



1% Cap on Participation in State Alternate Assessment Intermediate School District (ISD) Summary Form

All intermediate school districts (ISDs) must complete this summary form regarding the percentage of students assessed using Michigan’s alternate assessment (MI-Access). This includes justification forms from local educational agencies (LEAs)/ public school academies (PSA) that assessed more than 1% of students in the spring of 2018 using MI-Access.

Author: Michigan Department of Education

Last updated: 1/9/19

District Information

Date: _____

Intermediate School District (ISD) Name

Phone

District Contact’s Information

ISD Contact Name

Phone

Email

Data

Total number of LEAs/PSAs including the ISD (only if the ISD runs programs in their own facility): _____

Note: If an ISD runs programs in their own facility, they must also complete an LEA Justification Form for that program and its participating students.

Number of LEAs/PSAs including the ISD (only if the ISD runs programs in their own facility) that assessed more than 1% of all students tested in the spring of 2018 using MI-Access (in grades 3-8 and 11): _____

Justification forms are attached for each agency represented in the above number.

Yes No

ISD personnel have reviewed the LEA/PSA justification forms and have identified priorities for targeted assistance and profesional development.

Yes No

Technical Assistance and Professional Development

Please provide an outline of technical assistance provided as a result of feedback from MDE regarding targeted assistance and professional development from the 2017 justification form review. Include any professional development and targeted assistance the ISD provided, either individually to LEAs and/or offered to all LEAs (add additional pages if necessary).

Technical Assistance and Professional Development Continued

Please outline additional priorities based on a review of the LEA/PSA/ISD justification forms received for 2018 (add additional pages if necessary). Include plans for assisting LEAs/PSAs/ISDs that have been flagged for disproportionality for participation in the alternate assessment, if relevant. If no LEAs were flagged for disproportionality, leave this section blank.

Assurances

Please provide the following assurances. *Select all that apply.*

The ISD will provide targeted assistance to LEAs/PSAs that have been flagged for disproportionality for participation in the alternate assessment as outlined on the previous page.

Targeted assistance and professional development will include an emphasis on LEAs/PSAs using the state assessment selection guidance documents and online trainings.

Assessment selection will remain an individualized education program (IEP) team decision and will not be overridden by administrative or procedural decisions.

Submission Process

The ISD special education director (or designee) will collect all LEA/PSA/ISD forms and review them to prioritize targeted assistance and professional development. Then all justification forms for LEAs/PSAs/ISDs who assessed more than 1% of students using MI-Access will be compiled, along with this ISD summary and submitted to MDE no later than **February 8, 2019**.

Questions regarding this form can be directed to John Jaquith at the MDE at JaquithJ@michigan.gov.

Instructions

1. Complete the ISD summary form (fillable PDF) and save.
2. Send the ISD summary form and LEA forms either electronically (preferred) or by mail. Larger ISDs may need to send in parts. If this is the case, please number each batch sent (for example, "Submission 1 of 3" in the subject line of the email).

Electronic Submission:

1. Scan all justification forms for LEAs/PSAs/ISDs who assessed more than 1% of all tested students using MI-Access and save as a PDF. Larger ISDs may need to make several smaller files.
2. Send the ISD summary form and all justification forms from the previous section vial email to JaquithJ@michigan.gov.

Mail Submission:

1. Print the ISD summary form and make copies of all justification forms for LEAs/PSAs/ISDs who assessed more than 1% of all tested students using MI-Access.
2. Create a hard copy packet with the ISD summary form as the cover page, followed by the copies for each LEA/PSA/ISD justification form.
3. Mail to: John Jaquith
Assessment Consultant for Students with Disabilities
Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability
Michigan Department of Education
Second Floor
608 West Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30008Lansing, MI 48909

Technical Assistance and Professional Development

November. 2017

Oakland Schools provided each LEA with data unique to their district including the following: previous test year's alternate assessment participation rate; total number of MI-Access test takers, building level participation rates, and building level rates broken down by test (i.e., FI, SI, P). Each LEA was asked to dig into their district/bldg. level data to identify additional characteristics of those assigned to take MI-Access, including student eligibility categories, specialized programming and educational environment factors (to perhaps highlight areas that may warrant further analysis of assessment selection practices that may require correction).

Februarv. 2018

Oakland Schools developed and offered on-site training (i.e., PPT presentation) to all LEAs, with regard to the ESSA 1 % regulation, state guidance on alternate assessment selection, factors that should not be a part of the assessment selection process, importance of aligning instruction and assessment, county wide data analysis, and action steps to ensure students currently assigned

MI-Access are properly assigned.

Oakland Schools provided above referenced training during a professional learning community meeting, for public school academy special educators.

March. 2018

Oakland Schools shared the above training presentation with LEA directors and supervisors so that they may have as a resource for future trainings with their staff.

