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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Full Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent(s)/Guardian(s)</td>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>SSID #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/State/Zip</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 the 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 the most significant cognitive disabilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does the student have a <strong>current IEP</strong>? (Skip question if this is for an Initial IEP. Questions regarding IEP content should be answered through supporting documentation)</td>
<td>No. Stop here, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the data reviewed provide evidence of a <strong>most significant cognitive disability</strong> (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)?</td>
<td>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. Stop here, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do the student’s PLAAFPs indicate adequate performance with KS curricular standards? <strong>If yes, stop here.</strong> If no, choose descriptor that best matches student performance.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the learner data document a significant deficit across many domains of <strong>adaptive behaviors</strong>? 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?</td>
<td>a) <strong>Conceptual skills</strong>: receptive and expressive language, reading and writing, money concepts, self-direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. What level of support and instruction do the student’s goals and objectives describe? What level of documentation is indicated in the evaluation portion of the goals and objectives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Statements</th>
<th>b) Statements</th>
<th>c) Statements</th>
<th>d) Statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>indicate general levels of academic support to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</td>
<td>indicate minimal to moderate levels of support to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</td>
<td>indicate increasing levels of support to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</td>
<td>indicate maximal levels of support to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student general independence in academic progress</td>
<td>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student’s need for minimal, continual assistance in making academic progress</td>
<td>Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student’s need for increasing levels of continual assistance in making academic progress</td>
<td>Documentation consists generally of checklists collected by teacher; documentation indicates maximal levels of support are needed to make academic progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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