

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

Students who have been determined eligible for Access Points/Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AP-AAAP) participate and are assessed through the state FAA Performance or Datafolio assessments. It's important to note that students who are not yet eligible for FAA due to the requirement to be enrolled in the appropriate and aligned courses using alternate achievement standards for two consecutive full-time equivalent reporting periods before the assessment are assessed using the FAST state assessment. These students will continue to participate in our district assessments, which may include: (Elementary level: FAST, Dreambox, iReady, Amira), (Middle School Level: FAST, iReady, Common Lit, Benchmark Testing), and (High School Level: FAST, EOC's, Achieve 3000, ALEX).

For students who these assessments are not appropriate, students on AP-AAAP will participate in assessments using Teach Town enCORE diagnostic tools and benchmark testing. Additionally, they will have ongoing standards-based assessments to include pre/post units, and students may use Striving Reader assessments to identify and address individual skill gaps. For all students on alternate assessment progress monitoring data collected within enCORE remain in the program and never deleted, capturing cumulative progress for students. For all students on AP-AAAS, progress monitoring data is collected within the enCORE program, and data is maintained for the entire time the student is accessing the system, capturing longitudinal progress for students.

#### 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%

History

**Mathematics**

| 1%

History

**Science**

| 1.2%

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.)**

Sarasota County Schools assures that students with disabilities (SWD) are correctly identified to participate in Access Points curriculum and Florida Alternate Assessments by having specific policies and procedures in place for appropriate identification and placement. For students currently participating in the AP-AAAS, data is analyzed to identify any content area or disability category that may have a larger percent or disproportionality. The district staff ensures that IEP teams adhere to the criteria for determining the eligibility for participation in Access Points and Florida Standards Alternate Assessment through training, support, and ongoing monitoring. District staff and school-based teams utilize the Checklist for Course and Assessment Participation ([faa.fsassessments.org](http://faa.fsassessments.org)) when considering eligibility.

District staff provides ongoing training opportunities to psychologists, social workers, administrators, teachers, school-based liaisons, and families related to AP-AAAS including identifying implications and considerations when students are placed on a modified curriculum.

A school psychologist and school administrator (designee) participate in all IEP meetings when considering initial eligibility for AP-AAAS and when updated evaluation results are to be considered. At least annually, IEP teams meet to determine if the student continues to meet the AP-AAAS criteria, reviewing state and district assessment scores, achievement data, students' present performance levels, IEP goals, and other pertinent indicators. In cases where data does not appear to support such a decision, teams will develop a plan to support the student as they transition from AP-AAAS to BEST/FAST, and an ESE district team member is included in the meeting to ensure supports are put in place to assist in the transition.

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).**

Sarasota County continues to monitor students participating in AP-AAAS, and in the area of Science, Sarasota County Schools was at 1.2% for 2022-2023. For the 2022-2023 testing window there were 118 students participating in the FSAA, compared with a total of 10,215 students participating in 5th and 8th grade FAST/FSAA, Biology EOC and Biology FSAA. The number of 5th and 8th grade students tested aligns with students tested in Reading and Math, the variation is in the students taking the biology assessment. For general education students, the Biology EOC is given in 10th grade. Given the small population of students at each high school on AP-AAAS, science courses are scheduled on a rotation in our districted high schools with students in grades 9-12 taking the courses. This means that in some cases, we will have a larger cohort taking Biology one year than the next. Based on scheduling in 2022-2023, students taking the Biology FSAA were in grades 10-12, with 12 out of 23 being in 11th or 12th grade and with 18 out of 23 total students tested in one school in grades 9-12 enrolled in Biology.

History

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

**ELA American Indian or Alaskan Native**

American Indian or Alaskan Native students were 0 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

History

**ELA Black, non-Hispanic**

Black, non-Hispanic students were 2 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

History

**ELA Hispanic**

Hispanic students were 0.94 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

History

**ELA Asian or Pacific Islander**

Asian students were 0.83 and Pacific Islander students were 4.1 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

History

**ELA White, non-Hispanic**

White, non-Hispanic were 0.79 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

History

**ELA Economically Disadvantaged**

Economically Disadvantaged students were 2.79 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

[History](#)

**ELA English Language Learner**

English Language Learner students were 0.37 times more likely to participate in an ELA FSAA than a student participating in an ELA FAST

[History](#)

