Alternate Assessment Breakdown Report

Monitoring School Year: 2019 - 2020 | Assessment School Year: 2018 - 2019 | D0355 Ellinwood Public Schools | Status: Submission Approved by KSDE on 02/17/2020

Based on the data provided in KIAS, our district had student(s) in the following disability categories taking the DLM.

- [x] Autism
- [ ] Blind/Visually Impaired
- [ ] Deaf-Blind
- [ ] Developmentally Delayed
- [ ] Emotionally Disturbed
- [ ] Hearing Impaired/Deafness
- [ ] Intellectual Disability
- [ ] Multiple Disability
- [ ] Orthopedic Impairment
- [x] Other Health Impaired
- [ ] Specific Learning Disability
- [ ] Speech and Language Impairment
- [ ] Traumatic Brain Injury

Based on the data provided in KIAS for disproportionality, our district needs to address disproportionality (A risk ratio greater than 3.0 needs to be addressed.)

[x] Yes [ ] No

If yes, please explain how you will address the disproportionality.

The only risk ratio that was greater than 3.0 was in the Hispanic Student Sub-Group in Reading and Math (and those weren't even the subject areas that triggered the requirement of us having to complete this justification form). I believe this was solely the result of an extremely small testing population, as there was only [redacted] that took that math and reading subject DLM assessment out of [redacted] assessed students ([redacted] participated in the regular math and reading assessments).

Percentage of students performing at target or advanced on the DLM for the school year.

ELA:	0%
Math:	0%
Science:	0%

Monitoring School Year: 2019 - 2020 | Assessment School Year: 2018 - 2019 | D0355 Ellinwood Public Schools | Status: Submission Approved by KSDE on 02/17/2020

☐ **Please provide a narrative that includes the data types and processes that the IEP teams are utilizing to qualify students for the Alternate Assessments (DLM) in the box below and press Save.**

Fundamentally, the data reveals that our small sample size in science is what triggered the completion of this justification form. And even then, we were only .06% away from the 1.05% limit (1.11%). Simply put, we had [redacted] that was given the science assessment. In an absolute sense, that is the smallest non-zero number of participants that can take a DLM. Unfortunately, we only had [redacted] total students assessed ([redacted] took the regular science assessment). I'm not sure if a logical sweeping narrative exists about IEP processes when only [redacted] was given the DLM in science. I firmly believe this is a product of our small total assessment population. In fact, in our other subject areas (math and reading-where the total assessed populations were also small, but slightly larger), the DLM rates were 0.87% and 0.85% respectively with only [redacted] taking each of those DLM assessments.

☐ **What are the district's next steps to ensure that annually the appropriate test is administered to each student?**

I feel like our current processes effectively administer the appropriate test to each student. When [redacted] triggers the justification report at 1.11% with a cutoff of 1.05%, I believe that is more a product of statistical noise (small total assessment population) than a systemic overreach of DLM assessment selection.

Based on the data for our district, our LEA needs additional training.

☐ Yes ☒ No

Our district anticipates testing over 1% of our students in one or more content areas during the school year.

☐ Yes ☒ No