



OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
EDUCATION

SCHOOL SUPPORT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

2023 State Assessment Conference

Session 2C:

Root Cause Analysis & Continuous Improvement

September 27, 2023

8:45-10:00

10:15-11:30



FOCUS AREA: 2
Session 2C:
Root Cause Analysis & Continuous
Improvement

Andrew Hinkle, NCEO, ahinkle@umn.edu

Sheryl Lazarus, NCEO, laza0019@umn.edu

Cary Rogers, Kansas State Department of Education, crogers@ksde.org

Wendy Stoica, Ohio Department of Education, wendy.stoica@education.ohio.gov

Robin Stripling, Arkansas Department of Education, robin.stripling@ade.arkansas.gov

Kathy Strunk, NCEO, kstrunk@umn.edu



A note About this Conference/Session

- The purpose of this conference/session is to provide an opportunity for State education agency (SEA) staff to interact and engage with relevant experts and other SEA staff about alternate assessment participation.
- The observations and opinions of the session presenters are their own.



Root Cause Analysis and Continuous Improvement Agenda

8:45-9:00	Introduction
9:00-10:00	Panel and Table Discussion
10:00-10:15	Break
10:15-11:20	Practices that Work – State Examples
11:20-11:30	Questions



Objectives

- To hear from a panel of states on how they approached determining root causes and first steps
- To gain an understanding of actions that have been identified as having high impact
- To learn about emerging approaches to continuously improve or maintain state participation rates



Panel

- How did you choose where to start?
- What was your access point?
- What did you do first? Where did that lead you to next?
- How did you dig into your data?
- With whom did you need to collaborate?



Questions?





Table Discussion and Sharing





Practices that Work

- Clearly defined participation criteria and definition of most significant cognitive disability
- Required training on decision making
- Three-tiered system of technical support
- Decision-making monitoring system
- Focusing on teacher disposition



Break! Be back at 10:15!





State Examples: Definitions and Participation Criteria



Example: Kansas

DYNAMIC LEARNING MAPS PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES FOR KANSAS

Name of Student: _____ Date: _____

The student is eligible to participate in the DLM if **ALL** responses below are marked YES.

CRITERIA	YES	NO	SUPPORTING EVIDENCE
<p>1. Cognitive assessment data supports a most significant cognitive disability (<u>intellectual</u> disability).</p> <p>PARTICIPATION CRITERION DESCRIPTORS: Review of student records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact intellectual functioning. Typically functioning 2 ½ or more Standard Deviations (SD) below the mean.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>2. Adaptive assessment data supports a most significant deficit in adaptive behavior.</p> <p>PARTICIPATION CRITERION DESCRIPTORS: Review of student records indicate a disability or multiple disabilities that significantly impact adaptive behavior (those skills and behaviors essential for someone to live independently and to function safely in daily life). Typically functioning 2 ½ or more SD below the mean.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>3. The student is primarily being instructed (or taught) using the DLM Essential Elements as content standards.</p> <p>PARTICIPATION CRITERION DESCRIPTORS: Present levels and measurable goals listed in the IEP for this student are linked to the enrolled grade level DLM Essential Elements and address knowledge and skills that are appropriate and challenging for this student. All goals must have at least 2 benchmarks/objectives.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>4. The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in ALL grade-and age-appropriate curriculum at a reduced depth, <u>breadth</u> and complexity.</p> <p>PARTICIPATION CRITERION DESCRIPTORS: The student:</p> <p>a. Requires extensive, repeated, individualized instruction and support that is neither temporary nor limited to specific content areas.</p> <p>AND</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<p>b. Uses substantially adapted materials and individualized methods of accessing information in alternative ways to acquire, maintain, generalize, <u>demonstrate</u> and transfer skills across multiple settings.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

2 Kansas State Department of Education | www.ksde.org








Example: Ohio

#EachChildOurFuture

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)?		
<input type="checkbox"/> No, the student does not have an IEP.  Stop here. The student is not eligible for alternate assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, the student has a current IEP.  Proceed to the next statement.	
2. Review the student's Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) category .		
<p>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Specific Learning Disability <input type="checkbox"/> Speech or Language Impairment (only) <p style="text-align: center;"></p> <p>Stop here. The student is not eligible for participation in the alternate assessment.</p>	<p>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Deafness/Hearing Impairment <input type="checkbox"/> Emotional Disturbance <input type="checkbox"/> Orthopedic Impairment <input type="checkbox"/> Other Health Impairment <input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impairment <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"></p>	<p>Student meets state eligibility criteria under the following disability category designations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Autism <input type="checkbox"/> Deaf-Blindness <input type="checkbox"/> Intellectual Disability <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple Disabilities <input type="checkbox"/> Traumatic Brain Injury <p>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.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"></p>



Example: Arkansas

Does the student have a disability that significantly impacts intellectual functioning?

