January 15, 2021

The Honorable Paolo DeMaria  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Ohio Department of Education  
25 South Front Street  
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Superintendent DeMaria:

I am writing in response to the Ohio Department of Education’s (ODE’s) request on November 4, 2020, for a waiver of section 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) of the requirement that a State may not assess using an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS) more than 1.0 percent of the total number of students in the State. Based on 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 data, and a credible estimate of students who would have taken an alternate assessment in 2019-20, ODE has concluded that it will need to assess more than 1.0 percent of students using an AA-AAAS in the 2020-2021 school year.

After reviewing ODE’s waiver request, I am granting, pursuant to my authority under section 8401(b) of the ESEA, for school year 2020-2021, a one-year waiver extension of section 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(I) of the ESEA so that the State may assess with an AA-AAAS more than 1.0 percent of the total number of students in the State who are assessed in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science.

As part of this waiver, ODE assured that it:

- Will continue to meet all other requirements of section 1111 of the ESEA and implementing regulations with respect to all State-determined academic standards and assessments, including reporting student achievement and school performance, disaggregated by subgroups, to parents and the public.
- Will test at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of students with disabilities who are enrolled in grades for which an assessment is required.
- Will require that a local educational agency (LEA) submit information justifying the need of the LEA to assess more than 1.0 percent of its assessed students in any such subject with an AA-AAAS.
- Will provide appropriate oversight of an LEA that is required to submit such information to the State, and it will make such information publicly available.
- Will verify that each LEA that is required to submit such information to the State is following all State guidelines in 34 CFR § 200.6(d) (with the exception of incorporating principles of universal design) and will address any subgroup disproportionality in the percentage of students taking an AA-AAAS.
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- Will implement, consistent with the plan submitted in the ODE waiver request, system improvements and will monitor future administrations of the AA-AAAS to avoid exceeding the one percent cap.

I want to remind you of the requirement in 34 CFR § 200.6(c)(3)(iv) that the State must make publicly available the information submitted by an LEA justifying the need of the LEA to assess more than 1.0 percent of its students on the AA-AAAS, provided that such information does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student. I also encourage you to make available your State’s plan and timeline and your progress to date in reducing the percentage of students taking the AA-AAAS.

Given the workplan submitted by the ODE, I expect to see positive results of this plan in the 2020-2021 school year and beyond. Any future requests for an extension of this waiver will be contingent on both continued progress implementing your plan and progress in reducing the percentage of students taking the AA-AAAS in all tested subjects.

Finally, in order to help all States support implementation of the 1.0 percent participation threshold for AA-AAAS participation, the Department is supporting work by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO). I note that ODE’s 1.0 percent disproportionality methodology will follow the NCEO guidelines (e.g., determining relative risk of participating in the alternate assessment). In 2019, NCEO published several resources that may be helpful to stakeholders in your State. They may be found online at https://nceo.info/Assessments/alternate_assessments.

I appreciate the work you are doing to improve your schools and provide a high-quality education for your students. If you have any questions, please contact my staff at ESEA.Assessment@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

/s/
Frank T. Brogan
Assistant Secretary
for Elementary and Secondary Education

cc: Jo Hannah Ward, Director – Office for Exceptional Children
One Percent Waiver Extension Request for Reading, Mathematics and Science

ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and 34 CFR 200.6(c) and (d)

Submission to U.S. Department of Education

NOV. 4, 2020
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INTRODUCTION

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, addresses alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Each state must submit a waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education if it predicts exceeding 1 percent participation in the alternate assessment in a subject. Ohio submitted and was granted a waiver for school year 2017-2018. Ohio submitted and was granted a waiver extension request for school year 2018-2019.

Ohio’s alternate assessment participation rates were 1.95 percent in English language arts, 1.99 percent in mathematics and 2.02 percent in science for school year 2017-2018. Participation rates in school year 2018-2019, were 1.93 percent in English language arts, 1.95 percent in mathematics and 1.96 percent in science (See Table 1). Because of these past rates, Ohio anticipated exceeding the 1 percent threshold for the 2019-2020 administration of the alternate assessment in English language arts, mathematics and science and requested an extension to the school year 2018-2019 waiver. Ohio’s request for an extension was approved in February 2020.

Prior to approval, an addendum was submitted on January 21, 2020 to provide additional data to Ohio’s November 19, 2019 request for a waiver extension. Included in this addendum were two tables showing Ohio’s participation data as originally submitted in November 2019 and an updated data table using EdFacts data to align with the information source used by the U.S. Department of Education.

Until the U.S. Department of Education asked Ohio to submit an addendum to their 2019-2020 waiver extension request, Ohio’s assessment participation rate was calculated using data from the Department’s Education Management Information System (EMIS). This data set differs from the EdFacts data used by the U.S. Department of Education which includes only the assessments required for federal accountability purposes. The EMIS data included high school assessments required for graduation in Ohio, but not reported for federal accountability purposes. Therefore, there appeared to be a discrepancy in the number of students tested in English language arts, mathematics and science with the EdFacts data showing fewer total students tested. Starting with the addendum to Ohio’s 2019-2020 waiver extension request and including this waiver extension request for school year 2020-2021, the Department will use the EdFacts data when submitting a waiver extension request.

Table 1 shows the percentage of students who took an alternate assessment by content area in grades 3-8 and high school in school years 2016-2017 through 2018-2019. Using the EdFacts data set, Ohio’s participation rates improved for all three assessments. The participation rate in Ohio’s mathematics alternate assessments indicates improvement from 1.99% in 2017-2018 to 1.95% in 2018-2019, an improvement of 0.04% fewer students participating. Most significantly, participation in science alternate assessments improved from 2.02% in 2017-2018 to 1.96% in 2018-2019, an improvement of 0.06% fewer students participating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: Participation in Alternate Assessment by Content Area Across Years (EdFacts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to COVID-19, Ohio was unable to complete statewide alternate assessment testing in spring 2020. Therefore, Ohio is again using school year 2018-2019 alternate assessment participation data and anticipates exceeding the 1 percent threshold for the 2020-2021 administration of the alternate assessment in English language arts, mathematics and science. Ohio is requesting an extension to the 2019-2020 approved waiver for the 2020-2021 school year.

As stipulated in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Ohio’s improvement plan includes annually requiring justifications from districts and community schools exceeding the 1 percent threshold, supporting and monitoring districts and community schools to appropriately use the state’s eligibility guidelines for the alternate assessment, and using a statewide tiered system of support to provide appropriate oversight and support to districts that exceed the 1 percent threshold.

Ohio’s participation rate continues to be above the 1 percent threshold. The Ohio Department of Education is collaborating with local and national partners to develop and implement innovative approaches to ensure only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are participating in Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. An Alternate Assessment Participation Workgroup (Workgroup), created at the Department in early 2017, continues with regularly scheduled meetings and includes representatives from the Offices for Exceptional Children, Learning and Instructional Strategies, Assessment, Innovation and Improvement, Accountability, Data Quality and Governance and Community Schools. This cross-agency team participates in the National Center for Educational Outcomes Community of Practice and Professional Learning Groups, and includes Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) Assessment, Standards and Education of Special Students (ASES) members, representatives from the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence (OCALI) ) and members from Ohio’s state support teams. The Workgroup has consulted with numerous stakeholder groups such as the Ohio State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children, the Ohio Association of Pupil Service Administrators and the special education statewide testing advisory committee to gather input and feedback throughout the school year.

Ohio continues to build on the Department’s system of regional state support teams to provide technical assistance and monitoring to local districts and community schools. The Department is collaborating with state support team directors and key staff members to implement a tiered system of support to assist districts and community schools in reviewing and improving their alternate assessment policies and practices. The goal is to ensure that only eligible students with the most significant cognitive disabilities participate in the state’s alternate assessments. Ohio’s tiered intervention monitoring plan is described in more detail beginning on page 14 of this document.

As stipulated in the Every Student Succeeds Act, districts and community schools exceeding 1 percent participation are required to complete and submit an electronic justification and assurances. Last school year, districts and community schools were required to submit this form beginning in January 2020 describing their individualized education program policies and processes for determining assessment participation for students with disabilities. The Department updated the justification form requiring districts and community schools to provide assurances about how they are using the Department’s eligibility guidelines and companion resources when making decisions about alternate assessment participation. Districts and community schools were also asked to describe any special programs or circumstances that might impact their participation rate and, as a result, would justify exceeding the 1 percent participation threshold. The Workgroup also updated the justification form for 2019-2020 to include more detailed participation data, including state comparison data.

Due to COVID-19, the United States department of Education waived the requirement for states to collect justifications from districts in school year 2020-2021. However, states are still required to collect assurances
from districts that staff are appropriately using Department guidelines and resources. The Department will collect these assurances from districts beginning in January 2021.

Alignment to Ohio’s Strategic Plan for Education

*Each Child, Our Future* is Ohio’s strategic plan for education. The purpose of the plan is to lift aspirations, create hope and excitement, guide development of state-level education policies and promote high-quality educational practices across the state. Introduced in 2018, the plan focuses on three core principles: Equity, Partnerships and Quality Schools – with the goal of creating a system in which each student is challenged, prepared and empowered for his or her future. The Department’s work on alternate assessment participation aligns with the purpose and goals of Ohio’s strategic plan. The Department is working to reduce participation in alternate assessments not solely to meet federal requirements, but to ensure each student has access to rigorous curriculum and assessments that prepares them for future success. *Ohio’s goal is to ensure the right students are taking the right tests.*

Ohio’s strategic plan recognizes that equity of education achievement is a persisting challenge. Page 10 of the plan states that appropriate supports must be made available so personal and social circumstances do not prohibit a child from reaching his or her greatest aspiration. Access to academically challenging standards is fundamental to achieving equity in education and over-reliance on Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities limits students’ access to rigorous curriculum and assessment that meets the personalized learning needs of each child. The Department is working with regional state support teams, Educational Service Centers, districts, community schools and other partners to improve the process of identifying students for participation in the alternate assessment to ensure that all students have equitable access to high quality education and related services leading to post-secondary success. The strategic plan promotes a focus on meeting the needs of the whole child. As we improve our ability to meet students’ individual learning, behavioral and social emotional needs, fewer students will be at risk of being inappropriately identified as having a disability and therefore being inappropriately assigned to take an alternate assessment. *Ohio’s Significant Steps Toward Ensuring the Right Students are Taking the Right Assessments*

Ohio’s focus on Equity as a core principle has made access to appropriately rigorous curriculum and assessment for all students a priority. While the Department is working to reduce the percentage of students participating in the alternate assessment, the priority is to ensure that all students are taking the most appropriate assessments given their unique needs. The Department is working with regional state support teams, districts and community schools to ensure that Individualized Education Program teams are using the guidance documents appropriately, consistently applying the criteria for alternate assessment participation and using the available accommodations to provide students with disabilities access to Ohio’s State Tests.

Ohio has taken significant steps toward improving the use of the alternate assessment statewide. These steps include:

1. The Department added alternate assessment participation rates to both the [Special Education Profiles and Special Education Ratings](#) which are published annually. Both the profiles and the ratings are available to stakeholders and include easy to understand explanations of the published data. Districts and community schools identified as significantly exceeding the 1 percent threshold are assigned to Tier 3 of a tiered intervention and support system. Districts and community schools identified for Tier 3 are required, with the assistance of regional state support team consultants, to complete a root cause data analysis and an improvement plan. This is monitored at the state level through Ohio’s compliance dashboard.
2. The Department’s Office for Exceptional Children collaborated with the Department’s Office for Innovation and Improvement to add alternate assessment participation guidance to the Compliance Support Tool used with districts and community schools in school improvement status. The tool is designed to promote communication among state, regional and local staff to ensure alignment of improvement plans and support meaningful progress on improvement goals. The Compliance Support Tool provides the Department another outlet for supporting districts and community schools in improving their use of the alternate assessment.

3. The Department worked in partnership with stakeholder groups like the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence, the state Assistive Technology network and others to provide regional state support teams with training and tools to support appropriate use of the alternate assessment and Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended.

4. The Department updated guidance documents available for use by Individualized Education Program teams when considering alternate assessment for students. Updates were made with multiple levels of stakeholder input. The department has developed a new Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool. During the creation of the tool, the department collected nearly a thousand comments from around 200 people representing 11 statewide stakeholder groups and two national groups. The new tool is the required decision-making framework Individualized Educational Program teams must use when determining student participation in the alternate assessment. This tool is in effect for the 2020-2021 school year. The department also created a frequently asked questions document to support implementation of the new tool and is developing a webinar about the tool that will be posted in mid to late November.

5. The Department updated for school year 2020-2021 the State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit for use by state support team consultants as they assist districts and community schools to improve their use of the alternate assessment. This toolkit includes presentation materials, communication examples, resources from OCALI on the use of extended standards and administration materials from the test developer. The key update is that the Department aligned the resources in the tool kit with each section of the root cause analysis tool that Tier 3 districts are required to complete with their State Support Team. By having the resources aligned to each element in the root cause analysis tool, State Support Team members can readily focus their support to the needs of the district. The Department will continue to update and refine this toolkit.

6. Alternate Assessment Workgroup members from across the agency, along with selected stakeholders, participate in ongoing national learning and networking opportunities. These opportunities include the National Center on Educational Outcomes’ Communities of Practice and Professional Learning Groups, the TIES Center’s Professional Learning Groups, membership in the Council for Chief State School Officers State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards Assessment, Standards and Education of Special Education Students State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards, and the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence OCALICON international conference. With support from the United States Department of Education Office for Elementary and Secondary Education, the National Center for Educational Outcomes began providing technical assistance to Ohio on their one percent work in February 2020. Ohio meets with the National Center for Educational Outcomes monthly and the technical assistance is ongoing.

The 2020-2021 state waiver extension request was posted for public comment October 9-23, 2020. The nine responses received were not responsive to the required components of the waiver.
REQUIRED COMPONENTS OF ONE PERCENT WAIVER EXTENSION REQUEST

Component 1

*Be submitted at least 90 days prior to the start of the state’s testing window for the relevant subject;*

Ohio’s assessment window for the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities opens Feb. 2, 2021. Ninety days prior to the start of Ohio’s testing window (Nov. 4, 2020), the Department will submit a waiver extension request to the United States Department of Education.

Component 2

*Provide state-level data, from the current or previous school year, to show:*

a. *The number and percentage of students in each subgroup of students who took an alternate assessment;*

Component two of Ohio’s one percent waiver extension request includes the number and percentage of students assessed in each subgroup of students who took the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (*See Table 2*).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Number of students who took the standard assessment</th>
<th>Number of students who took the alternate assessment</th>
<th>All students tested</th>
<th>Percentage alternately assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>894,189</td>
<td>17,603</td>
<td>911,792</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>22,970</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>23,302</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>146,705</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>151,058</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55,997</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>56,992</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>47,339</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>48,149</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>620,074</td>
<td>11,091</td>
<td>631,165</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>127,448</td>
<td>17,581</td>
<td>145,029</td>
<td>12.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>449,645</td>
<td>11,813</td>
<td>461,458</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>25,368</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>26,118</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>885,259</td>
<td>17,619</td>
<td>902,878</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>22,546</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>22,879</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>144,700</td>
<td>4,364</td>
<td>149,064</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>55,329</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>56,325</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>46,773</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>47,590</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>614,826</td>
<td>11,088</td>
<td>625,914</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>126,197</td>
<td>17,598</td>
<td>143,795</td>
<td>12.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>443,860</td>
<td>11,813</td>
<td>455,673</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>25,014</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>25,766</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>386,326</td>
<td>7,621</td>
<td>388,947</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9,846</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>59,281</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>61,123</td>
<td>3.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>22,864</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>23,265</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>18,925</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>19,274</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>269,921</td>
<td>4,876</td>
<td>274,797</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>52,343</td>
<td>7,613</td>
<td>59,956</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>181,461</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>186,399</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Learners</td>
<td>9,697</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>9,993</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. The state measured the achievement of at least 95 percent of all students and 95 percent of students in the children with disabilities subgroup enrolled in grades for which the assessment is required.

Ohio follows federal requirements for participation in statewide assessments as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act. Students in grades 3 through 8 are required to take both English language arts and mathematics assessments annually. Students in grades 5 and 8 must take a science assessment. High school students are required to take end-of-course exams to meet state graduation requirements. Ohio met federal requirements for statewide test participation in 2018-2019 through the administration of Ohio’s State Tests. Data in Table 3 indicate that the Department measured achievement for more than 95 percent of all students enrolled in grades and courses for which an assessment is required. The Department measured achievement for more than 95 percent of students in the children with disabilities subgroup enrolled in grades and courses for which an assessment is required (See Table 3).

Table 3: 2018-2019 Participation Rate of All Students and Students with Disabilities (Grades 3-8 and High School)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Students tested</th>
<th>Students required to test</th>
<th>Percent achievement measured for all students</th>
<th>Students with disabilities tested</th>
<th>Students with disabilities required to test</th>
<th>Percent achievement measured for students with disabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>911,792</td>
<td>916,706</td>
<td><strong>99.46%</strong></td>
<td>145,029</td>
<td>146,496</td>
<td><strong>99.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>902,878</td>
<td>908,972</td>
<td><strong>99.33%</strong></td>
<td>143,795</td>
<td>145,599</td>
<td><strong>98.76%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>388,947</td>
<td>393,203</td>
<td><strong>98.92%</strong></td>
<td>59,956</td>
<td>61,164</td>
<td><strong>98.02%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. The US Department of Education encourages a State to use current year (2020-21) IEP or test registration data to make a credible estimate of the number and percentage of students (including by subgroup, if possible) who will take the alternate assessment in SY 2020-21 or who would have taken the alternate assessment in SY 2019-20 if testing had been conducted.

