

**Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM) for
Students with a Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities**

Student Full Name _____	Date _____
School _____	Date of Birth _____
Parent(s)/Guardian(s) _____	Grade _____
Address _____	SSID # _____
City/State/Zip _____	Telephone _____

This rubric is provided as a companion document to the *DLM Participation Guidelines* to assist Individualized Education Program (IEP) Teams in making appropriate decisions regarding student participation in Kansas's Alternate Assessment for Students with a most significant cognitive disabilities.

IEP Teams must use various data sets in review of a student's eligibility to take the Alternate Assessment which could include but is not limited to:

- Evaluation Team Reports
- Benchmark assessment data
- Diagnostic assessments
- Assistive Technology evaluation
- Speech and Language assessments that determine expressive/receptive language communication status.
- IEP goal/objectives progress data
- Both formative academic and transition assessment data
- Adaptive skills checklists/inventories
- Progress on functional, daily living and life skill standards
- Sensory and/or motor assessments describing access modes of communication, fine and gross motor tasks.

Evidence for the decision to participate in the Alternate Assessment is **NOT BASED** on:

1. A disability category or label
2. Poor attendance or extended absences
3. Native language/social, cultural or economic difference
4. Expected poor performance on the general education assessment
5. Academic and other services student receives
6. Educational environment or instructional setting
7. Percent of time receiving special education services
8. English Learner (EL) status
9. Low reading level/achievement level
10. Anticipated disruptive behavior
11. Impact of student scores on the accountability system
12. Administration decision
13. Anticipated emotional duress
14. Need for accommodations (e.g., assistive technology/ Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC) to participate in the assessment process

Note: Intelligence quotient (IQ) scores are not a reliable measure to determining eligibility, as many of the assessment tools used to determine IQ are not fully accessible for learners with significant motor, communication and sensory complexities. IQ scores should never be used in isolation to determine eligibility.

Directions: Review a student's IEP and related documents to answer each question. Mark the column that best answers the question. Responses do not all need to be in the far-right column, but **all or most** should be in the 3rd and 4th columns to the right. Only a small number of learners, approximately 1.0 percent across the entire state, should qualify as meeting the criteria for the KS Alternate Assessment which is designed for Students with a most significant cognitive disabilities.

<p>1. Does the student have a current IEP? (Skip question if this is for an Initial IEP. Questions regarding IEP content should be answered through supporting documentation)</p>			
<p>No. Stop here, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment</p>		<p>Yes. Continue to question #2.</p>	
<p>2. Does the data reviewed provide evidence of a most significant cognitive disability (typically 2 ½ - 3 standard deviations below the mean as determined by district administered ability assessment, plus significant impairments to a person's ability to reason, plan, solve problems, think abstractly, comprehend complex ideas, learn quickly, and learn from experience)?</p>			
<p>a) ___ Presence of disability but no documentation that a cognitive disability interferes with learning; goals and objectives that are designed to support learners in achieving grade-level skills/standards.</p> <p>Stop here, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment</p>	<p>b) ___ Documentation/data shows a wide skill gap in reading and/or mathematics.</p> <p>Need for prescriptive, direct, and systematic instruction is present in the IEP/documentation.</p> <p>(Note: Complex reading and/or math difficulties does not qualify the learner as having a most significant cognitive disability.)</p>	<p>c) ___ Evidence that a cognitive disability interferes with learning grade-level skills and concepts.</p> <p>Goals and objectives address grade-level academic skills/concepts through the alternate academic achievement standards (Essential Elements) or with documented need for significant curriculum modifications</p>	<p>d) ___ Evidence that a cognitive disability significantly interferes with learning grade-level skills and concepts.</p> <p>Goals and objectives to support acquisition of expressive/receptive language and communication skills and/or sensory/motor access for active participation and engagement aligned with Alternate Academic Standards (Essential Elements)</p>
<p>3. Do the student's PLAAFPs indicate adequate performance with KS curricular standards? If yes, stop here. If no, choose descriptor that best matches student performance.</p>			
<p>a) ___ Present levels of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP) indicate that the learner's skills are closely aligned with general grade-level standard concepts and skills</p>	<p>b) ___ Student PLAAFPs indicate a level of performance still commensurate with general grade-level concepts but indicating some need for supports and scaffolding.</p>	<p>c) ___ Student PLAAFPs indicate ability to make adequate progress through the <u>most complex alternate standards</u>, with increasing levels of supports and scaffolding, and objectives that include alternate standard skills and concepts or learning progression steps that lead to grade-aligned performance target(s)</p>	<p>d) ___ Student PLAAFPs indicate ability to make progress through alternate standards (Essential Elements) with maximal supports and scaffolding in order to make progress on concepts and skill targets on the <u>least complex</u> side of the range.</p>
<p>4. Does the learner data document a significant deficit across many domains of adaptive behaviors? Does the student require systematic, direct instruction of adaptive behavior (an individual's ability to apply social and practical skills in everyday life) skills to be embedded within standards-based instruction?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual skills: receptive and expressive language, reading and writing, money concepts, self-direction • Social skills: interpersonal, responsibility, self-esteem, follows rules, obeys laws, is not gullible, and avoids victimization. • Practical skills: personal activities of daily living such as eating, dressing, mobility and toileting; instrumental activities of daily living such as preparing meals, taking medication, using the telephone, managing money, using transportation and doing housekeeping activities, occupational skills; maintaining a safe environment. 			
<p>a) ___ NO instruction needed in any of the adaptive skills.</p>	<p>b) ___ General instruction needed in 1 or more domains of adaptive skill, which are covered in district MTSS/PBIS and core instruction initiatives.</p>	<p>c) ___ Systematic, direct instruction needed within 2 or more domains of adaptive skills.</p>	<p>d) ___ Prescriptive, systematic, direct instruction needed across many or all adaptive skills within each domain.</p>

5. What level of support and instruction do the students' goals and objectives describe? What level of documentation is indicated in the evaluation portion of the goals and objectives?			
<p>a) ___ Statements indicate <u>general levels of academic support</u> to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</p> <p>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student <u>general independence</u> in academic progress</p>	<p>b) ___ Statements indicate <u>minimal to moderate levels of support</u> to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</p> <p>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student's need for <u>minimal, continual assistance</u> in making academic progress</p>	<p>c) ___ Statements indicate <u>increasing levels of support</u> to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</p> <p>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student's need for <u>increasing levels of continual assistance</u> in making academic progress</p>	<p>d) ___ Statements indicate <u>maximal levels of support</u> to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</p> <p>Documentation consists generally of checklists collected by teacher; documentation indicates <u>maximal levels of support</u> are needed to make academic progress</p>

The IEP Committee used the above evaluation data analysis and discussion to determine:

- The student **DOES** meet the criteria to participate in the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM) for students with significant cognitive disabilities.
- The student **DOES NOT** meet the criteria to participate in the Kansas Alternate Assessment (DLM) for students with significant cognitive disabilities.

_____ Parent/Guardian

_____ Parent/Guardian

_____ Administrator/Designee/Chairperson

_____ General Education Teacher

_____ Special Education Teacher

_____ Other

***NOTE:** If this report does not represent an individual team member's conclusions, that team member must submit a separate statement presenting the member's conclusions.*