Intellectual functioning well below average (IQ typically below 55 or 3.0 or more standard deviations below the mean).

___ Yes

Does the student have a disability that significantly impacts adaptive behavior?

Adaptive behavior* scores are typically two to three standard deviations below the mean in two or more areas.

___ Yes

Does the student require extensive adaptations and supports in order to perform and/or participate meaningfully and productively in the everyday life activities of integrated school, home, community, and work environments?

A significant cognitive disability is pervasive, affecting student functioning across all academic, social, and community settings. The student is expected to require intensive and ongoing supports after graduation and throughout life.

___ Yes

Does the student require substantial modifications to the general education curriculum?

Substantial modifications change the content expectation through a significant reduction in depth, breadth, and complexity of grade-level standards.

___ Yes



State Examples: Training



Example: Kansas

- Six (6) DLM webinars offered per year
 - First focuses on who the students are who should be taking an alternate assessment, Kansas participation guidelines, and least dangerous assumption
- Prerecorded DLM webinar available on KSDE DLM webpage
- In-person trainings provided to districts by request



3 Principles of the Least Dangerous Assumption



If you are going to fail, fail because you believed in the student, not because you placed an artificial limit on the student.

[Chris Bugaj: The Least Dangerous Assumption](#)



Example: Ohio

Access to the General Education Curriculum for ALL Learners

The general education curriculum often consists of courses, lessons, and planned learning activities that are intentionally taught. But, what about the informal and unspoken messages and strategies that are communicated and used in the classroom? These are not part of the formal curriculum, but contribute to student growth, engagement, inclusion, and more. This FREE, 10-part video series explores strategies grounded in research that are designed to ensure ALL learners have access to the general curriculum.

Login

Create Account

OGALI Teaching Diverse Learners Center

67%

Check Out the List of Modules

These chapters are designed for special education professionals, teachers, developmental specialists, and other teaching professionals to increase your knowledge about access to the general education curriculum. Each chapter builds on previous knowledge while providing new strategies, tools, and resources you can use right away in the classroom and beyond.

- Research
- Video Explanations
- Downloadable Resources
- Documents
- Reflection Questions

Each chapter in this module consists of several pages that relate to the chapter. Before watching each video, set the stage for your learning by reading the video description. To continue your exploration of the topic after the video, visit the "research and connected resources" section to learn more.

- Chapter 1:** Ensuring Inclusive Dispositions and Presuming Competence
- Chapter 2:** Design Rich Tier I Core Instruction and Assessment
- Chapter 3:** Designing Inclusive Learning Environments and Rich Tier I Instruction and Assessment
- Chapter 4:** Language and Communication Access: ALL In!
- Chapter 5:** Reading Research in Language and Literacy: From Research to Practice
- Chapter 6:** Stretching Word Recognition to Include Learners with Complex Needs: Access to Communication, Reading, and Writing for ALL Learners
- Chapter 7:** Stretching Language Comprehension to Include Learners with Complex Needs: Applying Reading and Writing Across Content Areas
- Chapter 8:** Tier I Planning Continued: Integrating Learner Supports within Standards-Based Instruction and Assessment
- Chapter 9:** Targeted Interventions: Tiers 2 and 3
- Chapter 10:** Curriculum Screening, Audit, Selection, and Deselection



Example: Arkansas

Training Resources:

- DLM's *Who Are the Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities*
- *Using the Least Dangerous Assumption in Educational Decisions* from the TIES Center
- Online training modules on the Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines
- Presentations at state conferences and meetings