In the June 9, 2020 memorandum to states about additional information regarding the requirements to request a waiver or waiver extension request for the 2020-2021 school year, the US Department of Education encouraged states to make a credible estimate of the number and percentage of students, by subgroup if possible, who would have taken an alternate assessment in school year 2019-2020, if testing had not been interrupted by COVID-19. Because statewide alternate assessment testing in school year 2019-2020 was not completed and because the general education testing was not scheduled to begin until late March, not all districts had uploaded student information into the testing system. With incomplete student testing enrollment, Ohio is not able to estimate alternate assessment participation based on school year 2019-2020 test enrollment data. Therefore, Ohio is making a credible estimate based on information in the state’s Electronic Management Information System for school year 2019-2020. Ohio is estimating alternate assessment participation by using the number of students who had the test type of alternate assessment identified in their testing record (numerator) and the total number of students enrolled in tested grades during the October 2019 student count week (denominator). Our credible estimate is more than 0.1% point lower than school year 2018-2019.
Table 4: Credible estimate of students who would have taken the alternate assessment in school year 2019-2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number of students with alternate assessment indicated in testing record</th>
<th>Total number of students in tested grades enrolled in Ohio schools during October count week</th>
<th>Percent alternate assessment participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23,012</td>
<td>1,274,059</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Component 3A

*Include assurances from the state that it has verified that each district or community school that the state anticipates will assess more than 1 percent of its assessed students in any subject using an alternate assessment followed the state’s guidelines for participation in the alternate assessment.*

In school year 2018-2019, data showed that a considerable number of districts and community schools, 559, exceeded the 1 percent threshold and were required to submit a justification form with assurances. The form asked districts and community schools to detail how they implemented the Department guidelines for participation in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. In school year 2019-2020, the deadline for submitting the justification form with assurances was March 16, 2020, the same day that the Governor of Ohio ordered school buildings closed statewide due to COVID-19. To ensure that districts had ample time to submit their justification form, the Department extended the submission window until June 1, 2020. Even though alternate assessment testing was not completed due to COVID-19, 687 districts submitted justification forms. This is 128 more submissions in districts and schools than in the previous school year. The department believes that all districts which had exceeded the 1 percent threshold in 2018-2019 did submit a justification form in 2019-2020. That all districts which were previously over the 1.0 percent threshold submitted their justification, plus the fact that districts had the option to submit a justification form even if they did not go over the 1.0 percent threshold, accounts for the significant increase in the total number of submissions.

**Evidence of Progress**

The Department received justification forms with assurances from 100 percent of required districts and community schools (those that exceeded 1 percent alternate assessment participation in school year 2018-2019), as well as a significant number of districts that did not anticipate exceeding 1 percent but submitted the form anyway. The Alternate Assessment Workgroup utilized both quantitative and qualitative data from district and community school justifications to plan for technical assistance. Trends identified include:

- An overabundance of students with specific learning disabilities and other health impairments - disability categories that do not include intellectual disabilities;
- An overabundance of students in other disability categories not typically associated with the most significant cognitive disabilities and alternate assessment needs;
- Explanations that confused low academic performance with intellectual disability;
- Repeated references to high poverty combined with both urban and rural settings;
- Misconstrued notion that drug addiction, unemployment and low socioeconomic status are automatically causally linked to high rates of the most significant cognitive disabilities; and
Review of justification forms revealed multiple opportunities for improvement across districts. The Alternate Assessment Workgroup created a tool kit for regional state support teams to utilize when they provide professional development to districts and community schools. This set of resources was created to help the state support teams assist districts in completing the self-review summary report. The self-review summary report is a root cause analysis document that all Tier 3 districts identified in the special education profiles are required to complete with assistance from their regional state support team. The tool kit includes resources for each section of the summary report. Those sections cover policies, practices and procedures districts use for determining alternate assessment participation, training for district staff regarding alternate assessment participation eligibility, parent and family involvement, student alternate assessment data exploration and, alternate assessment disproportionality. One resource that all districts will be required to use with the state support teams is the new decision-making tool.

An overview of the new decision-making tool, decision-making tool Frequently Asked Questions and other alternate assessment updates were provided to all districts and community schools in the form of a webinar, with slides and a transcript posted online following the webinar. The webinar also addressed the calculation of projected participation rates, an update on the state waiver process and the timeline for submitting assurances. The Department shared a preview of family resources regarding alternate assessment participation criteria for, and implications of, participation in Ohio’s alternate assessment and use of Ohio’s Learning Standards-Extended for instruction.

The Department notified the districts that were required to submit a justification in school year 2018-2019 but did not submit a justification. The Department considered the failure to submit a justification in the rubric used to determine the monitoring tier to which a district was assigned as described in profile indicator component 4B of the special education profiles Additionally, when the special education profiles are released in December 2020, all Tier 2 districts will be notified that they are required to complete the self-review summary report independently (without state support team assistance) and submit it to the Department.

Component 3B

*Include assurances from the state that it has verified that each district or community school that the state anticipates will assess more than 1 percent of its assessed students in any subject using an alternate assessment will address any disproportionality in the percentage of students in any subgroup taking an alternate assessment.*

The Department continues to address disproportionality in the percentage of students in any subgroup participating in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities *(See Table 2)*. Ohio’s 2018-2019 EdFacts data shows a continuing disproportionately high number of participants in the economically disadvantaged subgroup. This is a persisting area of concern that was also evident in the qualitative data analysis of the district-level justification forms. Data also show a disproportionate number of black students participating in the alternate assessment, which echoes state-level significant disproportionality data regarding the identification of students with disabilities. The Department plans to assist districts and community schools with the analysis of alternate assessment disproportionality data. In alignment with *Each Child, Our Future’s* focus on equity, the Office for Exceptional Children plans to make disproportionality a high-priority focus for 2020-2021. The Alternate Assessment Workgroup plans a targeted analysis of student participation by 1) socioeconomic status, 2) race and ethnicity, and 3) disability category. This analysis will include data at the state level and within identified Tier 3 districts and community schools.
Evidence of Progress

In 2018-2019, the Department included alternate assessment participation in Special Education Profiles and Special Education Ratings for the first time. Due to COVID-19, the department postponed the release of Special Education Profiles for school year 2019-2020 to December 2020. By incorporating alternate assessment participation in the profiles and ratings, the Office for Exceptional Children identified Tier 3 districts and community schools for the supports and monitoring process. This provided the opportunity and the platform to work with districts and community schools in analyzing their participation data. The electronic Special Education Profile system was designed to alert Tier 3 districts of mandatory action steps. Action steps included completing a self-review summary report and an improvement plan within the Department’s electronic compliance dashboard. The self-review for alternate assessment required analysis of participation rates by disability category. State support teams assisted districts and community schools in completing the self-review and developing aligned improvement plans.

For the 2020-2021 school year, the Department’s Alternate Assessment Workgroup concluded that the self-review summary report could be improved to engage districts and community schools in more rigorous data analysis, especially concerning disproportionality data. In addition to analyzing participation by disability category, the revised self-review will require analysis of participation data by race and ethnicity. Resources provided by the national Community of Practice, led by the National Center on Educational Outcomes, provided guidance to improve the template. The Alternate Assessment Workgroup is collaborating with the Department’s Significant Disproportionality Workgroup to explore methods for local districts and community schools to calculate and analyze their disproportionality data. The Workgroup will include the newly developed guidance in the State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit and will train state support team consultants to assist districts and community schools in analysis of disproportionality data. In school year 2020-2021, districts that are identified as Tier 3 districts and required to do a self-review summary report, will be asked to use an analytic approach to explore disproportionality as presented in the NCEO Brief #19 – Guidance for Examining Disproportionality of Student Group Participation in Alternate Assessments.

Component 4A

*Include a plan and timeline for improving the implementation of its guidelines for participation in the alternate assessment.*

The Department has made significant progress in improving the use of state guidelines for participation in the alternate assessment. A significant improvement was completed in 2018 when the Office for Exceptional Children embedded the State’s participation guidelines into its online, dynamic Individualized Education Program form. The dynamic form links directly to the participation criteria document. This document includes four required signatures: parent or guardian, intervention specialist, district representative, and general education teacher. The form is expected to be updated and signed annually during individualized education program review. However, stakeholder feedback indicated that the form is not being used consistently or effectively partially because it lacks specificity and clarity. Based on this feedback, the Department clarified and updated existing resources to better expand upon the criteria. Specifically, the Department created a new Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool.

Evidence of Progress

The Department offered multiple resources to inform Individualized Education Program teams in their decision-making process: 1) participation criteria form, 2) decision making flowchart, and 3) companion document. The
Alternate Assessment Workgroup gathered feedback on the resources from stakeholders on advisory committees and through discussions with state support team consultants. In July 2019, the Workgroup began the process of updating the existing guidance, with a focus on turning the companion document into a decision-making tool that expands on the participation criteria. The updated tool, The Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool, is organized in sections correlated to Ohio’s participation criteria to provide additional guidance and specificity to the participation criteria. The Department’s Supports and Monitoring Team in the Office for Exceptional Children will use the new tool with Individualized Education Program teams in targeted districts and community schools, including those identified as Tier 3. Furthermore, beginning this year, the new decision-making tool is required for use by all IEP teams when determining alternate assessment participation.

The Department worked with its testing contractor, Cambium Assessments Inc., to address the concern that many students with disabilities that do not include an intellectual component are assigned to the alternate assessment. Beginning with school year 2019-2020, the Department added a step to Ohio’s assessment enrollment procedures that requires districts to submit the disability category for each student when alternate assessment is selected as their test type. The Department will not consider test records complete for participating students until a disability type is identified. The goal is to provide another opportunity for educators to reflect on and affirm the team’s decision to use the alternate assessment. Due to COVID-19 and interrupted testing, the Department was unable to analyze if this new requirement appeared to have any impact on alternate assessment participation. The Department will compare the testing data from school year 2018-2019 with 2020-2021 to see if any correlation can be made between including this additional step and a reduction in participation.

**Timeline for Improving Implementation of Guidelines**

**Summer 2019:** The Workgroup drafted language for an updated version of the current “companion document”. The Workgroup engaged external experts to refine the language and format the content into a step-by-step framework for discussing student eligibility. The companion document was renamed and became the Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool.

**September 2019 through May 2020:** The Workgroup gathered input and feedback from external stakeholder groups, including:

- The State Advisory Panel for Exceptional Children (SAPEC)
- The Ohio Association of Pupil Services Administrators (OAPSA)
- The Students with Disabilities Testing Advisory
- The Ohio Assistive Technology and Accessible Educational Materials network
- The Low Incidence and Autism Spectrum Disorder network
- The State Support Team Directors
- The State Support Team Alternate Assessment trainers
- The Alternate Assessment Content and Fairness review committee
- The Ohio Test Advisory Committee
- The Ohio Test Steering Committee
- The Ohio State University Family Engagement Center
- The Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities (OCECD)
- The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) Assessment, Standards and Education of Students with Disabilities (ASES) State Collaborative on Assessment, Standards and Students (SCASS)
- The National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO)
September 2019 through June 2020: The Workgroup used stakeholder feedback to revise and finalize the new tool.

October 2020: Ohio’s Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-making Tool released.

Component 4B

*Include additional steps to support and provide oversight to each district or community school projected to exceed the 1 percent threshold.*

**Tiered Intervention and Monitoring Plan**

The Department continues to work with districts and community schools directly and through assistance of the state’s 16 regional [state support teams](#) to ensure appropriate participation in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. The cornerstone of the Department’s multi-faceted approach is a system of tiered intervention and monitoring, designed to improve application of state guidelines for participation in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. Implementation of the tiered system of support includes collaboration with the state’s 16 regional state support teams. For Tier 1 districts and community schools, the Department provides professional learning opportunities, tools and resources. For Tier 2 and 3 districts and community schools, the Department collaborates with state support teams to provide additional intervention, support and monitoring through the self-review summary report and improvement plan process and other training opportunities.

Using submitted justifications, Ohio School Report Card data and Special Education Profiles, the Department annually identifies the districts and community schools with the greatest need of intervention and support. Of the 559 school districts and community schools above 1 percent participation in school year 2018-2019, the Department identified 83 for Tier 3 intervention during 2019-2020. However, due to COVID-19, the release of state Special Education Profiles was delayed. These 83 school districts and community schools will be notified of their Tier 3 status in the school year 2020-2021 profiles. Each of the 16 regions in the state will have approximately 5 traditional districts and community schools identified. The Department used a multi-point rubric to identify districts for tiers. The Department considered the following data in the rubric:

- 2018-2019 alternate assessment participation rates;
- Multi-year increase in participation rate;
- A spike of more than 1% participation in a single year;
- Failure to submit a justification when having exceeded 1%;
- Failure to report alternate assessment data in the Education Management Information System (EMIS);
- Participation of disability types atypical to alternate assessment participation within the district; and
- Information provided in the previous year’s justification form and recommendations from the alternate assessment support staff in the state support teams.

**Evidence of Progress: Tier 3**

Tier 3 support is provided to districts and community schools that are identified as needing significant support. This tier includes continued Tier 1 and Tier 2 support.

Intervention and monitoring processes related to alternate assessment improved greatly in 2018-2019 due to the use of the Special Education Profiles and Compliance Dashboard. These two tools allowed the Department
and state support teams to work together to assist and monitor improvement efforts in Tier 3 districts and community schools. As described above, the Special Education Profiles informed districts and community schools of their Tier 3 status and the required action steps. The Compliance Dashboard is an interactive system that allows districts to read and respond to comments from the Department, submit self-reviews and improvement plans and upload documentation of completed action steps. Specialists in the Department’s Office for Exceptional Children review and monitor the documentation. State support teams assisted district teams with analyzing data using the Self-Review Summary Report, developing and submitting improvement plans, and implementing planned action steps.

The Alternate Assessment Workgroup created a SharePoint site to share alternate assessment professional learning resources with state support team staff. The State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit currently includes presentations, group learning activities, sample forms, parent communication examples, and so on from the Office for Exceptional Children and the Ohio Center for Autism and Low Incidence. This content focuses on the 5 areas of the self-review summary report that all Tier 3 districts must complete with their regional state support team before doing an improvement plan. The workgroup will continue to expand and update the toolkit as new resources become available. For example, the workgroup is updating the parent and family frequently asked questions document.

The Department provided technical assistance and resources to Tier 3 districts and community schools as outlined in the 2018-2019 waiver extension request. Evidence of implementation for each action step is listed in Table 4 below. Some of the sample documents referenced are available via web-based links or are available in the Appendix (marked with an asterisk *) (See Table 5).

Table 5: Evidence of Tier 3 Progress 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 3 Progress</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Planned Action Steps | • Office for Exceptional Children Comprehensive Monitoring Process*  
| 1. Districts and community schools will, with the assistance of the Department and state support team consultants, construct goals to be included in improvement plans for appropriately identifying students for participation in the alternate assessment. Improvement plans should include measurable outcomes, timelines, frameworks for technical assistance, updated procedures and training opportunities. | • District Self-Review Summary Report*  
| | • District Improvement Plan Template* |
| 2. The Department will review records (e.g., Evaluation Team Reports, Individualized Education Programs) and evaluate current determination processes, policies and procedures used to qualify students for participation in the alternate assessment. | • Office for Exceptional Children Comprehensive Monitoring Process* |
| 3. The Department and state support team consultants will assist districts and community schools with analysis of subgroup participation data to identify and address any disproportionalities in assignment of subgroups | • District Self-Review Summary Report*  
| | • District Improvement Plan Template*  
| | • State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit* |
### Evidence of Progress: Tier 2

Tier 2 support is for districts and community schools that need moderate support. This tier includes continued Tier 1 support.

The Department provided technical assistance and resources as outlined in the 2018-2019 waiver. Evidence of implementation for each action step is listed in Table 5 below. Some of the sample documents referenced are available via web-based links or are available in the Appendix (marked with an asterisk *) (See Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Action Steps</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to the alternate assessment. Districts and community schools with significant</td>
<td>• Office for Exceptional Children Comprehensive Monitoring Process*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disproportionalities will address the root causes as part of their improvement plans.</td>
<td>• Parent meetings led by Office for Exceptional Children staff*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Department and state support team consultants will engage in discussions</td>
<td>• Parent public meeting notice and notification letter*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with teachers, administrators and Individualized Education Program team members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as part of monitoring processes and root cause analysis as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parents and families will be notified of monitoring procedures and records</td>
<td>• Parent meetings led by Office for Exceptional Children staff*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviews and provided opportunities to ask questions and participate in discussions as members of the Individualized Education Program teams.</td>
<td>• Parent public meeting notice and notification letter*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Department’s Office of Innovation and Improvement will include alternate</td>
<td>• Compliance Support Tool*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment participation in its school improvement processes for high-priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schools and districts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Evidence of Tier 2 Progress 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2 Progress</th>
<th>Planned Action Steps</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                | 1. Department staff, in collaboration with state support team consultants, will lead regional and local professional learning opportunities focusing on analyzing data and reviewing special education records.                | • State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit*  
• Regional meetings with special education administrators  
• Ohio Statewide Testing and Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee meetings*  
• Presentations at Ohio Association of Pupil Service Administrators meetings and other professional organizations*  
• Presentation at Ohio Educational Technology Conference |
|                | 2. Department staff, in collaboration with state support team consultants, will provide training opportunities for special education leaders, as well as district and school administrators to ensure Individualized Education Program teams have the necessary resources and are using them properly. | • State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit*  
• Regional meetings with special education administrators  
• Presentations at Ohio Association of Pupil Service Administrators meetings and other professional organizations* |
|                | 3. The Department will develop training resources to address disproportionality in the assignment of subgroups of students to the alternate assessment.                                                  | • State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit*  
• Office for Exceptional Children Comprehensive Monitoring Process*  
• Universal Support Training Materials  
• Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool |
Evidence of Progress: Tier 1

Tier 1 support is for districts and community schools that are above the 1 percent participation threshold, as well as any districts or community schools seeking assistance with alternate assessment participation.

The Department provided technical assistance and resources as outlined in the 2018-2019 waiver. Evidence of implementation for each action step is listed in Table 6 below. Some of the sample documents referenced are available via web-based links or listed in the Appendix (marked with an asterisk *) (See Table 7).

Table 7: Evidence of Tier 1 Progress 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Action Steps</th>
<th>Evidence of Implementation 2019-2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. The Department will lead professional development webinars on appropriate alternate assessment participation and completion of required justification forms for exceeding 1 percent participation. Webinars will be recorded and posted public use. | • Train-the-trainer event for test administration training, November 2019*  
• Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment  
• Decision Framework for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines  
• Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool  
• 2018-2019 AASCD Refresher Training PowerPoint  
• Spring 2019 Alternate Assessment Directions for Administration Manual  
• Spring 2021 Online Training Certification Modules |
| 2. The Department will present at multiple statewide conferences and other events for teachers and administrators. | • Train-the-trainer event for test administration training, November 2019*  
• 2018-2019 Alternate Assessment Refresher Training PowerPoint  
• OCALICON Presentation November 2019 |
| 3. State support teams will continue to provide training on decision-making processes for Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities participation. | • Alternate assessment participation rates added to Special Education Profiles and Ratings*  
• Ohio Statewide Testing and Students with Disabilities Advisory Committee Meetings*  
• Alternate Assessment Decision-making Tool Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment  
• Decision Framework (Flowchart) for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines  
• Alternate Assessment Frequently Asked Questions for Families  
• Spring 2021 Online Training Certification Modules |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1 Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planned Action Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. The Department will provide resources, including data analysis tools, to address disproportionality in assignment of student subgroups to the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. | • Alternate assessment participation rates added to Special Education Profiles and Ratings*  
• Monthly state support team Directors’ Meetings*  
• Skype/webinars as needed |
| 5. Parent and family engagement staff will work with districts and community schools to ensure families understand how IEP decisions about alternate assessment participation are appropriately made and the implications of participation in the alternate assessment for students. | • AASCD FAQ  
• Participation Guidelines for Ohio Alternate Assessment  
• Decision Framework (Flowchart) for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines  
• Ohio Learning Standards-Extended  
• AASCD Administration Manuals and Guidance Documents  
• Alternate Assessment Practice Test Site |
| 6. Technical support from the Department is available to all stakeholders through phone support and a dedicated email address (AAparticipation@education.ohio.gov). | • Email support provided by Department staff via AApensation@education.ohio.gov  
• Phone support provided by Department staff at 614-466-13217 or 1-877-644-6338  
• ODE AASCD Web Page  
• Ohio Alternate Assessment Portal |
**ACTION STEPS FOR 2020-2021**

1. Provide a webinar, with presentation slides and associated transcript posted online following the webinar, to all districts and community schools. The webinar will introduce the new decision-making tool and Frequently Asked Questions document. The Department also will discuss the updated justification form (with assurances only), address the calculation of projected participation rates and the timeline for submitting assurances. The Department also will update stakeholders on the state waiver process and preview of new tools and guidance.

