

Social Studies Economically Disadvantaged

NA

History

Social Studies English Language Learner

NA

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.

No risk ratio is three or above in any areas.

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.

After the school psychologist has made observations of the student and interviewed the teacher, they will select the most appropriate test for that student's strengths and needs. An attempt will be made to use a full battery assessment while making direct observations and documenting student participation and performance. If the full battery assessment cannot be completed, the school psychologist will determine that a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable.

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.

1. Direct observations from the school psychologist while attempting to administer the full battery assessment.
2. The school psychologist will administer the Developmental Profile 4th Edition, or a similar developmental evaluation as appropriate.
3. The school psychologist will facilitate the completion of the adaptive behavior rating scales with the teacher and/or parent.

History

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

Training regarding procedural compliance will be provided to the school psychologists, staffing specialists, and other applicable IEP team members through monthly PLC trainings. Monitoring of compliance, after each occurrence, will be completed through the completion of the Putnam Assessment Review Committee Form and through review of applicable documentation for assessment participation decisions at each IEP team meeting.

History