State Examples: Three-tiered Support



Ohio Tiered TA

Tier # - AASCD %	Alternate Assessment Participation, Supports and Monitoring
 Tier 1 under 1% February-June	<p>A. District Justifications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All public LEAs required to submit assurances LEAs testing over 1% must submit justifications Proper processes for an effective AASCD program listed in assurances Request for technical assistance from Department/SST embedded (tracked in Excel) <p>B. Resource/Toolkit Development: linked within district justification form</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> D-M Tool and D-M Tool FAQ's Teacher and family resources District AA Self-Reflection Guide AASCD TA Certification Course + Certificate of Completion from CAI
 Tier 2 1.1% - 3.4% July-June	<p>A. Supports available to all LEAs but developed with Tier 2 & Tier 3 LEAs in mind.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> District Alternate Assessment Self-Reflection Guide Quarterly meetings with Regional Support Teams AASCD office hours before, during and after test window opens. Agenda sessions during statewide committee meetings (SAPEC, ODE/SST Webinars, Advisory Committees) Available pipeline to request technical assistance or submit a testimony in the AASCD TA Feedback Survey
 Tier 3 3.5%+ December-October	<p>A. LEAs identified & notified as a tier 3 LEA in the release of Ohio's Special Education Profiles</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Required: Self-Review Summary Report & Improvement Plan with signature of participation from SST consultant prior to submission to the Department Department reviews SRSR & IP: revise and resubmit OR approved. LEA implements improvement plan & submits systemic improvement/evidence



Kansas Tiered TA

- Universal – online training and tools are available (recorded DLM training module, student information sheets); justifications and assurances are required; individual recommendations are provided to LEA on request
- Targeted Technical Assistance – appropriate local staff are required to watch the DLM training module; review of what the district’s data shows; Student Information Sheets completed and submitted to KSDE to be used as part of the district data dive; development of a plan to assist the district in identifying the correct students for the DLM; possible DLM test observations completed by KSDE staff – canceled due to COVID 19; justifications and assurances are required
- Intensive Technical Assistance – appropriate local staff required to watch the DLM training module; review of what the district’s data shows; Student Information Sheets completed and submitted to KSDE to be used as part of the district data dive; development of a plan to assist the district in identifying the correct students for the DLM; onsite folder review by KSDE staff during DLM test observations- cancelled due to COVID 19; justifications and assurances are required



Arkansas: Tier One

- Part I: Evidence of Training
 - Artifact(s) documenting topics covered in the training
 - Sign-in sheets
- Part II: Student List
 - State ID Number
 - Grade
 - Eligibility Category
- Disproportionality Review
- Part III: Assurance Page



Arkansas: Tier Two

- Part I: Evidence of Training
 - Artifact(s) documenting topics covered in the training
 - Sign-in sheets
- Part II: Individual Student Information Sheet
 - Eligibility Category
 - Intellectual Functioning Data
 - Adaptive Behavior Data
- Disproportionality Review
- Part III: Assurance Page



Arkansas: Tier Three

- Part I: Evidence of Training
 - Artifact(s) documenting topics covered in the training
 - Sign-in sheets
- Part II: Individual Student Information Sheet
 - Eligibility Category
 - Intellectual Functioning Data
 - Adaptive Behavior Data
- Disproportionality Review
- Part III: Onsite Review
- Part IV: Assurance Page



State Examples: Monitoring Systems



Example: Kansas

- DLM justifications – customized data display template (added assurances to the justifications)
- Three years of data on number and percentage of students taking the AA-AAAS per LEA
- Red-Flag data based on DLM First Contact Survey
 - Disability categories (SLP, SLD, ED)
 - Instructional setting Reading levels with comprehension
 - Writing skills
 - Computational skills
 - Performance level for the 2018-2019 assessments
- DLM test observations districts over 1% and high rates red flags
- On-site TA – districts who request or have high rates of potential red flags



Kansas: Data Displays within Justifications

3/13/2020 1:48:42 PM

Disability Categories Taking the DLM - Math

Monitoring School Year: 2019 - 2020 | Assessment School Year: 2018 - 2019 | All Districts

Exceptionality	Total Students
Autism	770
Deaf-Blindness	6
Developmentally Delayed	91
Emotional Disturbance	19
Hearing Impairment	13
Intellectually Disability	1268
Multiple Disabilities	280
Orthopedic Impairment	14
Other Health Impairment	271
Specific Learning Disability	92
Speech / Language Disabilities	5
Traumatic Brain Injury	18
Visually Impaired	8
Total:	2855

3/13/2020 1:23:54 PM

Alternate Assessment Participation by Subject Subgroup - Math

Page 1

Monitoring School Year: 2019 - 2020 | Assessment School Year: 2018 - 2019 | All Districts