2. Conduct a targeted analysis of student participation in alternate assessment by 1) socioeconomic status; 2) race and ethnicity; and 3) disability category. This analysis will include data at the state level. An analysis of disproportionality data will help the Department clarify state-wide trends and support local districts and community schools in improving their use of alternate assessments. This analysis will be included in a new alternate assessment participation data story the Department is preparing. Information from this data story will be used for training, technical assistance, professional development and other presentations.

3. Improve the rigor of the self-review summary report for Tier 3 districts and community schools. The Department will update the self-review to engage districts and community schools in more rigorous data analysis, especially concerning disproportionality data. In addition to analyzing participation by disability category, student performance on the alternate and other data trends, the revised self-review will require analysis of participation data by race and ethnicity. The Department will include a tool for examining disproportionality in alternate assessment participation in the State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit and provide training for state support team consultants to assist districts and community schools in analysis of disproportionality data.

4. The Department will continue to provide resources and training to districts about the new decision-making tool. The new tool will help address the inappropriate placement of students without the most significant cognitive disabilities on the alternate assessment. It will also assist educators with consistent application of the state’s participation criteria.

5. Expand the State Support Team Alternate Assessment Participation Professional Development Toolkit with new and updated content on how to apply the participation criteria, fully engage parents and improve their understanding of the alternate assessment participation decision making process, and other elements covered in the self-review summary report. Regional and local professional development will provide opportunities to dispel some of the misunderstandings observed in district and community school justification forms.

6. Continue and modify, as needed, use of a multi-tiered system of statewide support to improve the use of alternate assessment. The Department will continue to apply the action steps by tier as outlined in Tables 5, 6 and 7 above.

7. Continue participation in national networks and learning opportunities for state staff. Working collaboratively with other members of the Assessment, Standards, and Education of Students in Special Education (ASES) collaborative, through the Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the Department is participating in the development of communications templates for parents, administrators and educators. The collaborative also provides access to timely research and best practices from other states.

8. Continue to receive technical assistance form the National Center for Educational Outcomes (NCEO) as well as participate in the 1% Community of Practice and Peer Learning Groups hosted by NCEO and the TIES Center.
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Ohio’s Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool

Background
To guide and support individualized education program (IEP) teams in determining whether a student is most appropriately assessed with an alternate assessment, the Ohio Department of Education, in consultation with parents, teachers, administrators and other stakeholders, has developed this Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool.

In 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) was signed into law and replaced and updated the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The purpose of ESSA “...is to provide all children significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education, and to close educational achievement gaps.” As part of the assessment provisions of the ESSA, the law requires the vast majority of students take a state’s general assessment at various grade levels, as this helps to measure educational progress. To help maintain a critical focus on educational equity and excellence for all students, only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities can take an alternate assessment aligned with alternate academic achievement standards. ESSA limits the number of students who may take such assessments to 1% of all tested students in a given subject.

While many states have been able to meet the 1% limit, Ohio has far exceeded the 1% cap and consistently has one of the highest rates of students taking the alternate assessment in the county. Eventually, if Ohio cannot lower the rate of students taking the alternate assessment, the U.S. Department of Education could withhold Title I Part A State administrative funds.

Instructions
Any year a student could participate in the state’s general assessment and prior to a student participating in Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD), the IEP team must complete this tool.

This tool is divided into four parts, A through D. IEP teams must work though the document, starting with Part A. At the end of each part, the team should review if the student meets the criteria. If, after reviewing the information, a student does not meet the eligibility criteria in all parts, the student may not participate in Ohio’s alternate assessment. All members of the IEP team must sign the decision-making tool. Please attach this completed form to the student’s IEP.

Throughout the tool, IEP teams must review multiple sources of information, including the student’s IEP, Evaluation Team Report (ETR) and other data, such as results from formative assessments, evidence-based interventions, assistive technology assessment and the student’s cumulative folder documenting supports and services.

---

Ohio’s Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool

Student: ___________________  Grade: _______  Date: ______________________

Part A – Determining Initial Eligibility
Directions: Complete the first two questions to determine if the student may be eligible for participation in the alternate assessment.

1. Does the student have a current individualized education program (IEP)?
   - [ ] No, the student does not have an IEP. **STOP**
     - Stop here. The student is not eligible for alternate assessment.
   - [ ] Yes, the student has a current IEP. **GO**
     - Proceed to the next statement.

2. Review the student’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Specific Learning Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Speech or Language Impairment (only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STOP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student identified with these disability categories very rarely will be a student with a most significant cognitive disability and therefore rarely, if ever, qualify for the alternate assessment.

Proceed to Part B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Deafness/Hearing Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emotional Disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Orthopedic Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Health Impairment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Visual Impairment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student with any of these disabilities may have a cognitive disability. However, fewer than half the students in these categories may have a most significant cognitive disability that would qualify them for the alternate assessment.

A student identified with these disability categories very rarely will be a student with a most significant cognitive disability and therefore rarely, if ever, qualify for the alternate assessment.

Proceed to Part B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Autism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deaf-Blindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intellectual Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Multiple Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student identified with these disability categories very rarely will be a student with a most significant cognitive disability and therefore rarely, if ever, qualify for the alternate assessment.

Proceed to Part B.
Part B – Determining if the Student has a Most Significant Cognitive Disability
Directions: Select the column in each of three adaptive skills domains (Conceptual, Social and Practical) that best describes the student’s daily functioning. After reviewing all available data, if the team still is struggling to decide between two columns, presume competence and select the column to the left (for example, if the team is trying to decide between Column 2 or Column 3, select Column 2).

### Conceptual Domain
The Conceptual Domain covers skills that are needed to communicate, apply academic skills, and manage and accomplish tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student is on grade level academically in all content areas, **and**

The student has age-appropriate receptive and expressive communication skills, including conversation skills (verbally or through a communication device), **and**

The student expresses and makes independent choices, exhibits self-control and takes responsibility for choices at an age-appropriate level.

The student has difficulty learning academic content aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards but is making progress with appropriate supports and interventions as specified in the IEP, **and**

After learning new content, the student may need additional practice with direct instruction to generalize the new skills into daily living activities, **and**

The student has some age-appropriate receptive and expressive communication skills (verbally or through a communication device), uses and understands simple, nonverbal communication and can follow simple, age-appropriate directions and routines with prompting, **and**

The student may have been referred for an initial evaluation during elementary school due to academic difficulties.

The student has difficulty learning grade-level academic content across all subject areas and may require multiple tiers of intervention, accommodations or modifications, **and**

The student may need instruction aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended to build base skills to get back to grade level, **and**

The student may struggle to generalize skills outside the classroom, even with assistance and practice, **and**

The student has difficulty communicating wants, needs, thoughts and ideas but receptively understands messages, **and**

The student struggles to follow directions and routines without significant assistance, **and**

The student may have been referred for an evaluation in preschool or kindergarten based on developmental differences.

The student has significant difficulty with learning academic content and may require instruction that is designed by clustering grade-level standards into life-applied units of study with intensive accommodations for access, **and**

The student requires significantly modified curriculum and instruction using Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended and likely is unable to apply or generalize skills outside the classroom setting, **and**

The student may be unable to clearly express wants and needs and may not seem to understand the messages conveyed by others. The student likely requires maximum adult assistance to communicate, **and**

The student requires layers of supports (accommodations, scaffolding and assistive technologies) to follow directions and daily routine activities, **and**
The student was most likely identified with developmental delays as an infant or toddler and received early intervention services through the Help Me Grow/Birth-to-3 programs.

Social Domain
The Social Domain covers behaviors needed to engage in interpersonal interactions, act with social responsibility and use leisure time. This includes social competence, self-esteem, gullibility, naïveté (wariness), social problem-solving, following rules/obeying laws and avoiding being victimized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student displays age-appropriate social, communication and leisure skills, and</td>
<td>The student may have difficulty with social interactions (for example, may misinterpret peers’ social cues or others may consider the student’s actions as immature), and</td>
<td>The student has social, behavior and communication skills markedly different from peers who are the same age, and</td>
<td>The student often uses behaviors to communicate, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student can initiate and maintain friendships, express and recognize emotions with peers who are the same age, and</td>
<td>The student’s communication, language and conversation skills are more concrete or immature than peers who are the same age, and</td>
<td>The student is able to be understood but uses a mode for communication that is much less complex than peers who are the same age, and</td>
<td>The student’s communication skills are very limited in terms of vocabulary and grammar, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student engages in play and recreational activities without additional support.</td>
<td>The student may have challenges in regulating emotion and behavior in an age-appropriate manner, and these challenges may be noticed by peers and adults.</td>
<td>The student may use behaviors to communicate, and</td>
<td>The student may be in the process of developing a mode of communication, may be described as nonverbal or uses very limited non-symbolic communication, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The student may not perceive or interpret social cues accurately, and</td>
<td>The student requires significant adult assistance to communicate with peers or adults and may require layers of support (simple speech, visuals, gestures, etc.) to communicate, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The student often needs significant support to engage in social situations and/or use communication skills, and</td>
<td>The student may not yet show understanding of symbolic communication with speech or gesture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Practical Domain
The Practical Domain covers behaviors needed to address personal and health needs; take care of home, classroom or work settings; and function in a school or community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student is able to follow safety rules and functions in the community and classroom setting similarly to peers who are the same age, and The student independently performs self-care activities such as eating, dressing and taking care of personal hygiene.</td>
<td>The student often functions age-appropriately in personal care daily living activities and using community resources, and</td>
<td>The student may need support to care for personal needs (for example, eating, dressing, toileting needs), may have needed an extended period of explicit teaching in these areas and may require prompting or cues, and</td>
<td>The student requires significant support and direct instruction across all activities of daily living (meals, dressing, bathing, toileting needs) or may be dependent on others for all aspects of physical care, health and safety, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The student displays recreational skills typically on the same level as peers, although some additional support may be needed, and The student may need support in navigating the school and community and may need reminders about being mindful of safety hazards.</td>
<td>The student often requires additional support and learning opportunities for recreational skills, and The student requires intensive support to safely navigate the school and community.</td>
<td>The student often requires additional support and learning opportunities for recreational skills, and The student requires intensive teaching and ongoing support for recreational and navigation skills, not because of physical ability but because of significant cognitive needs. The student requires supervision at all times.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Determining Most Significant Cognitive Disability:
Students with a most significant cognitive disability will have significant deficits in ALL adaptive skills domains.

- The student’s daily functioning skills **do not** align within column 4 of ALL three adaptive skills domains above. **STOP**

  **Stop here. The student is not eligible for participation in the alternate assessment.**

- The student’s daily functioning skills align only within column 4 of ALL three adaptive skills domains above. The student has a most significant cognitive disability. **GO**

  **Proceed to Part C.**
Part C – Determining if the student requires extensive direct individualized instruction aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

Directions: Select the column that best describes the student’s curriculum, instruction, supports, accommodations, modifications and assistive technology needs. After reviewing all available data, if the team still is struggling to decide between two columns, presume competence and select the column to the left (for example, if the team is trying to decide between Column 2 or Column 3, select Column 2).

<p>| Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment: This section describes the student’s daily learning needs as outlined in the IEP. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student’s present levels of performance on the IEP indicates that skills are closely aligned with grade-level standards, concepts and skills with present-level data showing skill gaps represented within Ohio’s Learning Standards.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP includes annual goals and objectives aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards and may include short-term learning objectives aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended in prescriptive area(s) of data-determined need, and Instruction and assessment are aligned to grade-level targets that build in complexity from Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended toward achievement of learning aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards, and The student’s IEP requires Specially Designed Instruction that is standards-based and includes explicit instruction in all content areas on grade-level standards.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP includes goals and objectives that target modified grade-level standards within Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended in the a-c range of complexities, and Instruction and assessments are aligned to modified grade-level targets within Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended in the a-c range of complexities, and The student’s IEP requires Specially Designed Instruction that is standards-based and includes life-applied grade-level learning. The student requires both accommodations and modifications.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP includes present level of performance statements that align learner data with grade-level standards through Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended, building the base skills and engagement skills, and Instruction and assessments are based on student data, likely showing skill gaps within the engagement zone as described in Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended with Learning Progressions, and The student’s IEP requires Specially Designed Instruction that is standards-based and also includes life-applied grade-level learning; The student requires extensive accommodations and modifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Accommodations/Modifications**: This section describes the accommodations and modifications needed for the student to participate meaningfully in daily instructional and assessment activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student’s IEP outlines a list of accessibility features that are presented in Ohio’s Accessibility Manual under Universal Tools and Designated Supports that are provided during instruction and assessment to support access.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP outlines a list of accessibility features that are presented in Ohio’s Accessibility Manual under Universal Tools, Designated Supports and Accommodations that are provided during instruction and assessment to support access.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP outlines a list of accessibility features that are presented in Ohio’s Accessibility Manual under Universal Tools, Designated Supports and Accommodations that are provided during instruction and assessment to support access, and The student requires additional individualized accommodations, modifications and scaffolds not allowed on Ohio’s State Tests. These also are provided during instruction and assessment to support access.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP outlines individualized supports, accommodations and modifications and materials beyond those that are presented in Ohio’s Accessibility Manual to meet the cognitive and physical task demands of instruction and assessment. These additional supports address the communication, motor and/or sensory needs of the learner and provide the learner opportunities to show what he or she knows and can do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assistive Technology:** This section describes the use of assistive technologies needed for the student to actively engage and participate meaningfully and productively in daily activities in *school, home, community and work* environments.

Note: The assistive technology box on the IEP should be a quick reference before taking a deeper look into the supports, services and testing accommodations section of the IEP. There are more than 10 domains of assistive technology IEP teams should consider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The student’s IEP team has determined the student does not need any assistive technology.</td>
<td>The student requires assistive technology supports and services. The IEP team is in the process of learning about assistive technology and determining specific supports for the student.</td>
<td>The student’s IEP outlines required assistive technology supports and services, <strong>and</strong></td>
<td>The student’s IEP describes complex physical, sensory or medical needs that require multiple assistive technology supports and services across most of the assistive technology domains. It may be challenging to determine access for the use of assistive technologies, <strong>and</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
<td>The student had an assistive technology evaluation completed and it was determined that no assistive technology is required as indicated in the check box on the IEP.</td>
<td>An assistive technology assessment was used or is in the process of being used to feature match individualized, assistive technology to support academic instruction, communication, daily living, seating/positioning, mobility, sensory and/or motor needs, etc., <strong>and/or</strong></td>
<td>The student currently requires person-dependent supports or scaffolds that may be replaced with assistive technology once feature matching can be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The student’s IEP includes assistive technology in the Special Instructional Factors, Measurable Annual Goals, Specially Designed Services, and/or Statewide and District Testing as presented in the Assistive Technology Consideration in the IEP document and Ohio’s Accessibility Manual.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Determining whether the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports:** The characteristics of students who qualify for the alternate assessment will only fall into columns 3 or 4.

- The student’s characteristics in the columns above in Part C include some characteristics from columns 1 and 2.

  **Stop**

  Stop here. The student is not eligible for participation in the alternate assessment.

- The student’s characteristics in the columns above in Part C are in Columns 3 or 4 only. The student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction with learning targets aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

  **Go**

  Proceed to Part D.
Part D – Additional Considerations

The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is made after reviewing the entire decision-making tool and the collection of evidence used in parts A, B and C. The decision to participate in the alternate assessment is NOT made based solely on any of the following considerations.

- Disability category, educational environment or instructional setting.
- Student’s instructional reading level is below grade level.
- Expected poor performance on the general education assessment.
- Administration decision or anticipated impact of student scores on the accountability system.
- Anticipated disruptive behavior or emotional duress if taking general assessments.
- Poor attendance or extended absences.
- The fact the student is an [English learner](https://www.example.com) or other social, cultural or economic differences.
- Need for accommodations (such as assistive technology or [augmentative and alternative communication](https://www.example.com)) to participate in the general assessment.

Based on the review of evidence in parts A, B and C and ensuring the decision is not based solely on any of the considerations above, does the student meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment?

___ Yes. The student meets all criteria in parts A, B and C and will participate in the alternate assessment.

___ No, the student does not meet all criteria in parts A, B and C and is not eligible for participation in the alternate assessment.

School District Representative (Name/Date) ________________________________

Intervention Specialist (Name/Date) ________________________________

General Education Teacher (Name/Date) ________________________________

Parent/Guardian (Name/Date) ________________________________
GLOSSARY

**Accommodation**: Changes made to how a student accesses learning content, communication, environments, materials or assessments. Testing accommodations are adjustments to the testing conditions, test format or test administration that provide equitable access during assessments for students with disabilities and students who are English learners. Testing accommodations cannot change what is being measured.

**Adaptive skills**: Practical, everyday skills needed to function and meet the demands of one’s environment, including the skills necessary to effectively and independently take care of oneself and interact with other people (American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 2017).

**Assistive technology**: An assistive technology device is any item, piece of equipment or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified or customized, that is used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted or the replacement of that device (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004). Visit the Assistive Technology & Accessible Educational Materials Center for more information about assistive technology.

**Assistive Technology Domains**: There are thousands of assistive technology supports that might assist a student to access, participate and become more independent in a variety of school activities and tasks, including both low- and high-tech options. These supports are organized into more than 10 domains.

**Assistive Technology Consideration in the IEP**: Beginning with the reauthorization of IDEA in 1997, the IEP team is required to “consider” the assistive technology needs of every student receiving special education services. The Assistive Technology Considerations in the IEP document helps teams navigate this process.

**Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC)**: Includes all forms of communication (other than speech) that are used to express thought, needs, wants and ideas (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 2017).

**Building the Base Skills**: Skills referenced within the Building the Base column of Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended with Learning Progressions documents. Base skills are foundational skills that contribute to the ability to demonstrate the target skills/concepts within a grade-level standard.