April, 2018

Oakland Schools provided each LEA with 'MOE specific feedback' regarding their justification forms; this included emphasizing to many LEAs that eligibility categories and/or special ed. programming do not drive or determine assessment selection but rather, assessment selection must be made on an individual basis given the unique circumstances of each student.

MOE provided training on the 1 % cap and alternate assessment selection guidance to special ed. directors and supervisors at a county wide special education directors meeting .

Oakland Schools reached out to specific, individual special education directors, who supervi districts with high rates of alternate assessment participation, and asked how the !SD could assist the LEA with training and technical assistance for staff (this included Pontiac School District, Oak Park Schools, and Southfield Public Schools).

November, 2018

Oakland Schools provided each LEA with data unique to their district including the following: previous test year's alternate assessment participation rate; total number of MI-Access test takers, building level participation rates, and building level rates broken down by test (i.e., FI, SI, P). Oakland Schools also provided data (broken down by building) that included student eligibility categories, specialized programming and educational environment factors (to highlight areas that may need further analysis of

assessment selection practices). This data was provided in the form of a spreadsheet and was reviewed as whole group and then, later, in smaller individual groups where questions could be answered. On-site training was offered, via a sign-up sheet, to all LEAs that exceeded the 1 %.

December, 2018

At a monthly director's meeting, Oakland Schools provided examples/options of action steps that districts could take to address their exceeding the 1 % cap, as part of their 'Local Plan' on the Justification form. Included in these suggested options was a process for conducting building level 'data digs', in which caseload providers review student files/information and determine if there is sufficient evidence to assure that students assigned the alternate assessment 1) are students with significant cognitive disabilities, 2) are receiving instruction that is aligned to alternate content standards (for the content area in which alternate assessment is being selected), and 3) the students parent(s) are/were informed of the implications of their child taking MIAccess. Furthermore, the 'dig' would also include review of previous student assessment performances to evaluate mastery of alternate content standards. If mastery has occurred for any student, providers are encouraged to modify instruction to reflect a greater range of complexity and to later re-determine the most appropriate state assessment.

[January, 2019

Oakland Schools consultant met with several special education directors to assist with completing their justification form and to help develop their 'Local Plan' and address any disproportionality

(this included Pontiac School District, Hazel Park Schools, Clarenceville School District, Madison District Public Schools, The Lamphere Schools, Troy School District, Rochester Community Schools, and Bloomfield Hills Schools)

Ongoing, Informal Assistance

Repeated conversation (with directors, supervisors and special educators) has occurred over the course of the past year, emphasizing the purpose of the ESSA requirement - to ensure that students are being assessed with the most appropriate instrument that is matched to the instruction they are receiving - and that IEP teams are not basing decisions on factors such as low academic skill, limited linguistic acquisition, behavioral excesses, or post-secondary projections.

Technical Assistance and Professional Development Continued

Review of LEA Justification Forms

In reviewing the LEA justification forms, it appears that the majority of districts plan to utilize the state's Assessment Selection Guidelines Training and the Assessment Selection Interactive Decision-Making Tool in some fashion within their LEA. Many also reported that they will continue to disseminate and review state guidance (with new and current staff as well as administrators) to ensure understanding of proper assessment selection practice. Additionally, several LEAs reported that they will have their staff review student information/files to ensure that students assigned to take MIAccess have been properly matched.

ISO Priorities

Oakland Schools will continue to:

- Offer professional development on alternate assessment selection
- Provide presentation materials and other resources (such as the 'Data Dig' process) to LEAs
- Share the MOE resources, including the online training and interactive tool, to administrators and educators
- Assign a specific consultant to address any questions from LEA administrators and educators regarding the ESSAs 1 % cap and the state's alternate assessment selection processes
- Annually disaggregate LEA data and provide each LEA with building level data on participation rates and further break down totals specific to eligibility categories, specialized programming and educational environments (to assist with building level analyses)
- Make suggestions to LEAs regarding action steps to address the exceeding of the 1 %, to ensure all educators are informed and utilizing the state guidance

Oakland Schools will also provide instruction to LEAs on how to develop custom reports, through Illuminate DnA or the BAA, that will disaggregate MIAccess test takers by demographic type. Students from subgroups can then be reviewed to assure that they are properly assigned the appropriate assessment given their unique circumstances/characteristics.

Specific Upcoming: Professional Development

As part of our IEP Coach Training series for our LEAs (includes approximately 90 participants), ESSA 1 % regulation and alternate assessment selection (state guidance) will be included in the learning objectives for the upcoming year (and any future IEP Coach training years)

Walled Lake (March, 2019) - ESSA 1 % regulation and alternate assessment selection professional learning has been scheduled