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

Student Name: _________________________________________________ Date: _________________________________
School: _____________________________________________________ Date of Birth: ________________________
Parent(s)/Guardian(s): _____________________________________ Grade: _______________________________

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 the Kansas 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.

Kansas leads the world in the success of each student.
**Rubric for Determining Eligibility on the DLM**

**Directions:** Review a student's IEP, assessment data, 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 **most** should be in the 4th column. 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 designed for Students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

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)*
   - **No. Stop here.** the student is not eligible for alternate assessment
   - **Yes. Continue to question #2.**

2. **Does the cognitive assessment data support a most significant cognitive disability** *(typically 2 ½ or more 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? Students in the not limited and mild cognitive limitations stop here, the student is not eligible for the alternate assessment)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not limited</th>
<th>Mild Cognitive Limitations</th>
<th>Moderate to Significant Cognitive Limitations</th>
<th>Most Significant Cognitive Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Intelligence/Cognition (related to language skills)</td>
<td>Verbal intelligence in average range or above (85 IQ or above)</td>
<td>Verbal Intelligence 1 to 2 SD below mean (84-71)</td>
<td>Verbal Intelligence 2 to 2.5 SD below mean (70 - 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonverbal Intelligence/Cognition (related to visual-spatial skills)</td>
<td>Non-verbal intelligence in average range or above (85 IQ or above)</td>
<td>Non-verbal Intelligence 1 to 2 SD below mean (84-71)</td>
<td>Non-verbal Intelligence 2 to 2.5 SD below mean (70 – 64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking/Reasoning/Problem-Solving</td>
<td>Reasoning and problem-solving skills at age-level or within average range on an assessment</td>
<td>Minimal assistance (e.g., general education interventions/supports) needed to carry out reasoning and problem-solving tasks</td>
<td>Requires special education services, including modifications and levels of scaffolding to complete reasoning and problem-solving tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Function/Attention/Memory</td>
<td>Cognitive planning and working memory at age-level or within average range on an assessment</td>
<td>Minimal assistance (e.g., general education interventions/supports) needed to support cognitive planning and working memory</td>
<td>Requires special education services, including modifications and levels of scaffolding to support cognitive planning and working memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Learning grade level academic skills</td>
<td>Learning grade level academics with general education supports</td>
<td>Learning general standards or mastering target or successor linkage level EEs with increasing levels of assistance from special education services and supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Does the adaptive assessment data support a most significant deficit in adaptive behavior? 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? Students in the **not limited and mild to moderate deficits stop here.** the student is not eligible for the alternate assessment

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Limited</th>
<th>Mild to Moderate Deficits</th>
<th>Moderate to Significant Deficits</th>
<th>Most Significant Deficits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaptive Behavior Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall adaptive behavior score in average range or above (standard score 85 or above)</td>
<td>Adaptive behavior 1 to 2 SD below mean (ss 84 - ss 71)</td>
<td>Adaptive behavior 2 to 2.5 SD below mean (ss 70 – ss 64)</td>
<td>Adaptive behavior 2.5 SD or more below mean (ss 63 or lower)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-level expressive and receptive communication skills</td>
<td>Communicates expressively and receptively with minimal prompting/assistance</td>
<td>Beginning to communicate wants/needs/preferences using assistive technology (augmentative device or symbols)</td>
<td>No formal communication system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning grade level academic skills</td>
<td>Learning grade level academics with general education supports</td>
<td>Mastering target or successor linkage level EEs; learning grade level academics with increasing levels of assistance</td>
<td>Making progress on the Essential Elements (EEs) with moderate/maximal levels of supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No instruction is needed on responsibility, following rules, interpersonal skills</td>
<td>General instruction addressed through MTSS and general education interventions for responsibility, following rules, and interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Systematic, direct instruction in responsibility, following rules, and interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Prescriptive, systematic, direct instruction relating to responsibility, following rules, and interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No instruction needed on daily living skills or community living skills</td>
<td>Minimal assistance/supports for daily living skills and community living skills; student will likely be successful living independently and holding a job</td>
<td>Requires moderate assistance/supports to complete daily living skills and community living skills (e.g., meal prep, phone use, housekeeping); student will likely be successful in supportive living</td>
<td>Dependent on others for daily living skills and community living skills; student will likely need 24 hour supports as an adult</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present levels of Academic and Functional Performance (PLAAFP)</th>
<th>Student PLAAFPs indicate a level of performance still commensurate with general grade-level concepts but indicating some need for supports and scaffolding. <strong>Stop here</strong>, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment.</th>
<th>Student PLAAFPs indicate ability to make adequate progress through the <strong>most complex alternate standards</strong>, 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).</th>
<th>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 least complex side of the range.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stop here</strong>, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment.</td>
<td>Stop here, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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?**

| Statements indicate general levels of academic support to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills. Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student general independence in academic progress. **Stop here**, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment. | Statements indicate **minimal to moderate levels of support** to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills. Documentation consists of project rubrics, work samples, and/or portfolios, etc. showing student's need for **minimal, continual assistance** in making academic progress. **Stop here**, the student is not eligible for alternate assessment. | Statements indicate **increasing levels of support** to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills. 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. | Statements indicate **maximal levels of support** to make adequate progress through grade-level standard concepts and skills. Documentation consists generally of checklists collected by teacher; documentation indicates **maximal levels of support** are needed to make academic progress. |

**Summary Question:** Were most ratings in the far right-hand (fourth) column?
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/Desigee

___________________________

General Education Teacher

___________________________

Special Education Teacher

___________________________

Other

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

This document is modified with permission from West Virginia Department of Education’s *Rubric for Determining Student Eligibility for the WVASA*.