**Designated supports**: Within Ohio’s statewide testing accessibility system, designated supports are features provided during testing that are not universally provided to all students but that do not require an IEP or 504 plan to be provided if these supports meet individual student needs.

**Engagement zone**: The engagement skills referenced within the Building the Base column of Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended with Learning Progressions documents. Engagement skills are present in all standards across all four subjects.

**English Learner (EL)**: English learners are students whose primary or home language is other than English who need language assistance to effectively participate in school instructional programs.

**Evaluation Team Report (ETR)**: The Evaluation Team Report is the summary of testing for the initial evaluation and/or reevaluation. The Evaluation Team Report drives the services in a student’s IEP.

**Feature match**: Matching a learner’s strengths and needs with features of tools, instructional methods or materials.

**Modes for communication**: Can include, but are not limited to, sign language, bilingualism, cued speech, verbal therapy, braille, assistive technology devices and written language.
Modification: Changes what a student is taught or expected to learn. Modifications to grade-level learning change the expectation to learn the full breadth and/or depth of content. Modifications during testing are changes in the standards being measured on the test or in the conditions in which a student takes the test that result in changes in what the assessment is designed to measure by reducing or changing the expectations for the student. Modifications are not permitted during state testing. The alternate assessment is a different assessment, both in content and expectation, it is not a modified assessment.

Ohio’s Accessibility Manual: A comprehensive policy document providing information about the accessibility features of Ohio’s State Tests for grades 3-8 and high school in English language arts, mathematics, science and social studies. The manual helps define the specific accessibility features available for all students, students with disabilities, students who are English learners and students who are English learners with disabilities. Ohio’s Accessibility System features are made up of accommodations for students with disabilities and English learners, as well as other features including administrative considerations, universal tools and designated supports.

Ohio’s Learning Standards: Learning standards explain the knowledge and skills Ohio students in prekindergarten through grade 12 need to have. Ohio’s Learning Standards emphasize skills like critical thinking and problem-solving — qualities most sought by today’s employers. Teaching students to apply these skills to what they are learning in school helps ensure sure they are on track to graduate from high school and enjoy success in college, careers and life.

Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended: Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended also are commonly known as “the extended standards.” These standards help ensure students with significant cognitive disabilities have multiple ways to learn and demonstrate knowledge. At the same time, the extended standards maintain the rigor and high expectations of Ohio’s Learning Standards.

Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended with Learning Progressions: Learning standards provide targets for units of study, lessons and daily plans that drive instruction and assessment. A learning progression is a sequence of skills linked to a learning target that build base skills and engagement as learners make progress toward mastery of the standard or learning target.

Significant cognitive disability: Significant cognitive disability is not a disability category under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Students with a most significant cognitive disability are those students who meet all the criteria in Part B of this tool. Students are eligible to participate in the alternate assessment if they meet all of the criteria is sections A through D of this tool.

Specially Designed Instruction (SDI): Specially Designed Instruction is “…adapting, as appropriate to the needs of an eligible child under this part, the content, methodology or delivery of instruction (i) to address the unique needs of the child that result from the child’s disability; and (ii) ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that the child can meet the educational standards within the jurisdiction of the public agency that apply to all children” (34 CFR Sec. 300.39(b)(3)).

Universal tools: Features or preferences that are either built into the assessment system or provided externally by test administrators. Universal tools are available for all students taking Ohio’s State Tests. Since these features are available for all students, they are not classified as accommodations.

IDEA Category Definitions as defined by the Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities. Please note in definitions of disability categories below that most categories typically do NOT include intellectual impairment and therefore will rarely align with the participation criteria for the alternate assessment.

- “Autism” means a developmental disability significantly affecting verbal and nonverbal communication and social interaction, generally evident before age 3, that adversely affects a child’s educational
performance. Other characteristics often associated with “autism” are engagement in repetitive activities and stereotyped movements, resistance to environmental change or change in daily routines and unusual responses to sensory experiences. (a) Autism does not apply if a child’s educational performance is adversely affected primarily because the child has an emotional disturbance, as defined in paragraph (B)(10)(d)(v) of this rule. (b) A child who manifests the characteristics of autism after age 3 could be identified as having autism if the criteria in paragraph (B)(10)(d)(i) of this rule are satisfied.

- **Intellectual disability** means significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning, existing concurrently with deficits in adaptive behavior and manifested during the developmental period, that adversely affects a child’s educational performance. (a) “Significantly subaverage general intellectual functioning” refers to an intelligence quotient of 70 or below as determined through a measure of cognitive functioning administered by a school psychologist or a qualified psychologist using a test designed for individual administration. Based on a standard error of measurement and clinical judgment, a child may be determined to have significant subaverage general intellectual functioning with an intelligence quotient not to exceed 75. (b) “Deficits in adaptive behavior” means deficits in two or more applicable skill areas occurring within the context of the child’s environments and typical of the child’s chronological age peers.

(c) A child who was identified by an Ohio educational agency as having a developmental handicap prior to July 1, 2002, shall be considered a child with a disability if the child continues to meet the definition of “developmentally handicapped” in paragraph “N” of former rule 3301-51-01 of the Administrative Code and the eligibility requirements of paragraph “F.1” of former rule 3301-51-04 of the Administrative Code that are both contained in the “Rules for the Education of Handicapped Children,” which were effective July 1, 1982, and were rescinded July 1, 2002. A child who meets these provisions shall be eligible to receive special education and related services in accordance with the “Operating Standards for Ohio’s Schools Serving Children with Disabilities” effective July 1, 2008.

- **Deaf-blindness** means concomitant hearing and visual impairments, the combination of which causes such severe communication and other developmental and educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for children with deafness or children with blindness.

- **Deafness** means a hearing impairment that is so severe the child is impaired in processing linguistic information through hearing, with or without amplification, that adversely affects a child’s educational performance.

- **Emotional disturbance** means a condition exhibiting one or more of the following characteristics over a long period of time and to a marked degree that adversely affects a child’s educational performance: (a) An inability to learn that cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors. (b) An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers. (c) Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal circumstances. (d) A general pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression. (e) A tendency to develop physical symptoms or fears associated with personal or school problems. (f) Emotional disturbance includes schizophrenia. The term does not apply to children who are socially maladjusted, unless it is determined they have an emotional disturbance under paragraph (B)(10)(d)(v) of this rule.

- **Hearing impairment** means an impairment in hearing, whether permanent or fluctuating, that adversely affects a child’s educational performance but is not included under the definition of deafness in this rule.
“Multiple disabilities” means concomitant impairments (such as intellectual disability blindness or intellectual disability orthopedic impairment), the combination of which causes such severe educational needs that they cannot be accommodated in special education programs solely for one of the impairments. “Multiple disabilities” does not include deaf-blindness.

“Other health impairment” means having limited strength, vitality or alertness, including a heightened alertness to environmental stimuli, that results in limited alertness with respect to the educational environment that: (a) is due to chronic or acute health problems such as asthma, attention deficit disorder or attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, diabetes, epilepsy, a heart condition, hemophilia, lead poisoning, leukemia, nephritis, rheumatic fever, sickle cell anemia and Tourette syndrome; and (b) adversely affects a child’s educational performance.

“Orthopedic impairment” means a severe orthopedic impairment that adversely affects a child’s educational performance. The term includes impairments caused by a congenital anomaly, impairments caused by disease (for example, poliomyelitis, bone tuberculosis) and impairments from other causes (for example, cerebral palsy, amputations and fractures or burns that cause contractures).

Specific learning disability. (a) General. “Specific learning disability” means a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or in using language, spoken or written, that may manifest itself in the imperfect ability to listen, think, speak, read, write, spell or do mathematical calculations, including conditions such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia and developmental aphasia. (b) Disorders not included. Specific learning disability does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor disabilities, intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, or environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.

“Speech or language impairment” means a communication disorder, such as stuttering, impaired articulation, a language impairment or a voice impairment, that adversely affects a child’s educational performance.

“Traumatic brain injury” means an acquired injury to the brain caused by an external physical force resulting in total or partial functional disability or psychosocial impairment or both that adversely affects a child’s educational performance. The term applies to open or closed head injuries resulting in impairments in one or more areas, such as cognition; language; memory; attention; reasoning; abstract thinking; judgment; problem-solving; sensory, perceptual and motor abilities; psychosocial behavior; physical functions; information processing; and speech. The term does not apply to brain injuries that are congenital or degenerative or to brain injuries induced by birth trauma.

“Visual impairment,” including blindness, means an impairment in vision that, even with correction, adversely affects a child’s educational performance.

(a) The term “visual impairment” includes both partial sight and blindness.

(b) The term “visual impairment” does not include a disorder in one or more of the basic psychological processes, such as perceptual disabilities, brain injury, minimal brain dysfunction, dyslexia and developmental aphasia.
Ohio’s Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool Frequently Asked Questions

Background
To guide and support individualized education program (IEP) teams in determining whether a student is most appropriately assessed with an alternate assessment, the Ohio Department of Education, in consultation with parents, teachers, administrators and other stakeholders, developed an Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool. The Department received many questions and comments about the decision-making tool from stakeholders during this process. This supplement to the decision-making tool was created to address those questions and concerns.

Each section in this document aligns with the same section of the decision-making tool. Part A of this document covers Part A of the decision-making tool, Part B of this document covers Part B of the tool, etc. This document also includes a section on general questions about the decision-making tool at the end.

Part A – Initial Eligibility

1. **Question 1 asks, “Does the student have a current Individualized Education Program (IEP)?” If the IEP team is considering participation for the student as part of the initial IEP, does that count as current?**

Yes. If this is the student’s initial IEP or the IEP is being reviewed, the team should consider the student to have a current IEP for the purposes of alternate assessment participation decision-making.

2. **What is a significant cognitive disability?**

   Significant cognitive disability is not a disability category under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). A student with a most significant cognitive disability is a student who meets all the criteria in Part B of the tool. Students are eligible to participate in the alternate assessment if they meet all the criteria is sections A through D of the tool.

   The reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 Sec 612(a)(17)(A) first required alternate assessments to be developed. This act defined alternate assessments as being for students “who cannot participate in State and district-wide assessment programs.” The term “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” was not used until proposed regulations for the No Child Left Behind Act Sec. 200.3(c) (Federal Register, 2002, p. 51005), released in summer of 2002, introduced the idea of different achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

   The No Child Left Behind Act Alternate Achievement Standards for Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities: Non-Regulatory Guidance of 2005 (pg. 23) provides an explanation for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. It states:

   **Who is eligible to participate in alternate assessments based on alternate achievement standards?**
Only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities may be assessed based on alternate achievement standards. The regulation does not create a new category of disability. Rather, the Department intended the term “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” to include that small number of students who are (1) within one or more of the existing categories of disability under the IDEA (e.g., autism, multiple disabilities, traumatic brain injury, etc.); and (2) whose cognitive impairments may prevent them from attaining grade-level achievement standards, even with the very best instruction.

The Every Student Succeeds Act §200.6 expands on the idea of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

(d) **State guidelines for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.** If a State adopts alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and administers an alternate assessment aligned with those standards, the State must—

1. Establish, consistent with section 612(a)(16)(C) of the IDEA, and monitor implementation of clear and appropriate guidelines for IEP teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards. Such guidelines must include a State definition of “students with the most significant cognitive disabilities” that addresses factors related to cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior, such that—

   i. The identification of a student as having a particular disability as defined in the IDEA or as an English learner does not determine whether a student is a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities;

   ii. A student with the most significant cognitive disabilities is not identified solely on the basis of the student's previous low academic achievement, or the student's previous need for accommodations to participate in general State or districtwide assessments; and

   iii. A student is identified as having the most significant cognitive disabilities because the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains on the challenging State academic content standards for the grade in which the student is enrolled.

3. **Why can’t a student identified with a specific learning disability or a speech or language impairment (only) qualify for participation in the alternate assessment?**

A student with a specific learning disability by definition does not have an intellectual component to his or her disability and therefore cannot be a student with a most significant cognitive disability. The definition of specific learning disability reads, “Specific learning disability does not include learning problems that are primarily the result of visual, hearing or motor disabilities, intellectual disability, emotional disturbance, or environmental, cultural or economic disadvantage.”

A speech or language impairment is a communicative disorder that impacts a student’s learning. It also does not have an intellectual aspect.

4. **Why are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) categories, Deafness/Hearing Impairment, Emotional Disturbance, Orthopedic Impairment, Other Health Impaired, and Visual Impairment in the middle column on the tool?**

Students identified with these disability categories will very rarely be students with most significant cognitive disabilities and therefore very rarely qualify for the alternate assessment. However, there may be situations when the IEP team identifies a student as having one of these disability types even
though the student is a student with a most significant cognitive disability. This should be a very rare occurrence. If a student’s cognitive disability is so significant the student would qualify for the alternate assessment, then the disability would not be the student’s identified disability type. For example, if a student has a visual impairment and has a most significant cognitive disability, then multiple disability likely would be a more appropriate designation.

5. Why are the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) categories, Autism, Deaf-Blindness, Intellectual Disability, Multiple Disabilities and Traumatic Brain Injury bolded in the tool?

Students identified in these five categories likely have significant cognitive disabilities. However, even within these five categories, not all students will have most significant cognitive disabilities and qualify for the alternate assessment.

Part B – Determining Most Significant Cognitive Disability

6. Why doesn’t the decision-making tool use IQ as a determining criterion?

We know today that IQ is not fixed. In a day and age where growth mindset and presumed competence are promoted, the use of these kinds of labels and markers for learners seems counterproductive and discriminatory.

As Dr. Martha Snell from the University of Virginia pointed out in an interview about the 2010 American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities Definition Manual, “It has been 17 years since we began the shift in focus to supports and away from deficiencies.” She continued, “If you provide an individual with the supports that they actually need to achieve valued outcomes, the focus is on what they can learn and what they can do rather than on numbers of IQ points and what an individual cannot achieve.”

7. In the Conceptual Domain of this section, why were the following statements included in their associated columns:

   • “The student may have been referred for an initial evaluation during elementary school due to academic difficulties” (column 2);
   • “The student may have been referred for an evaluation in preschool or kindergarten based on developmental differences” (column 3); and
   • “The student was most likely identified with developmental delays as an infant or toddler and received early intervention services through the Help-Me-Grow/ Birth-to-3 programs” (column 4)?

While not always true, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities commonly are identified and begin to receive services at a very early age. This progression of evaluations reflects the typical timelines students with varying degrees of disability are first identified and served.

8. Why must a student’s characteristics fall into column 4 of all three adaptive behavior domains to be eligible?

Students who have the most significant cognitive disabilities will have very significant deficits in all adaptive behavior domains. Only the descriptors in column 4 describe these very significant deficits.

9. Does the student’s cultural and socioeconomic context matter when determining placement in a column for adaptive behavior?
Yes. When determining limitations in adaptive behavior for students, teams should be careful to separate intellectual disabilities from external factors that are not related to students’ cognitive functioning.

For example, in some scenarios, due to a student’s home situation, the student may not have good hygiene, but this is not related to the student’s intellectual level. The student may not have been taught or had access to resources for hygiene or good personal hygiene might not have been viewed as a cultural priority (as the student’s parents, family and/or friends may be similar).

10. What does presume competence mean?
In 2005, Cheryl Jorgensen published an article titled The Least Dangerous Assumption: A Challenge to Create a New Paradigm. In this article, she quoted another respected researcher in special education, Anne Donnellan, who in 1984 wrote, “the criterion of least dangerous assumption holds that in the absence of conclusive data, educational decisions ought to be based on assumptions which, if incorrect, will have the least dangerous effect on the likelihood that students will be able to function independently as adults.” She went on, “we should assume that poor performance is due to instructional inadequacy rather than to student deficits.” Thus, Dr. Jorgensen argued that presuming competence when addressing students with significant cognitive disabilities is the least dangerous thing to do because to do otherwise is more likely to result in harm through fewer educational opportunities, inferior literacy instruction, a segregated education, and fewer choices as an adult.

In the decision-making tool, presuming competence means that in the absence of a clear choice between two columns, it is more beneficial to the student to assume the student can do more rather than less.

Part C - Determining if the student requires extensive direct individualized instruction aligned to Ohio’s Learning Standards – Extended and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

11. What does building the base skills zone mean?
Building the base skills zone is a section of the learning progressions that provides a list of individual skills or knowledge that lead up to or are part of the extended and general standards.

12. What does engagement skills zone mean?
The engagement skills zone is a section of the learning progressions that provides descriptions of engagement skills linked to grade-level learning.

13. Do all students who qualify for the alternate assessment really have assistive technology needs?
Yes. Given there are more than 10 domains of assistive technology, nearly all students with disabilities will have some assistive technology needs. Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities always will need some type of assistive technology because of the pervasiveness and severity of their disabilities that can impact access to communication, motor skills, mobility, seating/positioning, literacy, mathematics, executive functioning, vision, hearing, etc.

14. Is a formal assistive technology evaluation required for a student to have assistive technology?
No. An assistive technology evaluation is best practice in determining the feature match between a student's strengths and needs and features of assistive technology tools. This research, trial, data collection and evaluation process ensures a better match before money is spent on purchasing assistive technology.
Assistive technology should be considered for every student with an IEP. Consideration goes beyond simply checking “yes” or “no” on the IEP but is a careful and thoughtful discussion that focuses on the student’s needs and abilities, environments, tasks and how the student might be supported by assistive technology. The results of the assistive technology consideration discussion may indicate the need for a more in depth assistive technology assessment.

15. Are “low-tech” solutions still considered assistive technology?
Yes. Low-tech assistive technology most often is defined as a tool or device where no battery or electricity is required to operate it. Students with disabilities can benefit from a broad spectrum of low-tech assistive technology tools.

16. What does it mean to feature match assistive technology?
Feature matching is a decision-making process by which IEP or Assistive Technology teams match a student’s strengths and needs to assistive technology features.

17. Why does Part C allow a student to meet the criteria to participate in the alternate assessment if the student’s characteristics are in columns 3 or 4, while in Part B, the student characteristics must all be in column 4?
Students who have the most significant cognitive disabilities will have very significant deficits in all adaptive behavior domains. Only the descriptors in column 4 describe these very significant deficits. However, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities can have varying levels of instructional needs that exceed the least complex level (column 4 only).

Part D – Additional Considerations

18. Why does this document start by reviewing the disability category when the first bullet in this section says participation determination isn’t made based solely on disability category or label?
Students with severe learning disabilities, by definition, cannot have cognitive disabilities and therefore cannot participate in the alternate assessment. Students with speech impairment only also will never qualify. Students identified in categories marked as proceed with caution rarely will qualify since these students do not typically have cognitive disabilities significant enough to qualify for alternate assessment participation. If they do have most significant cognitive disabilities, they should be identified with a different category. For example, if a student is blind and meets the criteria for participation in the alternate assessment, a more appropriate category is multiple disability.