**Math American Indian or Alaskan Native**

American Indian or Alaskan Native students were 0 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

[History](#)

**Math Black, non-Hispanic**

Black, non-Hispanic students were 1.7 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

[History](#)

**Math Hispanic**

Hispanic students were 0.89 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

[History](#)

**Math Asian or Pacific Islander**

Asian students were 0.91 times and Pacific Islander students were 4.62 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST 0.89 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

History

**Math White, non-Hispanic**

White, non-Hispanic students were 0.83 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

History

**Math Economically Disadvantaged**

Economically Disadvantaged students were 2.72 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

History

**Math English Language Learner**

English Language Learner students were 0.33 times more likely to participate in a math FSAA than a student participating in a math FAST

History

**Science American Indian or Alaskan Native**

American Indian or Alaskan Native students were 0 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

History

**Science Black, non-Hispanic**

Black, non-Hispanic students were 1.64 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

History

**Science Hispanic**

Hispanic students were 1.35 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

[History](#)

**Science Asian or Pacific Islander**

Asian students were 0.72 times and Pacific Islander students were 0 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

[History](#)

**Science White, non-Hispanic**

White, non-Hispanic students were 0.68 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

[History](#)

**Science Economically Disadvantaged**

Economically Disadvantage students were 3.1 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

[History](#)

**Science English Language Learner**

English Language Learner students were 0.27 times more likely to participate in a Science FSAA than a student participating in a Science FAST

[History](#)

**Social Studies American Indian or Alaskan Native**

no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies Black, non-Hispanic**

| no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies Hispanic**

| no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies Asian or Pacific Islander**

| no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies White, non-Hispanic**

| no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies Economically Disadvantaged**

| no data to report

[History](#)

**Social Studies English Language Learner**

| no data to report



## 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.**

The ESE district team reviews data throughout the school year and examines the disproportionality data in each content area for each specific focused group that is tested using the AP-AAAS within the district. In reviewing the risk ratio data for 2022-2023, the following areas were identified with a ratio of 3 or above: The subgroups of Pacific Islander for Reading and Math and under-science students identified as economically disadvantaged were above three. To assess disproportionality in Sarasota County Schools, the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Department, Students Services, and the Student Systems and Assessment Department collaborate to create internal reports and analyze data from state reports to identify areas of disproportionality. Data is collected from the AP-AAAS 1% Data Cap State Report, the AP-AAAS Assurance Report, and the district-created monthly ESE Alternate Assessment Reports and reviewed at the district and school levels. To ensure all stakeholders are informed of the review process for disproportionality, the district ESE Team provides professional development opportunities utilizing the guiding questions to guide school teams to ensure best practices are in place. Sarasota also collaborates with FIN and Project Access for additional training for staff with a focus on inclusive practices for students on AP-AAAS.

## 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 primary factor used to determine that a direct assessment of cognitive functioning is not achievable will be the attempt of a qualified professional person, employed or contracted by the school district and qualified in accordance with Rule 6A-4.0311, F.A.C. or licensed under Chapter 490, F.S., to administer a direct assessment, and their subsequent determination that such direct assessment will not yield appropriately interpretable results. Documented determinations may be based on, but are not limited to, factors such as: medical diagnosis(es), hearing, vision, orthopedic functioning, language acquisition, mode of communication, culture, hypersensitivities, and distractibility.

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 direct assessment of cognitive functioning, the assessment process will include administration of the most recent version of the Developmental Profile or the Developmental Assessment of Young Children (DAYC). The Cognitive domain of the Developmental Profile or the DAYC will be considered in lieu of a direct measure of cognitive functioning. To obtain information from multiple sources, the Developmental Profile will be attempted with both a teacher or educator familiar with the student in the school setting, and with the parent/legal guardian or other caregiver familiar with the student in the home and/or community setting. When used for considering whether a student has a most significant cognitive disability, a professional person qualified in accordance with Rule 6A-4.0311, F.A.C. or licensed under Chapter 490, F.S. will administer the Developmental Profile or the Developmental Assessment of Young Children.

History

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

Written documentation of the information in Section A steps (1) through (2) will be incorporated into the district's Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Manual, School Psychologist Manual, and potentially in the ESE Policies & Procedures (P&P). Training will be provided directly to district school psychologists and ESE compliance staff. Compliance staff will be a required member of an IEP team that is first considering whether a student has a most significant cognitive disability.

History