

2023-2024 Policies and Procedures: Lee (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.)

Benchmark Readiness Test: ELA

Benchmark Readiness Test: Math

Benchmark Readiness Test: Science

Benchmark Readiness Test: Social Studies

None of these assessments is administered to students who are instructed with alternate academic standards and take the Florida Alternate Assessment.

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

1.2%

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.)

Lee County is ensuring that IEP teams are adhering to the criteria by training staff to follow the state protocol. To make informed and equitable decisions, the district IEP teams are answering each of the following questions when determining the appropriate course of instruction and assessment:

1. Meets the definition as having a most significant cognitive disability as defined in paragraph (1)(f) of this rule, or in the extraordinary circumstance when a global, full-scale intelligent quotient score is unattainable, satisfies the school district- determined procedure that had been approved by the Florida Department of Education under paragraph (5)(e) of this rule.
2. The student requires modifications to the general education curriculum standards – even after direct instruction, a variety of accommodations and assistive technology have been attempted as documented in the student’s individual educational plan.
3. Provisions for parental consent per Rule 6A-6.0331, F.A.C., have been followed.
4. Enrollment in appropriate and aligned courses for two consecutive full-time equivalent reporting periods prior to the assessment.
5. The student is receiving support through systematic, explicit and interactive small-group instruction focused on foundational skills.
6. The student is receiving specially designed instruction per the requirements of this rule.

7. **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;

§ **Instructed** by a certified teacher for at least 80 percent of the school year prior to the assessment.

8. **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).**

If “YES” is not checked in all three areas, then the student is instructed on general education standard and standard assessment with any appropriate accommodations. If the IEP team determines that all three of the questions accurately characterize a student’s current educational situation, then the student is enrolled in access courses and the FSAA is used to evaluate the student's academic achievement.

[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).

Lee County has a center school, Buckingham Exceptional Center. This school serves students with significant cognitive disabilities, most of which are also medically fragile. It is a small school, with total enrollment between 80 and 120 students, with 100% of students enrolled participating in alternate assessment. While the school does not serve students from surrounding districts, families with students of this profile do relocate here for access to this school.

History

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

ELA American Indian or Alaskan Native

0.95

History

ELA Black, non-Hispanic

1.72

History

ELA Hispanic

0.89

History

ELA Asian or Pacific Islander

.1.27

History

ELA White, non-Hispanic

| .75

History

ELA Economically Disadvantaged

| 1.40

History

ELA English Language Learner

| 1.20

History

Math American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0

History

Math Black, non-Hispanic

| 1.77

History

Math Hispanic

| .89

History

Math Asian or Pacific Islander

| 1.09

History

Math White, non-Hispanic

| .75

History

Math Economically Disadvantaged

| 1.44

History

Math English Language Learner

| 1.20

History

Science American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 2.43

History

Science Black, non-Hispanic

| 1.76

History

Science Hispanic

| .89

History

Science Asian or Pacific Islander

| 0.93

History

Science White, non-Hispanic

| 0.77

History

Science Economically Disadvantaged

| 1.33

History

Science English Language Learner

| 1.04

History

Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native

| 0

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 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.

The school psychologist will determine if a test of cognitive functioning is valid for a student by utilizing multiple methods, including:

1. Reviewing student records (do records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior).
2. Conducting an observation
3. Interviewing teacher and/or parent if needed
4. Consider test characteristics (format; cultural and linguistic load; manual dexterity; ability to visually track; need for hand over hand assistance).
5. Conduct, or attempt to conduct; an individually administered standardized intellectual assessment.
6. Communication barriers only:
 - a. If evidence indicates oral communication is the only barrier, a nonverbal test of cognitive ability may be considered. A comprehensive, multi-dimensional nonverbal assessment should be used in these cases (i.e. The Universal Nonverbal Intelligence Test-II, DAS-II Special Nonverbal Composite; Leiter International Performance Scale-III)
7. Psychologists may consider out-of-level testing on IQ tests that provide out-of-level and/or lower floor norms (i.e. DAS-II; Leiter International Performance Scales-III).
8. Document test observations and student performance.

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.

The school psychologist will clearly document in their report the steps taken to determine that a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable (as outlined in step 1) and the best alternative to a direct assessment of cognitive functioning.

1. An estimate of cognitive ability based on teacher checklist and parent checklist (or interview) on the current version of the Developmental Profile (currently Developmental Profile-Fourth Edition DP-4). Multiple attempts to obtain a parent checklist or interview must be made and documented. The cognitive score on the DP-4 must be at or below 67.
2. Any variation or consideration outside the use of these alternatives as described above will require the approval of the Director of Psychological Services and the Director of Exceptional Student Education or designee.

[History](#)

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

The district will provide annual training to school psychologists and staffing specialists on Section A procedure steps (1) through (2) along with the process for approval of utilizing an alternative measure to direct cognitive assessment. Prior to the eligibility or IEP meeting to review these assessment results, documentation of items in step 1 and 2 will be submitted to the Director of Psychological Services for compliance review and approval of use of alternative measure to direct cognitive assessment.

[History](#)