When the tool states participation determination is not made based solely on disability category or label, this means a team should not make the decision for a student to participate in the alternate assessment because of the student’s identified disability category without going through all parts of the tool. There is no disability category in which all students identified with that disability will qualify.

General Questions

19. Does the decision-making tool need to be completed every year? Does it need to be signed and kept in the student’s file or attached to the IEP?
IEP teams must review the decision-making tool at least annually if participation in the alternate assessment is being considered and at each IEP meeting where participation in the alternate assessment is discussed. All members of the IEP team listed on the tool must sign the tool. Attach the completed form to the student’s IEP.
20. Does there have to be data to support each decision-making point?  
Yes. For all parts of the decision-making tool, decisions must be data driven. Exactly what data evidence is used depends on what is being considered. Examples of data include results from formative assessments, data from evidence-based interventions, information from multiple sections of the IEP, assistive technology assessment data, learner profile or cumulative folder data documenting supports and services, and more.

21. What does the team do when it is having difficulty in determining which column to select?  
Go back to the data to review current evidence. It may be necessary to collect additional information. In the absence of additional data, presume competence and select the column that represents the present evidence.

When considering which column best describes a student, the team should take a holistic approach to the student’s characteristics. Do not tally the number of characteristics in each column to make a decision, rather consider which column overall best represents the student.

22. What should the IEP team do if the student has taken the alternate assessment in previous years but the team determines the student no longer is eligible to participate in the alternate assessment?  
Sometimes IEP teams determine that a student who previously participated in the alternate assessment no longer qualifies. If a student does not qualify for the alternate assessment, the team should switch the student to the general assessment, most likely with accommodations. The team also should consider other elements of the student’s program, such as whether the student requires new or additional assistive technology and whether the student should be moved to a more inclusive setting. Instructional practices and support services should be considered that may allow the student to make progress in the general education curriculum. Teams should continue to hold high expectations for all students with disabilities and focus on each student’s individual strengths, understanding that all students with disabilities first and foremost are general education students.

23. After the IEP team completed the decision-making tool, the student does not qualify for participation in the alternate assessment. However, the team believes the student is unable to take the general assessments and show what the student knows and can do. Can the student still take the alternate assessment?  
No. Only students who meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment may take the alternate assessment.

24. In our school, students in our self-contained classrooms for students with intellectual disabilities take the alternate assessment. Do the IEP teams of these students have to use the decision-making tool to determine if each of these students qualify for participation in the alternate assessment?  
Yes. Participation in the alternate assessment is an IEP team decision for each individual student. Where a student is placed is not a criterion for participation in the alternate assessment. Only students who meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment may take the alternate assessment.

25. The IEP team feels the student it is considering for alternate assessment will not perform well on the general assessments and this will impact the school and district report cards and reflect poorly in teacher evaluations. Since the district has less than 1% of the total student population participating in the alternate assessment, is it okay to include additional students who do not
meet all criteria for alternate assessment participation to the alternate assessment until the district reaches the 1% threshold?

Only students who meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment may take the alternate assessment. Some districts will have less than 1% participation in the alternate assessment. Districts and schools should not try to maximize their 1% threshold to improve school and district report cards or teacher evaluations. Student participation in the alternate assessment must not be based on anticipated negative impact on school or district report cards or teacher evaluations.

26. The IEP team is considering a student for participation in the alternate assessment. This student “melts down” when confronted with difficult tasks, such as taking the general assessments. The student does not meet all the criteria for participation in the alternate assessment, but the team feels it would be better for the student emotionally. May the student take the alternate assessment?

Only students who meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment may take the alternate assessment. If a student does not meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment but struggles taking the general assessments, it is imperative the IEP team consider all available testing accessibility features. For a student who gets frustrated easily during testing, the team may consider features such as one-on-one test administration, a familiar test administrator, music, white noise or ear plugs, the time of day the student will test, taking frequent breaks and the location the student will test. The student also may benefit from assistive technology and frequent opportunities to practice test taking.

27. The student does not qualify for the alternate assessment according to the decision-making tool, but the IEP team feels the needs of the child should supersede the decision-making tool and taking the alternate assessment still is the best option for the student. Does this tool supersede the IEP team’s decision-making process?

No. The decision-making tool provides the necessary information IEP teams must use to make the appropriate determination. The Every Student Succeeds Act §200.6 requires states establish, consistent with section 612 of the IDEA, and monitor implementation of clear and appropriate guidelines for Individualized Educational Program teams to apply in determining, on a case-by-case basis, which students with the most significant cognitive disabilities will be assessed based on alternate academic achievement standards. It is the role of the IEP team to determine if a student meets the guidelines for participation. Only students who meet all criteria for participation in the alternate assessment may take the alternate assessment.
| Attendees | OH: Andrew, Katie, Wendy  
NCEO: Kathy S, Kate N, Martha, Carol |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Updates &amp; Items</td>
<td>Schools are transitioning to hybrid soon. About half districts are hybrid and the rural ones are starting face to face. AA rates are high in rural areas and in urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver extension &amp; public comment period</td>
<td>Waiver extension is still under review—gave leadership a good 5 weeks before it goes for public comment. Have a couple of weeks before it needs to be out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALICON</td>
<td>Sent slides to Kathy. NCEO has registered for the conference. Next step is to contact them to set up prerecording session. OH is recording this week. Kathy didn’t attend the presenters training. It was recorded so Kathy will reach out to the conference providers. “OCALICONPass” Sign up for slot and sign the presenters’ form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision making tool update</td>
<td>Still with legal for 5 weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE data and student experiences</td>
<td>No update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making FAQ, webinar, PD</td>
<td>Still under review with legal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family resources for AA</td>
<td>This is next on Andrew’s list. Drafted awhile ago but haven’t done much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Story Visual</td>
<td>PPT had some great slides. Put it into real numbers for OH. 1% is 9,100 students. There are 3 applicable conditions (disability categories): Intellectual Disabilities, Autism, Multiple disabilities. Had 17000 AA test takers—way too many. Have Other Health Impairments, Specific Learning Disabilities, Traumatic Brain Injury. Emotional Disturbance participating but these are not enough to move the needle. Have to deal with the other 3 MD, IH, Aut. 94% of students with MD took the alternate.,37% of students with autism took an alternate. OH is definitely on the high side. Other health impaired (minor) was 4% of all students taking the AA. Have major and minor OHI. Having minor on the AA doesn’t make sense. Have identified students with down syndrome on the minor. Soft sell the disability in preschool and then reassign to a more reasonable one. More likely to take the AA if you are black. Less likely to take it if you are white—or any other race. If you are autistic and take the AA you are more likely to be Black, or EL or in an urban district. Charter schools are at 2.13%. State only are students who are not continuously enrolled in an LEA the rate is 2.62. Small LEAs are not at a disadvantage because of small ns. Great support from data visualization guy. Wants to get at the LRE data. Data system was down last week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disproportionality Tool</td>
<td>Excel calculator for disproportionality. New and exciting tool for the OH TA teams to use with districts. Step by step to show we are really trying to address disproportionality and not just paying lip service. Based on NCEO work—video and brief. Made the notes section as clear as possible. Two analytic approaches to disproportionality. Tricky thing is that n sizes are so small. Use multiple years to get a good n size. Risk ratio and difference in proportion. Two analytic approaches. Deciding if its meaningful—is it outside of a range like a confidence interval. What is significant though? With regular disproportionality—3.5 risk ration is sig pro for Indicator 9 and 10. Going to 2.5 in the state profile. Going to identify another 100 districts being identified. Don’t have one for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
disproportionality in the AA—teams use their own judgement. Plug in the numbers across 3 years and it calculates the disproportionality for subgroups on the AA. 95% confidence level. Risk ratio used chronic absentee data which is OH most disproportionate group. Uses the federal definition of chronic absenteeism. OH has legislation that has LEAs look at chronic absenteeism. Don’t look at out of school suspension in relation to chronic absenteeism though. Starting an early warning system in the state. Students are being assigned the AA because of their performance not their disability characteristics. Will need to provide professional learning to SSTs but it’s a handy tool for the LEAs. Have a tier approach to TA for the LEAs. T3 LEAs get an indicator on their special education profiles. Have to do a self-review summary report on how the IEP teams understand the decision-making for AA and disproportionality. Its like a root cause analysis. Have 16 regional support teams and they support the T3s in their regions. Each person has 5-6 LEAS. The SSTs work onsite with LEAs on the self-report. Now they can use the disproportionality tool. LEAs can use both methods to calculate because of the small ns. Other disproportionality calculations use the risk ratio so it’s familiar to them. Just four numbers total and focal group. Calculate for all the racial categories. Have a summary sheet with the findings for each racial group. T3 have to do it. Video was really helpful. Happy to share with other states. Ready to call it done. Will try it out this year and revise if we need to.

Meet again: **October 26 9.00am EDT**
Onsite Checklist

District: ___________________  IRN: ___________________
SPP Indicators to Verify Onsite: ___________________

**Lead will enter the district contact information into the database**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contacts &amp; Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST Consultant:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor (if community school):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management organization (if community school):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Documents/Equipment Needed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead will provide copy of the completed meeting notice to Donna for posting on website</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Public Meeting Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Obtain location from LEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Complete public meeting notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send notice to LEA to send to parents and post on LEA website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send a copy of the notice to Donna for posting on OEC’s website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send LEA Verification of Notification of Public Meeting Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Remind LEA to retain a copy of the notice in student file and to complete the notification of public meeting form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Determine any needed accommodations such as an interpreter, room accessibility, etc. and inform LEA at least one week prior to meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Consultant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Sign-In Sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Request to Address OEC Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Written Comments Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ PowerPoint Presentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request District to Provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ LCD Projector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Microphone (if necessary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Copies of Guide to Parent’s Rights in Special Education (provided by LEA) along with LEA special education contact information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Consultants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Parent Meeting Notes (electronic or written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Submit all notes to the Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Submit Sign-in Sheets to the Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Review Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send electronic list of student SSIDs selected for review to LEA requesting names and addresses (Student Address Format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send completed list from LEA to Donna for upload into database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send LEA instructions for uploading records to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ <a href="#">Document Upload Instructions</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ <a href="#">Document Request Checklist</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Assign records for review to individual consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Use the Record Review hard copy forms (back up to database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Verify that all record reviews have been entered in the Access Data Base (check district tally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Consultants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Enter all record reviews into Access database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Submit hardcopies of the Record Review Data Collection forms to Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Schedule 1 ½ hours for each team interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Special education teachers, regular education teachers, educational aides and related service providers will be interviewed separately from the LEA administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Identify location for the interviews and explain the need for adequate space and conference table seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Additional documentation from LEA if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Interview Questions – School Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Sign-in sheets to all consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Consultants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Interview Notes (electronic or written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Submit Interview Notes to Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Submit Sign-in Sheets to Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IEP Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ IEP Verification Checklists to all consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Request Student Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Request Building Maps for Class Locations if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Consultants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Debrief with team for inter-rater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Combine IEP Verification Checklists/Notes and submit to Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preschool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send electronic list of student SSIDs selected for review to LEA requesting names and addresses (Student Address Format)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Send completed list from LEA to Donna for upload into database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Send LEA instructions for uploading records to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Upload Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assign records for review to individual consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use the Record Review hard copy forms (back up to database)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify that all record reviews have been entered in the Access Data Base (check district tally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 1 ½ hours for each team interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special education teachers, regular education teachers, educational aides and related service providers will be interviewed separately from the LEA administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify location for the interviews and explain the need for adequate space and conference table seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional documentation from LEA if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview Notes (electronic or written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Interview Notes to Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit Sign-in Sheets to Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Student Schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request Building Maps for Class Locations if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief with team for inter-rater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combine IEP Verification Checklists/Notes and submit to Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.15.19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RR #</th>
<th>Item Reviewed</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>Comments/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DS-17</td>
<td>Data collected and analyzed to inform instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-18</td>
<td>Revisions to IEP made based on data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS-19</td>
<td>IEP Meeting-Qualified team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRE-1</td>
<td>Justification for removal from general education classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Notes**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3c: Participation in Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities Self-Review Summary Report

District: Internal Retrieval Number (IRN):

District Self-Review Team: The District Self-Review Team will review and discuss the questions, summarize and determine if it is an area of concern. If it is an area of concern, the team will determine the root cause and identify the area’s Priority Rank. A consultant from your district’s regional State Support Team must be listed as a member of your Self-Review Team and assist in completing the Self-Review Summary Report if noncompliance is involved.

Districts must complete and upload the Self-Review Summary Report to the Compliance Dashboard for approval by the Office for Exceptional Children. The Compliance Dashboard can be accessed through OH|ID Workforce.

Note: If your district submitted a Data Appeal, do not complete the Self-Review Summary Report until you receive a decision regarding the appeal from the Office for Exceptional Children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submitted by: Phone: Email:

Districts with approved Data Appeals: Complete SECTION A only
Districts with Indicator noncompliance: Complete SECTION B only
Districts with Indicator noncompliance and Data Appeals: Complete SECTION A and B
**SECTION A:** Do not complete the Self-Review Summary Report until you receive a decision regarding the district’s data appeal from the Office for Exceptional Children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section A: Guiding Questions for Approved Data Appeals Only</th>
<th>Area of Concern? (yes or no)</th>
<th>Priority (1 = highest priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Support Team Participation is not Required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The General Issues report allows districts to identify and correct data reporting errors before they become findings on the Special Education Profile (<em>answer supporting questions below</em>):</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Analysis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Who is responsible for accessing the General Issues report for your district to be certain discipline records and attendance records display matching data?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How often is the General Issues report accessed?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Influence (Root Cause): Identified area of concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can current practices be revised to prevent future data errors? If no current practice is in place, explore ideas for a new process to prevent future data errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. District’s practices regarding data reporting (<em>answer supporting questions below</em>):</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Analysis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Who is responsible for identifying and correcting data reporting errors, to include Education Management Information System (EMIS) noncompliance codes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. What is the practice for correcting data reporting errors, to include Education Management Information System noncompliance codes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Who is responsible for ensuring corrections to data reporting errors are complete and accurate (cannot be same person)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Influence (Root Cause): Identified area of concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can current practices be revised to prevent future data errors? If no current practice is in place, explore ideas for a new process to prevent future data errors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. District training and technical assistance regarding data reporting (<em>answer supporting questions below</em>):</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section A: Guiding Questions for Approved Data Appeals Only

**State Support Team Participation is not Required**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern? (yes or no)</th>
<th>Priority (1 = highest priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Summary of Analysis:**

A. What types of technical assistance and training has your district received regarding data reporting and/or the Education Management Information System?

B. How often do district personnel participate in training for the Educational Management Information System?

C. Who provides these trainings?

D. To whom are these trainings provided?

**Potential Influence (Root Cause):**

Identified area of concern: How can current practices be revised to prevent future data errors? If no current practice is in place, explore ideas for a new process to prevent future data errors.

### SECTION B: Analysis of higher than acceptable participation rate in the state’s alternate assessment.

**Section B: Guiding Questions for analysis of alternate assessment participation.**

**State Support Team Participation is Required**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern? (yes or no)</th>
<th>Priority (1 = highest priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**4. Policies, Practices and Procedures (answer supporting questions below):**

**Summary of Analysis:**

A. What is district practice regarding student eligibility for alternate assessment participation?

B. Do IEP teams utilize the alternate assessment decision making framework and companion document?

C. Do IEP teams confirm that students identified for the alternate assessment have a disability that significantly impacts intellectual functioning?

D. Do IEP teams confirm that students who are placed on the alternate assessment have adaptive behavior skills assessments and/or goals included in their IEPs?

E. If not, how do IEP teams decide which students are eligible for participating in the alternate?

**Potential Influence (Root Cause):**

Identified area of concern: Can current district policies, practices and procedures be strengthened or revised for effectiveness? Are practices consistently implemented across buildings? If policies are not consistent or if no policy exists, explore ideas to mitigate future instances of incorrect alternate assessment participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section B: Guiding Questions for analysis of alternate assessment participation.</th>
<th>Area of Concern?</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Support Team Participation is Required</td>
<td>(yes or no)</td>
<td>(1 = highest priority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Training for District Staff Regarding Alternate Assessment Eligibility *(answer supporting questions below)*:  

**Summary of Analysis:**  
A. How often are staff trained on alternate assessment participation criteria?  
B. Who receives this training?  
C. Who provides the training and what is their level of expertise?  
D. What professional learning opportunities are available to address meeting the needs of diverse learners?  
E. What coaching or supports are provided as follow-up to district professional learning?  

**Potential Influence (Root Cause):** Identified area of concern  
*How might district training and professional learning be more effective? Explore ideas to ensure all decision making is based on documented evidence and data that meets the criterion in the decision-making framework and companion document.*

6. Family Involvement *(answer supporting questions below)*:  

**Summary of Analysis:**  
A. How does the district ensure that parents are part of the IEP team decision for alternate assessment eligibility?  
B. What is district practice for discussing alternate assessment with parents in relation to post-secondary outcomes for students at all grade levels?  
C. How does the district document this conversation with the parent?  

**Potential Influence (Root Cause):** Identified area of concern  
*Can current district policies, practices and procedures be strengthened? Are policies consistent across buildings? If policies are not consistent or if revision is warranted, explore ideas that might ensure teams are effectively communicating with families about eligibility for alternate assessment participation and implications for post-secondary outcomes.*

7. Student Data Exploration *(answer supporting questions below)*:  

**Summary of Analysis:**  
**Potential Influence (Root Cause):** Identified area of concern  
*Can further analysis of student data reveal additional insights or areas for improvement? Explore strategies to integrate student data into planning and decision-making processes.*

---
Section B: Guiding Questions for analysis of alternate assessment participation.

State Support Team Participation is Required

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern?</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(yes or no)</td>
<td>(1 = highest priority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Analysis:

A. Are there high numbers of students consistently performing above proficient in all content areas on the alternate assessment? Are there patterns across schools or grade levels? What would account for these patterns?

B. Students identified with the disability categories listed below will very rarely meet the criteria to qualify for participation in alternate assessment. For each disability category, identify the number of students who are alternately assessed in the district:

- Deafness/Hearing Impairment
- Visual Impairment
- Orthopedic Impairment
- Emotional Disturbance
- Other Health Impaired – Minor

C. Other Health Impaired – Major Of the disability categories above, which two categories have the largest number of students participating in the Alternate Assessment?