Student Sub-Group	Comparison Group	# Students Participating in Regular Assessment	# Students Participating in Alternate Assessment	Total # Students Assessed	Percentage Participating in Alternate Assessment	Percent of Comparison group participating in Alternate Assessment	Risk Ratio
All Students	N/A	250937	2965	253902	1.167773393		
American Indian or Alaska Native	All Other Races	2028	23	2051	1.121404193	1.168151010	0.959982214
Asians	All Other Races	7013	84	7097	1.183598704	1.167318328	1.013946818
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	All Other Races	508	9	517	1.740812379	1.166604179	1.492204820
African-American Students	All Other Races	17581	306	17887	1.710739643	1.126623308	1.518466404
White	All Other Races	159095	1799	160894	1.118127463	1.253655600	0.891893645
Multi-Racial	All Other Races	13578	184	13762	1.337014969	1.158074457	1.154515550
Hispanic	All Other Races	51134	560	51694	1.083297868	1.189369362	0.910817028
Free and Reduced Lunch	All Self-Paid Lunch	118513	1729	120242	1.437933501	0.924734401	1.554969188
Migrant	All non-Migrant Students	1482	14	1496	0.935828877	1.169148119	0.800436542
English Learner Students	All non-English Learners	22949	138	23087	0.597738987	1.224790417	0.488033690
Non-English Learner Students	All English Learners	227988	2827	230815	1.224790417	0.597738987	2.049038868
Male	All Females	128264	1896	130160	1.456668715	0.863894232	1.686165576
Female	All Males	122673	1069	123742	0.863894232	1.456668715	0.593061568
Military Connected Students	All non-Military Connected	6252	52	6304	0.824873096	1.176503849	0.701122310
Homeless	All non-Homeless	3596	64	3660	1.748633880	1.159277819	1.508382073
Foster Care	All Foster Care	2582	72	2654	2.712886209	1.151451952	2.356056807



Example: Ohio

Ohio | Department of Education

**2022-2023 Alternate Assessment Participation
Indicator Improvement Plan**

District IRN State Support Team Region

Indicator for Improvement: Choose an item

Summary - Based on the Self-Review Summary Report, summarize the area(s) of concern:

Reflection - Summarize section B, question 4 of the Self-Review Summary Report. If the district has not written an Improvement Plan for this indicator in the last three years, type NA in this area:

Long-Term Goal(s) - Write the long-term goal to address specific areas of concern that may take place beyond the profile timeline:

Short-Term Goal(s) - Write the short-term goal(s) for addressing specific concerns within the profile timeline:

Activity	Resources	Timeline	Completion
Describe activities designed to achieve the short-term goal(s) – Items 1-3 are required for all districts. Districts can add additional activities needed for improvement:	List the resources needed for activity:	Activities must be completed by September 29, 2023 :	Evidence of completed activity (training materials, agendas, sign-in sheets, procedure manuals...)
1. Review policies, practices and procedures: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2. Training: <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3. Disproportionality Calculator (if applicable): <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4. <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

To add a row for an additional activity - Left click in last row of the table and select **+** when it appears at the end of the row.

Please upload signatures and plan as one document. Do not separate.

District Title of Personnel Responsible for Implementation

Title: Name: Signature: Email:

Superintendent

Name: Signature: Email:

Sponsor

Organization: Contact Name: Signature: Email:

State Support Team

Region: Consultant Name: Signature: Email:

Comment:

Improvement Plan approval by the Department will be noted in and communicated through the Monitoring System.



Example: Arkansas

Monitoring is embedded within our tiered system of support.

- Eligibility Category
- Intellectual Disability Data
- Adaptive Behavior Data
- Disproportionality Review
- Onsite Review


The OSE Monitoring Team also considers assessing more than 1% of a district's students on the alternate assessment a risk factor in their monitoring system.



State Examples: Continuous Improvement



Example: Ohio



District Alternate Assessment Self-Reflection Guide

Purpose of this guide: The District Alternate Assessment Self-Reflection Guide is an optional resource for districts that may need support based on their alternate assessment participation data. The Department is required to ensure districts are only testing eligible students with the alternate assessment. This self-reflection guide is designed to support districts in their data review process to address the appropriate eligibility of student participation in the alternate assessment. This guide best serves districts that are interested in being proactive regarding their alternate assessment participation rates. Each section provides the Department's best-practices following the Every Student Succeeds Act* along with guiding questions and resources.

Section A
Data Gathering and Reporting: The following data are required to be reported to the Department: EMIS Data, alternate assessment testing data, district justifications with assurances.
Guiding Questions: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What steps does your district take to ensure that all required data are accurately reported to the Ohio Department of Education?2. How will you know if there is a data error?3. If there is a data error, who is responsible for changes and updates? What steps are taken to avoid reporting errors in the future?
Resource(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Ohio's Special Education Profiles2. EMIS Manual
Section B
Policies, Practices and Procedures: All decisions about alternate assessment eligibility are made annually beginning in grade 3 by



Idaho: “At Risk” Monitoring System





Questions?





Thank you!