D. Explore each category’s data separately for possible commonalities, patterns or trends (building, grade level, teacher, school psychologist, receiving services outside the district, other):

Potential Influence (Root Cause): Identified area of concern

Can current district policies, practices and procedures be strengthened or revised for effectiveness? Are policies consistent across buildings? If policies are not consistent or if revision is warranted, explore ideas that might ensure teams are using common understanding about eligibility for alternate assessment participation.
Section B: Guiding Questions for analysis of alternate assessment participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Concern?</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(yes or no)</td>
<td>(1 = highest priority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Support Team Participation is Required

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Now, compare the data of both categories and identify commonalities, patterns or trends:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>What other factors within the district may be causing a higher number of students being alternately assessed (enrollment changes, expansion of services, other)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Our district examines disproportionality in the percentage of students in any subgroup participating in the alternate assessment. *(answer supporting questions below)*:

Summary of Analysis:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Are participation rates different for certain subgroups (e.g. black, Hispanic, Asian, white, English learners, economically disadvantaged) as compared to other subgroups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Viewing alternate assessment participation by subgroup over time (i.e., three years) are there trends evident that show participation of a subgroup increasing or decreasing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Are general education teachers and intervention specialists encouraged to use culturally responsive curricula and evidence-based practices for English learners in their classrooms?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Influence (Root Cause): Identified area of concern

*Can current district policies, practices and procedures be strengthened or revised for effectiveness? Are policies consistent across buildings? If policies are not consistent or if revision is warranted, explore ideas for a new process to improve the disproportionality rate in alternate assessment participation.*
Ensuring Appropriate Participation in Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities

**State Support Team Toolkit Overview**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folder</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supported By</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal General Resources</td>
<td>Companion Document to Participation Guidelines</td>
<td>This document is a companion to the Participation Guidelines for Ohio’s Alternate Assessment and Decision-Making Flowchart that will assist individualized education program (IEP) teams in making appropriate decisions regarding student participation in Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD).</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal General Resources</td>
<td>AASCD Decision Framework (Flowchart) for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</td>
<td>This is a tool that can be used by an IEP team to decide whether a student qualifies to participate in the alternate assessment.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal General Resources</td>
<td>AASCD Fact Sheet</td>
<td>This fact sheet provides an overview the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD).</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal General Resources</td>
<td>AASCD Family FAQ</td>
<td>This document provides answers to frequently asked questions for families of students who participate in the Alternate Assessment.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal General Resources</td>
<td>Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</td>
<td>This document outlines state and federal laws that inform whether a student can participate in Ohio’s alternate assessment.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at:</td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Supported By</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal Testing Manuals</td>
<td>Spring 2020 AASCD Directions for Administration Manual</td>
<td>The Spring 2020 AASCD Directions for Administration Manual outlines how teachers/test administrators should prepare for and administer the AASCD Operational Paper (1.0) administration and AASCD Online Independent Field Test (2.0) administration. All teachers, test administrators, and second raters should review the manual in advance of the test window.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASCD Portal Testing Manuals</td>
<td>Spring 2020 AASCD Test Coordinator's Manual</td>
<td>The Spring 2020 AASCD Test Coordinator’s Manual outlines the responsibilities and procedures that district and building test coordinators are to follow for the AASCD Operational Paper (1.0) administration and the AASCD Online Independent Field Test (2.0) administration.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and School Tools</td>
<td>2019-20 District AASCD Participation Justification Form (Sample)</td>
<td>This sample document will help districts and community schools collect the necessary data to complete a justification form online.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Available in both Word and PDF formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and School Tools</td>
<td>Indicator 3c Self-Review Summary Report</td>
<td>Districts and community schools significantly exceeding the 1% threshold are required to complete this review as an action step in their Special Education Profile. These questions will also be helpful to any district or community school seeking to lower their alternate assessment participation rate.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Available in both Word and PDF formats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and School Tools</td>
<td>School Participation Justification Support Worksheet</td>
<td>For districts who want to collect school level data, this worksheet can be completed by building level teams and shared with the district.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Support Team Toolkit Overview DRAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Folder</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Supported By</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District and School Tools</td>
<td>AASCD Decision-Making Tool and FAQ</td>
<td>To guide and support individualized education program (IEP) teams in determining whether a student is most appropriately assessed with an alternate assessment, the Ohio Department of Education, in consultation with parents, teachers, administrators and other stakeholders, has developed a new <em>Alternate Assessment Participation Decision-Making Tool</em>. The new tool does not replace the existing <em>Decision Framework (Flowchart) for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</em>. The tool does however, clarify and set specific criteria that students must meet for each criteria in the framework. <strong>This tool is required.</strong> Moving forward, IEP teams must use the tool each time the team is considering participation in the alternate assessment. The Department received many questions and comments about the decision-making tool from stakeholders during the writing process. A <em>Decision-Making Tool Frequently Asked Questions</em> document was also created as a supplement to the decision-making tool to address those questions and concerns.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and School Tools</td>
<td>AASCD Decision Framework (Flowchart) for Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines</td>
<td>This is a tool that can be used by an IEP team to decide whether a student qualifies to participate in the alternate assessment.</td>
<td>Please contact the Ohio Help Desk at: Customer Support E-mail: <a href="mailto:OHHelpdesk@air.org">OHHelpdesk@air.org</a></td>
<td>Also available on the Alternate Assessment Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Supported By</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALI Resources</td>
<td>13 Categories Activity PowerPoint</td>
<td>This professional learning activity includes slides, a graphic organizer, an article and the Ohio Operating Standards for the Education of Children with Disabilities. There are no speakers’ notes. This activity should be facilitated by trained facilitators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALI Resources</td>
<td>Adaptive Behavioral Tools</td>
<td>Includes two tools to document students’ adaptive behaviors for students ages 6 through 13 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALI Resources</td>
<td>IDEA – FAPE – LRE</td>
<td>Documents and a video to introduce and discuss the three big ideas around IDEA, FAPE and LRE, with a focus on inclusion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALI Resources</td>
<td>Ohio Data</td>
<td>Review Ohio special education data and read an analysis of national data trends.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The data provided are from 2016-2017 and will be updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCALI Resources</td>
<td>Extended Standards and Learning Progressions Overview PowerPoint</td>
<td>This presentation is a detailed overview of the purpose and use of extended standards and learning progressions. There are limited speakers’ notes available, requiring a trained facilitator to use this presentation. Some of the examples included could be used in different professional learning contexts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC Presentations and Webinars</td>
<td>AASCD Participation Webinar October 2019</td>
<td>This PowerPoint provides background on changes in ESSA, reviews state and LEA responsibilities including collection of district and community school justifications.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Pairs well with sample justification form in District and School Tools folder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC Presentations and Webinars</td>
<td>OCALICON 2019 AASCD Presentation</td>
<td>This set of slides reviews ESSA requirements, including justifications, and focuses on determining student eligibility and use of the “companion document”.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Pairs with companion document in District and School Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Supported By</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEC Presentations and Webinars</td>
<td>Webinar: Understanding Alternate Assessment Action Steps</td>
<td>This presentation discusses the questions in the Indicator 3C Self-Review Summary Report, including discussion of each IDEA disability category.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Pairs with Self-Review Summary Report in District and School Tools. Available in both PDF and mp4 (video). The video is also posted on YouTube.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources from Professional Organizations</td>
<td>National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) disproportionality paper</td>
<td>C. Evans &amp; C. Domaleski, Guidance for Examining Disproportionality of Student Group Participation in Alternate Assessments, January 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources from Professional Organizations</td>
<td>NCEO Guidance on Alternate Assessment Participation Data</td>
<td>NCEO, Guidance for Examining District Alternate Assessment Participation Rates, October 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources from Professional Organizations</td>
<td>Ohio NCEO Alternate Assessment Presentation</td>
<td>Presented at a national convening on alternate assessment, Ohio shared our work analyzing data and providing support to districts and community schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources from Professional Organizations</td>
<td>Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) Videos</td>
<td>DLM assessment consortium, funded in part by the US Department of Education, provides two videos that are helpful for discussion of the meaning of “significant” in relation to cognitive disabilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>These videos are between five and six minutes long.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folder</td>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Supported By</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training PowerPoints</td>
<td>2019 Refresher Training for AASCD Test Administrators</td>
<td>This is the 2018-2019 Refresher Training PowerPoint for AASCD test administrators who have been previously trained.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training PowerPoints</td>
<td>Ohio Accessibility Training 2019</td>
<td>Designed to be adapted for local use. Presenters will need to add details to slides.</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training PowerPoints</td>
<td>Using the AASCD Companion Document March 2019</td>
<td>This is a PowerPoint developed by a committee of SST members and ODE. This document is a training for the Companion Document to Participation Guidelines for the Alternate Assessment and Decision-Making Flowchart that will assist individualized education programs (IEP) teams in making appropriate decisions regarding student participation in the Ohio’s Alternate Assessment for Student’s with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD)</td>
<td>Please contact the Office for Exceptional Children at <a href="mailto:AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov">AAParticipation@education.ohio.gov</a></td>
<td>Companion document is available in District and School Tools folder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ohio Department of Education

Office for Exceptional Children (OEC)

IDEA Monitoring Process
Wildwood Environmental Academy
Parent/Public Meeting
February 11, 2020- 5:00 to 6:00 PM
Components of Monitoring Process

• Information from public meeting, written comments and individual meetings

• Review of randomly selected student records

• Interviews of staff (regular and special education), special education directors and administrators

• Written Summary Report

• Implementation of the district-developed Strategic Improvement Plan
Ground Rules

• Complete the “Request to Speak” form and return to OEC staff.
• The facilitator will recognize one speaker at a time.
• Direct comments to the OEC facilitator.
• Focus your response on operation or performance of the special education program and not individual staff and/or students.
• Be concise.
• Adhere to time limits.
Submitting Written Comments

1. Mail to:
Office for Exceptional Children
Ohio Department of Education
25 South Front Street, Mail Stop 409
Columbus, Ohio 43215-4183; or
2. Fax Raymond McCain at 614-728-1097; or
3. E-mail Raymond McCain at Raymond.McCain@education.ohio.gov

All written comments submitted must be received by 5 p.m. on March 12, 2020.
Handling Concerns

• Discuss your concerns with your child’s teacher.
• If not resolved at that level, talk with the building principal to seek resolution.
• If not resolved with the principal, contact the district’s special education department.
Alternative Dispute Resolution

• Mediation – a neutral third party works with the district and the parents to reach consensus on a variety of issues;

• Facilitation – a neutral third party works with the IEP team or the evaluation team to reach consensus.
Dispute Resolution
Contact Information

The Office for Exceptional Children

(614) 752-1404 Sandy Kaufman
(614) 466-0946 Heather Clingerman
-or-
Toll-free at (877) 644-6338.

OECMediationFacilitation@education.ohio.gov
SST Contact Information

Region: State Support Team 1
Name: Laura Low
Email: escleww_lw@sstr1.org
Phone: (419) 720-8999 x153
Other Supports

The Ohio Coalition for the Education of Children with Disabilities
(Ohio’s Parent Information Center)
Toll-free (800) 374-2806
ATTENTION PARENTS

Notice of Public Meeting

Wildwood Environmental Academy
Special Education Program

Wildwood Environmental Academy has been selected by the Ohio Department of Education, Office for Exceptional Children (OEC), for a review of its special education program. OEC will be in the district on February 11 and 12, 2020 to complete this review.

OEC is asking parents, guardians and other members of the public to share their views on Wildwood Environmental Academy’s special education program. OEC staff will be at the Henthorne Cafeteria to take public comments on February 11, 2020 from 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

If you would like to provide comments in writing, please email Raymond McCain at Raymond.McCain@education.ohio.gov. If you have questions regarding the onsite review, please call Raymond McCain at (614) 752-1298 or send your questions to the above email address.

Please Note: Comments made in the meeting do not constitute a formal complaint. For information regarding your rights and the formal complaint process, contact the Office for Exceptional Children at 614-752-1404. Information shared, either in writing or during the public meeting, will be considered during the review process, but may not be included in OEC’s summary report to the district.
SY 18-19

Question 8

Alternate Assessment – only required for those identified as significantly exceeding the 1.00% threshold as identified in the 2018-2019 Special Education Profile. (CCIP Label)

How is implementation of the Corrective Action Plan guiding IEP teams to review the appropriate assignment of students to the Alternate Assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey level</th>
<th>Who sees the question</th>
<th>Who answers question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question Level</td>
<td>All traditional districts and Community Schools</td>
<td>Significantly exceeding the 1% threshold, as identified in the 2018-2019 Special Education Profile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SY 19-20

Alternate Assessment – only required for those identified as significantly exceeding the 1% threshold, as identified in the 2018-2019 Special Education Profile. (CCIP Label - after the release of Special Education Profile - November 2019)

How is implementation of the Corrective Action Plan guiding IEP teams to review the appropriate assignment of students to the Alternate Assessment?

Question Level

What action steps does the district or community school need to take to improve the implementation of the corrective action plan?

Question Level
Ohio Statewide Testing and Students with Disabilities
Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

November 6, 2019
9:00 AM – 4:00 PM
Quest Business Center – Polaris Room

Spring 2020 AASCD 2.0
- Test Design
- AASCD 2.0 Training 2020-2021 and beyond
- Learning Characteristics Inventory (LCI) Survey
- Paper Accommodation Testing
  - Differences Between Paper Accommodations
  - Ordering Paper Accommodations
- 2.0 Manuals Overview
- Test Window Dates/Reporting Timeline
  - Change to Administration Window
  - Item Data Review
  - Standard Setting
  - State Board Approval
  - Release of Scores in ORS
- Score Report Mockups

1% Cap
- Decision Making Tool
- Justification webinar
- Data story slides
- Tier 3 and Tier 2 districts (Videos and ?)
- Ohio 1% Waiver Extension

Alt-ELPA
Graduation Requirements
General Testing

DIAMOND tool
Alternate Assessment 2019-2020

- Justifications
- Participation
- AASCD 2.0

Andrew Hinkle | Virginia Ressa
District Justifications

• Districts expecting to exceed 1 percent must submit a justification to the Department.

• The Department must provide oversight and support to districts exceeding 1 percent participation.

• The Department must make district justifications available to the public.
559 districts and community schools exceeded the 1 percent threshold. That’s still almost 2/3 of all Ohio districts and community schools.

31 traditional districts had participation rates over 3 percent.

631 districts and community schools submitted justifications.
Submitting District Justifications

• Submit a justification if you anticipate exceeding the 1.0 percent threshold

• Sample form is available on the Department’s website

• Submission will be done through the K-12 Help Desk
  – Superintendents will receive the link through email
  – K-12 Help Desk at support@ohio-k12.help

• Deadline: TBD (Late January?)
Submitting District Justifications

- Now includes Science
- New requirement for disability type
- More streamlined
## Completing participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count of students taking English language arts alternate assessment</td>
<td>Count of all students tested in English language arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Average 2018-2019</td>
<td>17,591</td>
<td>1,035,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 2016-2017</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 2017-2018</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual 2018-2019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2019-2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Science calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Count of students taking science alternate assessment</th>
<th>Count of all students tested in science</th>
<th>Percentage of all students taking Science alternate assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Average 2018-2019</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>393,756</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2019-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Calculating percent participation

- When calculating participation in a content area, use participation data from Ohio’s State Tests in grades 3-8 and the end-of-course exams students take this year, plus any grade-level AASCD in the content area.
- Include ALL students counted within the district even if they are served outside of the district.
- Do not include any student retaking a high school test. Do not count 3rd grade students twice.
- Alternate Assessment / ALL students X 100 = %participation
## State AASCD Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Alternate Assessment Participation

State-level Rates for AA-AAAS Reading in 2016-17
Total Reported Participants by School Year

- 2006-07: 17,160
- 2007-08: 17,894
- 2008-09: 17,822
- 2009-10: 16,959
- 2010-11: 16,628
- 2011-12: 16,603
- 2012-13: 16,681
- 2013-14: 17,794
- 2014-15: 18,586
- 2015-16: 18,825
- 2016-17: 19,280
- 2017-18: 19,017
- 2018-19: 18,624
Students Participating in Ohio’s Assessments

- Students without disabilities: 86.20%
- Students with disabilities not alternate assessment: 13.00%
- Alternate Assessment: 1.80%
Goal

To ensure the right students are receiving the right services and taking the right assessments in the right environments
Determining Eligibility
Determining Eligibility

1. Identifiable Disability?  
   - No: General Assessment
   - Yes:
     2. Most Significant Cognitive Disability?  
        - No: General Assessment
        - Yes:
          3. Learning content linked to Extended Standards?  
             - No: General Assessment
             - Yes:
               4. Extensive and Substantial Support and Instruction?  
                  - No: General Assessment
                  - Yes:
                    5. Eligible for the AASCD

Ohio Department of Education
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

• Disability or multiple disabilities
• Significantly impacts intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior
• Individualized instruction and substantial supports
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

• Skills learned in one setting may not be demonstrated across other settings.
• Layers of adapted tools, scaffolds, prompts and cues are required to practice, learn and demonstrate skills.
• Prior AASCD data shows results across all content areas below the proficient range.
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

- Skills demonstrated at one time may not be demonstrated consistently over time – as if the skill were lost.

- Formative measures show consistent achievement within the “Engagement” range of skills and grade-level extended standards and learning progressions across all content areas.
Adaptive Behavior

• Explicit, sequential, direct instruction needed across all adaptive behavior skills within all domains that are integrated into the IEP and the general curriculum.

  Adaptive behavior domains include:
  ➢ conceptual skills/communication,
  ➢ social skills,
  ➢ practical/daily living skills.
Pie Chart from Leadership Conference?

• If we get the pie chart from the conference we won’t need the red bar graph.
Percent of Children with Disabilities by Category

- Visual Impairment *: 0.4
- Traumatic Brain Injury: 0.6
- Speech or Language Impairment **: 11.2
- Specific Learning Disabilities **: 41.3
- Other Health Impairments *: 15.9
- Orthopedic Impairment *: 0.6
- Multiple Disabilities: 5.5
- Intellectual Disability: 8.8
- Hearing Impairment *: 0.8
- Emotional Disturbance **: 6.6
- Deaf-Blindness: 0.01
- Autism: 8.3
Percent of Children with Disabilities by Category

- Autism
- Hearing Impairment *
- Orthopedic Impairment *
- Speech or Language Impairment **
- Deaf-Blindness
- Intellectual Disability
- Other Health Impairments *
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Emotional Disturbance **
- Multiple Disabilities
- Specific Learning Disabilities **
- Visual Impairment *

Specific Learning Disabilities **, 41.3
Other Health Impairments *, 15.9
Speech or Language Impairment **, 11.2
Autism, 8.3
Intellectual Disability, 8.8
Multiple Disabilities, 5.5
Emotional Disturbance **, 6.6
H... I... T... V...
IDEA Disability Categories

- Specific Learning Disability
- Other Health Impairment
- Speech/Language Impairment
- Intellectual Disability
- Autism
- Emotional Disturbance
- Multiple Disability
- Hearing Impaired
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Orthopedic Impairment
- Visually Impaired
- Deaf/Blind
- Developmental Delay*
Disability Categories Consistent with Significant Cognitive Disability

- Intellectual Disability
- Autism
- Multiple Disability
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Deaf/Blind
Students Participating in Ohio’s Assessments

- **100%**
- **15.5%**
- **3.6%**
- **1%**

- All Students
- All Students with Disabilities
- All students identified with Multiple Disabilities, Intellectual Disabilities, Autism, Traumatic Brain Injury or Deaf-blindness
- Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities
Total Reported Participants by School Year

- 2006-07: 17,160
- 2007-08: 17,894
- 2008-09: 17,822
- 2009-10: 16,959
- 2010-11: 16,628
- 2011-12: 16,603
- 2012-13: 16,881
- 2013-14: 18,794
- 2014-15: 18,586
- 2015-16: 18,825
- 2016-17: 19,280
- 2017-18: 19,017
- 2018-19: 18,624
- ESSA Cap: 13,000
## Companion to Participation Guidelines and Decision-Making Flowchart

**Directions:** Review a student’s IEP and related documents to answer each question. Mark the column that best answers the question.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the student have a current IEP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NO.</strong> Stop here. The student is not eligible for alternate assessment</td>
<td><strong>YES.</strong> Continue evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Does the data review provide evidence of significant cognitive disability (a person’s ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly and learn from experience)?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Presence of disability documented no evidence that a cognitive disability interferes with</td>
<td>[ ] Documentation shows the learner may have benchmark and diagnostic data that show a wide skill gap in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Evidence that a cognitive disability interferes with learning grade-level skills and concepts. Goals and</td>
<td>[ ] Evidence that a cognitive disability significantly interferes with learning grade-level skills and concepts. Presence of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation is NOT based on

• Percent of time receiving special education
• English Learner status
• Low reading/achievement level
• Disruptive behavior
• Student scores on accountability
• Administrator decision
• Emotional duress
• Need for accommodations to participate
Participation is NOT based on:

- Disability category or label
- Poor attendance
- Extended absences
- Native language
- Social/cultural/economic differences
- Academic/services received
- Educational/instructional setting or Least Restrictive Environment
AASCD 2.0

• Grade level
• Paper accommodations
• Training
• High School testing variable
• Text to Speech
• Learning Characteristics Inventory
Questions?
Let’s stay connected!

Office of Assessment
614-466-1317
Andrew Hinkle
Andrew.Hinkle@education.ohio.gov
Virginia Ressa
Virginia.Ressa@education.ohio.gov
Let’s stay connected!

Questions about calculating participation: accountability@education.ohio.gov

Questions about completing the justification and other questions about the 1 percent participation threshold: AAperticipation@education.ohio.gov
Resources

http://education.ohio.gov

_Keyword search: alternate assessment_
Share your learning community with us!
#MyOhioClassroom

Celebrate educators!
#OhioLovesTeachers
AGENDA

9:00 a.m.  Call to Order  
- Roll Call
- Welcome and Introductions  

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

Sandy Kaufman,  
Education Program Specialist,  
Office for Exceptional Children

9:10 a.m.  Panel Business  
Approval of SAPEC Meeting Minutes – September 26, 2019  

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

9:15 a.m.  Public Comment and Unmet Needs  
Opportunity for non-SAPEC members to comment on agenda items. Panel members may present emerging issues or unmet needs.  

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

9:25 a.m.  SAPEC Chairperson’s Report  
- December SAPEC meeting cancelled  
- Update on SAPEC applications received and letter of interest for member-at-large  
- Other  

Bonnie Brown, Chairperson,  
Membership and Elections Committee

9:30 a.m.  Office for Exceptional Children’s Report  
- Rule revision update  
- Ohio’s Special Education Profiles & Ratings  
- Disproportionality calculation and timelines  

Monica Drvota,  
Interim Associate Director,  
Office for Exceptional Children

Matt Loesch, Social Science Research Specialist,  
Office for Exceptional Children

Virginia Ressa,  
Education Program Specialist,  
Office for Exceptional Children

10:00 a.m.  Ohio’s Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities - SWD Roadmap  
OEC staff will provide an update on Ohio’s Plan to Improve Learning Experiences and Outcomes for Students with Disabilities. Recommendations developed by the four workgroups will be discussed.  

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

Kelly Barger,  
Education Program Specialist,  
Office for Exceptional Children
10:35 a.m.  

Break  

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

10:45 a.m.  

Small Group Discussion (Information Items¹)  
Participants will respond to guiding questions and will be asked to share highlights of their discussions.

Each group should assign the following roles:  
Facilitator: ensure that everyone participates in the discussion at your table.  
Recorder: take notes for the group and submit them to OEC staff.  
Timekeeper: monitors the discussion time.

Kelly Barger,  
Education Program Specialist,  
Office for Exceptional Children

11:45 a.m.  

Brief Reports  
Participants will be asked to share highlights of the table discussions.

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

11:55 a.m.  

SAPEC Learning or Information Items¹  
Tiers not Tears: A Tiered Approach to Mental Health in Schools  
The Governor of Ohio has provided funding to districts and schools to promote student wellness and success. These funds can be spent on 11 different initiatives. One of which is mental health. This presentation is being shared with district and schools teams, and community partners to help build better mental health supports in schools.

Emily Jordan,  
Education Program Specialist,  
Office of Integrated Student Supports

12:55 p.m.  

Agency Reports and Member Announcements  
Agency representatives have an opportunity to report on program initiatives, resources, and collaborative activities that are of interest to SAPEC members.

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

1:00 p.m.  

Closing Comments  
Motion to Adjourn  
Complete and submit evaluation

Ron Rogers,  
SAPEC Chairperson

¹ Information sharing and discussion of background information on new issues presented by OEC staff and/or other resource persons.
² Presentation of items introduced during a previous meeting that require action by SAPEC members.
³ Informal discussion where SAPEC members identify and present “unmet needs and emerging issues” for discussion during SAPEC meetings.
Ohio Alternate Assessment Train the Trainer
Meeting Agenda

November 7, 2019
9:00 AM – 4:00 PM
Quest Business Center – Scarlett/Gray/Buckeye

9:00 AM
Welcome, Introductions and Housekeeping

Part 1: Spring 2020 AASCD 2.0 Training PowerPoint Presentation
  • Introduction to AASCD 2.0
  • Participation Guidelines
  • Test Design
  • Administrator Roles and Requirements
  • AASCD Portal and Resources
  • Pre-Identifying Students
  • Demonstration on Administering the AASCD 2.0 Online Tests

LUNCH (on your own)

Part 2: Spring 2020 AASCD 2.0 Training PowerPoint Presentation
  • Accommodation Policies
  • Demonstration on Administering the AASCD 2.0 Supplemental Tests
  • Walkthrough of Paper Accommodation Testing
  • Data Entry Interface
  • Ordering, Receiving and Returning Materials
  • Test Security
  • Learning Characteristics Inventory (LCI)
  • Participation Reports
  • Conclusion
Panel Members

Matt Loesch
- Social Science Research Specialist
  Ohio Department of Education

Virginia Ressa
- Program Specialist
  Ohio Department of Education
What are Special Education Profiles?
Special Education Profiles

- Created annually for each district and community school
- Display performance over time on key indicators measuring services and outcomes for students with disabilities
- Notify the district of any **required activities** for compliance indicators and survey indicators
**Accessing District Profiles**

- Districts access the Special Education Ratings & Profiles on the OHID home page menu:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Web Applications</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AYP 2012</strong></td>
<td>AYP 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCIP</strong></td>
<td>Comprehensive Continuous Improvement Planning Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaboration Center</strong></td>
<td>Content Sharing and Work Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SES</strong></td>
<td>Supplementary Educational Service Providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SFPS</strong></td>
<td>School Foundation Payment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Education Profiles &amp; Ratings</strong></td>
<td>Districts' Annual Special Education Profiles and Special Education Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STARS V2.0</strong></td>
<td>STARS Professional Development and Technical Assistance System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Accessing Ratings & Profiles

**Winton Woods City School District**

**Reports Menu**

**Special Education Profile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Data Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-19 Special Education Profile</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Special Education Rating**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Data Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017-18 Special Education Rating</td>
<td>9/7/2018</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2017-18 Special Education Profile
- 2016-17 Special Education Profile
- 2015-16 Special Education Profile
- 2014-15 Special Education Rating

**IRN:** 044081  
**User:** matthew.toesch@education.ohio.gov

*Ohio Department of Education*
## Accessing Profiles

### Special Education Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Data Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2018-19 Special Education Profile</strong></td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
<td>2017-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2017-18 Special Education Profile**
- **2016-17 Special Education Profile**
- **2015-16 Special Education Profile**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Education Profiles</th>
<th>Special Education Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning of monitoring data cycle</td>
<td>End of the monitoring data cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Display longitudinal data in graphical format</td>
<td>Display only one year of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include all results and compliance indicators</td>
<td>Include a subset of results and compliance indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify districts of any required actions for the year</td>
<td>Indicators are scored based on completion of required actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are young children with disabilities entering kindergarten ready to learn?
- Indicator 6  Preschool Educational Environments
- Indicator 7  Preschool Outcomes
- Indicator 12 Early Childhood Transition from Part C to Part B

Are children with disabilities achieving at high levels?
- Indicator 3  Statewide Assessment
- Indicator 4  Suspension/Expulsion
- Indicator 5  School-age Educational Environments

Are youth with disabilities prepared for life, work and postsecondary education?
- Indicator 1  Graduation
- Indicator 2  Dropout
- Indicator 13 Secondary Transition
- Indicator 14 Postsecondary Outcomes

Does the district implement IDEA to improve services and results for children with disabilities?
- Indicator 8  Facilitated Parent Involvement
- Indicator 11  Child Find
- Indicator 15 Timely Correction of Noncompliance Findings
- Indicator 20 Timely and Accurate Data
Are children receiving equitable services and supports?

- Disproportionality: Identification
- Disproportionality: Placement
- Disproportionality: Discipline

Adding to Disproportionality
## Results & Compliance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance Indicators</th>
<th>Results Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on district’s performance in relation to an established target</td>
<td>Based on district’s performance in relation to an established target (set with SAPEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings with associated required actions are issued</td>
<td>No formal findings are issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for these indicators require individual correction and self-review summary report, an improvement plan, and systemic correction within one year of a finding being issued.</strong></td>
<td>No correction is required on these indicators, yet districts are encouraged to use the data to ensure future improvement and work with their State Support Team (SST) to improve outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicators Requiring Action by Districts

- Indicator 3c (AASCD Reading and Math; Proficiency Reading and Math)
- Indicators 4a & 4b (Discipline Discrepancy)
- Indicators 9 & 10 (Disproportionality)
- Indicator 11 (Initial Evaluations)
- Indicator 12 (Early Childhood Transition)
- Indicator 13 (Secondary Transition Planning)
- Indicator 15 (Timely Correction)
- Disproportionality: All categories (Identification, Placement, Discipline)

Compliance with submitting surveys:
- Indicator 8 (Parent Involvement)
- Indicator 14 (Postschool Outcomes)
Today’s Focus: Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

Are children with disabilities achieving at high levels?

- Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment
- Indicator 4: Suspension/Expulsion
- Indicator 5: School-age Educational Environments

Are children with disabilities achieving at high levels?
Goal

To ensure the right students are receiving the right services and taking the right assessments in the right environments
Students Participating in Ohio’s Assessments

- 86.20% Students without disabilities
- 13.00% Students with disabilities not alternate assessment
- 1.80% Alternate Assessment
Alternate Assessment Monitoring

- Goal is to **reduce participation to 1% or fewer of Ohio’s students**
- Districts are identified for **tier three support** based upon:
  - Participation rate
  - Significant increase in participation
  - Justification form content
  - Failure to submit a justification
  - Failure to submit accurate data
- **Required actions** include:
  - Completing a root cause analysis
  - Creating an improvement plan
  - Reporting on improvement efforts
# Ohio AASCD Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>1.75%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
<td>-0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 3: Statewide Assessment

**ESSENTIAL QUESTION 2 - ARE CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES ACHIEVING AT HIGH LEVELS?**

| Indicator 3b: Reading Participation Rate | Target: 98.00% or greater | Result: 96.77% | Not Met |
| Indicator 3b: Math Participation Rate | Target: 98.00% or greater | Result: 97.07% | Not Met |

**MORE INFORMATION**

| Participation in Reading Alternate Assessments | Target: Less than or equal to 1.00% | Result: 3.98% | Not Met |
| Participation in Math Alternate Assessments | Target: Less than or equal to 1.00% | Result: 4.39% | Not Met |

**MORE INFORMATION**

| Indicator 3c: Reading Proficiency Rate | Target: 24.68% or greater | Result: 29.66% | Met |
| Indicator 3c: Math Proficiency Rate | Target: 29.00% or greater | Result: 29.59% | Met |

**MORE INFORMATION**

| Indicator 4a: Discipline Discrepancy - Expulsion | Target: less than 1.00% | Result: NR | NR |
| Indicator 4a: Discipline Discrepancy - Suspension | Target: less than 1.00% | Result: 0.06% | Met |
### Participation in Alternate Assessment

**Description:** Percentage of students participating in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities in reading.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year:</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>≤1.00%</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>3.72%</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result:</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## AASCD Required Actions

### Action Statement:
**Indicator 3b Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD)**

**Required Action:** Your district is significantly exceeding the 1.00% threshold of students taking the AASCD and must complete a Self-Review Summary Report, an Improvement Plan, and submit documentation of SST training.

### Indicator 3b AASCD Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Review Summary Report</th>
<th>District Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A district significantly exceeding the threshold for Indicator 3b AASCD must conduct and complete a Self-Review Summary Report with the district team and with SST support to identify root causes for the high number of students taking the AASCD.</td>
<td>1) Submit to OEC the <strong>Indicator 3b AASCD - Self-Review Summary Report</strong> completed with the district team and SST support, focusing on root causes for the high number of students taking the AASCD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Improvement Plan | Improvement Plan, developed with the district team and with SST support, based on the root cause analysis conducted in the Self-Review Summary Report. The district must attend SST training regarding eligibility for the AASCD. | 1) Submit to OEC an **Improvement Plan**, developed with the district team and with SST support, based on the root cause analysis conducted in your Self-Review Summary Report. 2) Schedule and attend SST trainings regarding eligibility for the AASCD. |

| Verification of Training | The district must submit documentation of SST training. | 1) Submit to OEC documentation of SST training (sign-in sheets, agendas, etc.). |

---
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District Required Actions

1) Submit to OEC the *Indicator 3b AASCD - Self-Review Summary Report* completed with the district team and SST support, focusing on root causes for the high number of students taking the AACSD.
Summary of Analysis:

A. Do IEP teams utilize the alternate assessment decision making framework and companion document?  

B. If not, how do IEP teams decide which students are eligible for participating in the alternate assessment?  

C. How do IEP teams confirm that students identified for the alternate assessment have a disability that significantly impacts intellectual functioning?  

D. How do IEP teams confirm that students who are placed on the alternate assessment have adaptive behavior skills assessments and/or goals included in their IEPs?
Self-Review: Staff Training

Summary of Analysis:

A. How often are staff trained on alternate assessment participation criteria?

B. Who receives this training?

C. Who provides the training?

D. What professional learning opportunities are available to address meeting the needs of diverse learners?

E. What coaching or supports are provided as follow-up to district professional learning?
Self-Review: Family Involvement

Summary of Analysis:

A. How does the district ensure that parents are part of the IEP team decision for alternate assessment eligibility?

B. What is district practice for discussing alternate assessment with parents in relation to post-secondary outcomes for students at all grade levels?

C. How does the district document this conversation with the parent?
Self-Review: Student Data

A. A

B. Students identified with the disability categories listed below will very rarely meet the criteria to qualify for participation in alternate assessment. For each disability:

D. Explore each category’s data separately for possible commonalities, patterns or trends (building, grade level, teacher, school psychologist, receiving services outside the district, other): 

E. Now, compare the data of both categories and identify commonalities, patterns or trends: 

F. What other factors within the district may be causing a higher number of students being alternately assessed (enrollment changes, expansion of services, other)? 

C. Of the disabilities that have the largest number of students participating in the Alternate Assessment? 

Ohio Department of Education
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

- Disability or multiple disabilities
- Significantly impacts intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior
- Individualized instruction and substantial supports
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

• Skills learned in one setting may not be demonstrated across other settings.
• Layers of adapted tools, scaffolds, prompts and cues are required to practice, learn and demonstrate skills.
• Prior AASCD data shows results across all content areas below the proficient range.
Most Significant Cognitive Disability

• Skills demonstrated at one time may not be demonstrated consistently over time – as if the skill were lost.
• Formative measures show consistent achievement within the “Engagement” range of skills and grade-level extended standards and learning progressions across all content areas.
IDEA Disability Categories

- Specific Learning Disability
- Other Health Impairment
- Speech/Language Impairment
- Intellectual Disability
- Autism
- Emotional Disturbance
- Multiple Disability

- Hearing Impaired
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Orthopedic Impairment
- Visually Impaired
- Deaf/Blind
- Developmental Delay*
Disability Categories Most Consistent with Significant Cognitive Disability

- Intellectual Disability
- Autism
- Multiple Disability
- Traumatic Brain Injury
- Deaf/Blind
Summary of Analysis:

A. Are participation rates different for certain subgroups (e.g. black, Hispanic, Asian, white, English learners, economically disadvantaged) as compared to other subgroups?  

B. Viewing alternate assessment participation by subgroup over time (i.e., three years) are there trends evident that show participation of a subgroup increasing or decreasing?  

C. Are general education teachers and intervention specialists encouraged to use culturally responsive curricula and evidence-based practices for English learners in their classrooms?
Participation is NOT based on:

• Percent of time receiving special education
• English Learner status
• Low reading/achievement level
• Disruptive behavior
• Student scores on accountability
• Administrator decision
• Emotional duress
• Need for accommodations to participate
Participation is NOT based on:

- Disability category or label
- Poor attendance
- Extended absences
- Native language
- Social/cultural/economic differences
- Academic/services received
- Educational/instructional setting or least restrictive environment
## AASCD Required Actions

**Action Statement:**
**Indicator 3b Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD)**

**Required Action:** Your district is significantly exceeding the 1.00% threshold of students taking the AASCD and must complete a Self-Review Summary Report, an Improvement Plan, and submit documentation of SST training.

### Indicator 3b AASCD Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Review Summary Report</th>
<th>District Required Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A district significantly exceeding the threshold for Indicator 3b AASCD must conduct and complete a Self-Review Summary Report with the district team and with SST support to identify root causes for the high number of students taking the AASCD.</td>
<td>1) Submit to OEC the <a href="#">Indicator 3b AASCD - Self-Review Summary Report</a> completed with the district team and SST support, focusing on root causes for the high number of students taking the AASCD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Plan</th>
<th>1) Submit to OEC an <a href="#">Improvement Plan</a>, developed with the district team and with SST support, based on the root cause analysis conducted in the Self-Review Summary Report. The district must attend SST training regarding eligibility for the AASCD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verification of Training</td>
<td>1) Submit to OEC documentation of SST training (sign-in sheets, agendas, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Ohio Department of Education](#)
AASCD Required Actions

1) Submit to OEC an *Improvement Plan*, developed with the district team and with SST support, based on the root cause analysis conducted in your Self-Review Summary Report.
Improvement Plan

Office for Exceptional Children

District: 
IRN: 
SST Region: 

Area of Improvement or Correction:

Summary - Baseline Data and Potential Influence (Root Cause):

Goal:

Activity:

Resources Needed:

Individual Responsible for Ensuring Implementation:
Improvement Plan

Office for Exceptional Children

Improvement Plan

District

IRN

SST Region

Area of Improvement or Correction
Special Education Indicators (specify Indicator): Indicator 3b AASCD

Summary - Baseline Data and Potential Influence (Root Cause)
A Self-Review Summary Report was completed which indicated the root cause may be the lack of training for general education teachers and intervention specialists that do not administer the AASCD and lack of documentation to track participation in AASCD.

Goal
The district will ensure that only students with the most severe cognitive disabilities will participate in the AASCD by increasing teacher professional development and will decrease Participation in Alternate Assessment by 2% by Spring 2021.
Improvement Plan

Goal
The district will ensure that only students with the most severe cognitive disabilities will participate in the AASCD by increasing teacher professional development and will decrease Participation in Alternate Assessment by 2% by Spring 2021.

Activity
The district will host professional development to increase IEP team members knowledge on how to utilize additional student data and resources in the process of determining if a student is appropriate for the AASCD.

Resources Needed
1. Professional development and technical assistance from the SST
2. Companion to Participation Guidelines and Decision Making Flowchart
3. Diagnostic assessment
4. Formative academic assessment data
5. Assistive skills checklist
6. Assistive technology evaluation
7. Speech and language assessments
8. Progress on functional, daily living and like skills standards
9. Benchmark academic data
10. AASCD Participation Criteria

Individual Responsible for Ensuring Implementation
School Principal

Individual Responsible for Supervision of Implementation
Director of Special Programs
Improvement Plan

Goal
The district will ensure that only students with the most severe cognitive disabilities will participate in the AASCD by increasing teacher professional development and will decrease Participation in Alternate Assessment by 2% by Spring 2021.

Activity
The district will host professional development to increase IEP team members knowledge on how to utilize additional student data and resources in the process of determining if a student is appropriate for the AASCD.

Evidence of Activity Completed
1. Professional development sign-in sheet and agenda
2. Companion to Participation Guidelines and Decision Making Flowchart for every student

Evidence of Improvement (Impact)
Reduction in the percentage of students taking the alternative assessment by at least 0.5% by next school year
Improvement Plan

Office for Exceptional Children

Improvement Plan

District: __________________________ IRN: __________________________ SST Region: __________________________

Address: __________________________

City: __________________________ State: ______ Zip Code: __________________________

Superintendent: __________________________

E-mail Address: __________________________

Phone: __________________________

Superintendent Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________

Special Education Contact: __________________________

E-Mail Address: __________________________

Phone: __________________________

SST Consultant Signature: __________________________ Date: __________________________
Resources for Assistance

Resource: Indicator Manual for AASCD
• Great resource to walk through step by step everything we talked about
• AASCD section included with presentation

Resource: OEC Program Specialists
• Profiles show a program specialist assigned to assist each district
• AAparticipation@education.ohio.gov
Join the Conversation

facebook: OHEducation

twitter: @OHEducation  @OHEducationSupt

instagram: OHEducation

youtube: OhioEdDept

education.ohio.gov/text
Check Out the Ohio Department of Education Mobile App!

- Get the latest education news right on your mobile phone.
- Search Ohio School Report Cards.
- Send information from the Ohio School Report Cards to friends, family and colleagues.

Ohio Department of Education
Download on
SST Directors

Andrew Hinkle | Oct. 07, 2020
Topics

- Testing
- Graduation
- Alternate Assessment
Ohio State Tests

Fall Testing

Spring Testing
Alternate Assessment

Spring 2020

Spring 2021: Feb. 2 – Mar. 19
Graduation

Graduation Flexibility: Alternate Assessment

IEP excusal – 2023

Federal graduation rate
Graduation

Students with Disabilities Who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma
2017-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>≥ 79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70 – 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflects the additional options provided to all students, not just students with disabilities.

35%  31%  50%

2018  2019  2020
Percent of SWD Graduating with Regular Diploma

2016 State Determinations

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Regular Statewide Assessment Participation

Students with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Alternate Assessment Participation

State-level Rates for AA-AAAS Reading in 2016-17
# Participation in Alternate Assessment by Content Area Across Years (EdFacts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>1.93%</td>
<td>- 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
<td>1.99%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>- 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>- 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Reported Participants by School Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>17,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>17,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>17,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>16,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>16,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>16,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>16,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>17,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>18,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>18,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>19,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>19,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>18,624</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Reported Participants by School Year

Participants: 17,160 17,894 17,822 16,959 16,628 16,603 16,681 17,794 18,586 18,825 19,280 19,017 18,624 10,000
Ohio Numbers for School Year 2018-2019

~ 912,000 Total Test Takers in English Language Arts

~145,000 Students with Disabilities (15.91%)

~30,000 Students with Applicable Conditions (3.33%)

~17,600 AA Test Takers (1.93%)

1% Cap: ~9,100
AA Rate for Reading by District, SY 2019

Alternate Assessment Rate - Reading
- < 1.00%
- 1.00 - 1.99%
- 2.00 - 2.99%
- 3.00% +
AA Rate for Reading by District, SY 2019
# District Size and Participation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Test Takers</th>
<th>Traditional Districts</th>
<th>Average AA Rate</th>
<th>Districts with AA Rate of 1.0% +</th>
<th>Districts with AA Rate of 2.0% +</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 500</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,499</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-2,999</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-4,999</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternate Assessment Participation Rate by Number of Test Takers in District (N < 5000)**

![Graph showing participation rate by number of test takers in district](image)
### District Type

#### Statewide Distribution of Alternate Assessment Test Takers by Accountable District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Type</th>
<th>Participation Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Districts</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Town Districts</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core City Districts</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Districts</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Urban Districts</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Only</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Alternate Assessment Participation Rate

- Core City: 3.27
- Other Urban: 2.32
- Suburban: 1.45
- Small Town: 1.66
- Rural: 1.85
- Community Schools: 2.13
- State Only: 2.62
## District Distribution by Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AA Rate - Reading</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Pct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1.00</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.99</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 2.99</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 to 3.99</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 to 4.99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00 to 5.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disability Condition

Statewide Share of Alternate Assessment Test Takers

- Multiple Disabilities: 32.5%
- Intellectual Disabilities: 32.2%
- Autism: 24.6%
- Other Health Impaired -Minor: 3.9%
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 2.5%
- Traumatic Brain Injury: 1.5%
- Emotional Disturbance: 1.2%
- Other Health Impaired -Major: 0.5%
- Orthopedic Impairments: 0.4%
- Deafness: 0.3%
- Visual Impairments: 0.2%
- Deaf-Blindness: 0.1%
- Speech & Language Impair.: 0.0%

Participation Rate

- Multiple Disabilities: 94.32%
- Intellectual Disabilities: 47.58%
- Autism: 37.29%
- Other Health Impaired -Minor: 2.37%
- Specific Learning Disabilities: 0.65%
- Traumatic Brain Injury: 32.99%
- Emotional Disturbance: 2.23%
- Other Health Impaired -Major: 31.15%
- Orthopedic Impairments: 12.48%
- Deafness: 5.31%
- Visual Impairments: 6.13%
- Deaf-Blindness: 57.58%
- Speech & Language Impair.: 0.10%
Autism with Other Attributes

• Over one-third of students with Autism take the alternate assessment (37.29%)

• The participation rate is considerably higher for Autistic children who are also—
  ➢ Black: 54.38%,
  ➢ An English Language Learner: 48.92% or
  ➢ Enrolled in a Core City District: 50.87%
Race and Student Subgroups

Statewide Share of Test Takers by Race

- **Asian**: 2.5% (All Test Takers), 1.8% (AA Test Takers)
- **Black**: 16.6% (All Test Takers), 24.7% (AA Test Takers)
- **Hispanic**: 6.3% (All Test Takers), 5.7% (AA Test Takers)
- **Multiracial**: 5.3% (All Test Takers), 4.6% (AA Test Takers)
- **White**: 69.2% (All Test Takers), 63.0% (AA Test Takers)

Participation Rate by Race or Student Subgroup

- **American Indian**: 1.95
- **Asian**: 1.40
- **Black**: 2.88
- **Hispanic**: 1.75
- **Multiracial**: 1.68
- **Pacific Islander**: 2.18
- **White**: 1.76
- **English Learner**: 1.79
- **Economic Disadv.**: 2.56
- **Chronically Absent**: 3.42
What is 1%?
Tier 3 – Indicator 3c

• 83 Districts
  – 2018-2019 participation rates
  – Multi-year increase in participation
  – A spike of more than 1% participation
  – Failure to submit a justification
  – Failure to report EMIS data
  – Participation of disability atypical types
  – Information in justification form and recommendations.

• Self-review Summary report
• Tier 2
Self-review Summary Report

✓ Policies, Practices and Procedures
✓ Training for District Staff Regarding Alternate Assessment Eligibility
✓ Family Involvement
✓ Student Data Exploration
✓ Subgroup Disproportionality
Decision Making Tool

- Replaces Companion Document
- Required
- Does NOT change criteria
- Defines Criteria
Part A – Determining Initial Eligibility

• Does the student have a current IEP?

• Review the student’s IDEA category

Determining Initial Eligibility

1. Complete the first two questions to determine if the student may be eligible for participation.

Does the student have a current individualized education program (IEP)?

Yes, the student has a current IEP. Go to the next statement.

No, the student does not have an IEP. Proceed to the next statement.

Review the student’s Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) category.

If the student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:

- Specific Learning Disability Speech or Language Impairment (only)

Proceed to Part B.

If the student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:

- Autism
- Deaf-Blindness
- Intellectual Disability
- Multiple Disabilities
- Traumatic Brain Injury

A student identified with these disability categories very rarely will be a student with a most significant cognitive disability and therefore rarely, if ever, qualify for the alternate assessment.

Proceed to Part C.

Part C – Alternate Assessment

- For students identified with a disability category as specified above, the student must be provided with an alternate assessment.

- For students who do not meet state eligibility criteria, the student may be provided with an alternate assessment.

- For students who do not meet state eligibility criteria and are not provided with an alternate assessment, the student must be provided with a full and individualized education program (IEP) that addresses their unique needs.

Proceed to the next statement.
Part B – Determining Most Significant Cognitive Disability

Significant deficits in all three adaptive behavior domains

- Conceptual
- Social
- Practical
Part C – Determining extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports

Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment

Accommodations/Modifications

Assistive Technology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision made after reviewing the entire decision-making tool</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection of evidence in parts A, B and C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to participate NOT based solely on…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

Accommodation: Changes made to how a student accesses learning content, communication, environments, materials or assessments. Testing accommodations are adjustments to the testing conditions, test format or test administration that provide equitable access during assessments for students with disabilities and students who are English learners. Testing accommodations cannot change what is being measured.

Adaptive skills: Practical, everyday skills needed to function and meet the demands of one’s environment, including the skills necessary to effectively and independently take care of oneself and interact with other people (American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 2017).

Assistive technology: An assistive technology device is any item, piece of equipment or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified or customized, that is used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capabilities of a child with a disability. The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted or the replacement of that device (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004). Visit the Assistive Technology & Accessible Educational Materials Center for more information about assistive technology.

Assistive Technology Domains: There are thousands of assistive technology supports that might assist a student to access, participate and become more independent in a variety of school activities and tasks, including both low- and high-tech options. These supports are organized into more than 10 domains.

Assistive Technology Consideration in the IEP: Beginning with the reauthorization of IDEA in 1997, the IEP team is required to “consider” the assistive technology needs of every student receiving special education services. The Assistive Technology Considerations in the IEP document helps teams navigate this process.

Augmentative and alternative communication (AAC): Includes all forms of communication (other than speech) that are used to express thought, needs, wants and ideas (American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, 2017).
Decision Making Tool FAQ

► Organized by part (A, B, C, D)
► 27 questions
► 8 pages
Alternate Assessment Participation Disproportionality

- Step 1: Establish Participation Rate for Each Focal Group
- Step 2: Calculate the Test Statistic
  - Difference in Proportions
  - Risk Ratio
- Step 3: Determine if the Difference is Meaningful
Justifications

2019: 559/633

2020: 78/678

No justifications 2020-2021

Yes assurances 2020-2021
Other Resources Coming Soon

- Waiver request 2020-2021
- public comment
- Webinar
- Family FAQs
- Disproportionality Tool
**Start with the End in Mind**

The state's alternate assessment, based on alternate academic achievement standards, is meant for a very small number of children with significant cognitive disabilities. Although life after school seems a long time away, taking the alternate assessment instead of the general state test can affect your child's future.

![Graduation](image1)
**Graduation**

![Further Education and Training](image2)
**Further Education and Training**

![Military Service](image3)
**Military Service**

![Employment](image4)
**Employment**

**Five things to consider when making state test decisions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only children with the most significant cognitive disabilities can take the alternate state assessment.</td>
<td>Every year the IEP team should make the decision about which test your child will take.</td>
<td>IEP team members use the state's participation guidelines to decide whether your child should take the state alternate assessment or the state general assessment.</td>
<td>Everyone on the IEP team should agree that your child meets each of the state's participation criteria for taking the alternate assessment.</td>
<td>All children are taught academic content for their enrolled grade level. Students who take the alternate assessment may need content presented in reduced depth, breadth, or complexity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions?
Let’s stay connected!

Office of Assessment
614-466-1317

Wendy Stoica
Wendy.Stoica@education.ohio.gov
Resources

http://education.ohio.gov

Keyword search: alternate assessment
Share your learning community with us!
#MyOhioClassroom

Celebrate educators!
#OhioLovesTeachers
One Percent Waiver Extension Request
for
Reading, Mathematics and Science

ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D) and 34 CFR 200.6(c) and (d)

Addendum, Jan. 4, 2021
INTRODUCTION

This addendum is submitted to provide additional data to Ohio’s Nov. 4, 2020 request for a waiver extension for exceeding 1.0 student participation in the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities (AASCD). Included in this addendum are the revised Table 4 showing Ohio’s participation data by content area of reading, mathematics and science and comments received during the public comment period of Oct. 9-23, 2020.

Ohio’s assessment participation is calculated using data from the Department’s Education Management Information System (EMIS). This data includes high school assessments required for graduation in Ohio. Participation in the AASCD includes 10th graders taking reading, mathematics and science and 9-12 graders taking end of course assessments in reading, mathematics and science.

COMPONENT 2

Component two of Ohio’s one percent waiver extension request includes the percentage of students assessed using the Alternate Assessment for Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. Using the Department’s Education Management Information System (EMIS), Table 4 provides a credible estimate of the percentage of students who took an alternate assessment by content area in grades 3-8 and 10th grade for school year 2019-2020. Using this data set, the total participation rates in Ohio’s alternate assessments show 23,012 students and 1,274,059 students taking the general assessments with a total percentage of 1.81% of students taking the alternate assessment.

TABLE 4: Credible estimate of students who would have taken the alternate assessment in school year 2019-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Total Number of Alternate Students</th>
<th>Total Number of Standard Students</th>
<th>Total Percentage of Students taking Alternate Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>16,114</td>
<td>1,274,059</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>16,114</td>
<td>1,274,059</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>7,187</td>
<td>1,274,059</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23,012</td>
<td>1,274,059</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC COMMENT

Ohio’s One Percent Waiver Extension Request for Reading, Mathematics and Science
On Oct. 9, 2020, the Ohio Department of Education (Department) posted a Draft for Public Comment of its One Percent Waiver Extension Request for Reading, Mathematics and Science. An accompanying message invited citizens to use a posted survey to comment on the draft from then through Oct. 23, 2020. The Department also notified all district and community school superintendents, special education contacts and testing coordinators of the public comment opportunity through its e-newsletter, EdConnection, and through its email service, GovDelivery.

During the survey window, the Department received written comments from 9 respondents.

Summary of Comments
Comments included suggestions that students with significant cognitive disabilities should not be required to participate in state-wide standardized assessments.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 1997), most recently reauthorized in 2004, mandates that all children, including those with the most significant cognitive disabilities:

- Have access to the general curriculum;
- Be involved in the general curriculum; and
- Progress in the general curriculum.

The phrase “general curriculum” refers to the same grade-level academic content standards (called learning standards in Ohio) that guide instruction for other students. Federal guidelines allow for the use of alternate or extended academic content standards aligned to grade-level academic content standards for students with significant cognitive disabilities. IDEA also requires that all students participate in statewide assessments. Federal laws require all states, districts and schools to administer state tests to all students. IEP teams cannot exempt students from participating in statewide assessments. The role of the IEP team is to determine how a student will participate in state tests, not if they will participate.

Commenters asked for clarity about the basis and fairness of the 1 percent threshold for the state waiver request. Some commenters expressed the opinion that the state should not use the 1 percent threshold because it is unrealistic and forces undue pressure on the state.

Based on Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), a state education agency must submit a waiver request to the U.S. Department of Education if it predicts exceeding 1.0 percent participation, statewide, in alternate assessment in any subject area.
In June 2020, the U.S. Department of Education, sent a memo to state assessment, title I and special education directors providing guidance on the content required for state waivers.
Comments included support for the request for extension of the 1 percent waiver.
The Ohio Department of Education appreciates your support and time dedicated to all students. The Department aims to ensure every child is challenged, prepared and empowered to become a resilient, lifelong learner who contributes to society.

Comments included concerns about the application and consequences of a 1 percent threshold or “cap” on districts and community schools.

Whether a student is eligible to participate in the AASCD is a local IEP team decision, not a state decision. The Ohio Department of Education offers guidance to assist and support IEP teams to appropriately identify students who should participate in the alternate assessment. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) section 1111(b)(2)(D) and 34 CFR 200.6(c) and (d) requires the participation of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities in the alternate assessment. ESEA section 1111(b)(2)(D)(i)(I) limits the total number of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities who are assessed statewide with an alternate assessment to 1.0 percent of the total number of students in the state who are assessed in that subject. 34 CFR 200.6(c)(3), says that a state may not prohibit a district from assessing more than 1.0 percent of its testable students using an alternate assessment. However, when a district anticipates testing more than 1.0 percent of students in any subject with the alternate assessment, the state must require the district to submit justification for its need to exceed the 1.0 percent threshold. States must provide appropriate oversight of each district that is required to submit a justification and must make the justification publicly available, so long as the document does not reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.