

Appendix B: ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT DISPROPORTIONALITY ROOT CAUSE
 LEA may substitute Appendix E, the 1% Alternate Assessment Participation Monitoring Short Form, in lieu of Appendix B (Root Cause Analysis).

Phase 2F and Phase 3H

District Name:

The LEA team is required to review and discuss the questions, summarize, and determine areas of concern. As an area of concern is identified, the team needs to determine the root cause. **The LEA must identify a local team to complete the root cause analysis. Examples of members are provided below.**

Phase 2 LEA (>1% and <2%): This document is used for reflection. The questions and LEA’s answers will be part of the [1% Phase 2 and 3 Monitoring Slide Deck](#) and virtual audit with NMPED.

Phase 3 LEA (exceeding 2%): This document is used for investigation. The questions and LEA’s answers will be part of the [1% Phase 2 and 3 Monitoring Slide Deck](#) with NMPED. This document guides LEA’s Improvement Plan including short and long term goals.

**Phase 2 and 3
 Audit and Monitor**

Insert LEA Name, Date of Audit

Insert LEA Responsible Parties on the Call

Phase 3 LEAs must complete and upload the completed slide deck and Alternate Assessment Improvement Plan if disproportionality exceeds 2%, to Canvas. [1% Phase 2 and 3 Monitoring Slide Deck](#). (APPENDIX E MAY BE USED IN PLACE OF CREATING A SLIDE DECK.)

Print Name	LEA Team Member Title (e.g.)	Phone #/Email	Date
	OSE Administrative Representative		
	Administrator		
	Regular Education Teacher		
	NMPED Assessment or REC, or OSE Representative (Phase 3)		
	Person Submitting		

Section A
Accurate Student Placement in Alternate Assessment

Guiding Question

What are the processes to review, collaborate with experts regarding each student, ensure careful consideration of the student’s future, and analyze participation rates in the state’s alternate assessment (DLM) for students identified with a *most significant cognitive disability*?

Process to discern Alternate Assessment Eligibility	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>A. How does the LEA determine alternate assessment placement in the IEP process?</p> <p>B. Has the LEA applied PED’s definition of most significant cognitive disability as part of the IEP decision making process? What evidence can the LEA provide that this definition is being applied?</p>			

Section A: Summarize LEA’s process to discern Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

What is working?

What needs to change?

Section B
Verifying Data Errors

Guiding Question

What is the process the LEA has in place to enter data correctly within the student information system, STARS, share data with PED, identify errors and/or correct errors?

Data Transfer from IEP documentation and entry	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>How does your LEA know that the Alternate Assessment related information is accurate and complete:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the local SIS and PED's data system (i.e., STARS/NOVA)? 2) For review of the First Contact Survey, Verification of Enrollment, and Rostering? 			

Data Revision and Correction	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>Who is responsible for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Revising/updating and correcting data reporting to include STARS/NOVA error codes? 2) Submitting the First Contact Survey information? 3) Validating the students roster in DLM before and after testing? 			

Section B: Summarize Data Review Process and Verification:

What is working?

What needs to change?

Section C
Professional Development regarding Alternate Assessment

Guiding Question

How does the LEA ensure that staff has the required and necessary information and professional development regarding the new MSCD definition, SED IEP processes, IEP addendums, and impact on students?

Professional Development on Alternate Assessment	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>A. How is the completion of Alternate Assessment required training(s) verified at site level and LEA level?</p> <p>B. What monitoring, coaching or supports are provided as follow-up to district professional learning in regards to Accommodations and Alternate Assessment?</p>			

Section C: Summarize required Professional Development verification and monitoring

What is working?

What needs to change?

Section D
Examining Data Trends and Patterns

Guiding Question

What do the data trends and patterns tell your LEA about DLM testing and assignments?

Data Trends and Patterns	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>A. Examine assessment patterns of students assigned to the Alternate Assessment. Typically students <u>do not change</u> assessments during their K-12 education. Examine if students were assigned a different test for one grade level only, and what is the reason for the change?</p> <p>B. Are any students identified that are outside the definition for <i>most significant cognitive disability</i>?</p> <p>C. Explore data patterns separately for possible commonalities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Enrollment in general education courses b. Building, grade level, teacher, school, school psychologist, receiving services outside the district, etc. patterns that may indicate over identification. <p>D. Examine First Contact Survey for patterns and trends.</p>			

Section D: Summarize required Data Trends and Patterns

What is working?

What needs to change?

Section E
Examining Disproportionality

Guiding Question

NMPED must provide assurances, one of which that NMPED has verified that each LEA that assesses more than 1% of its students in any subject using an Alternate Assessment has followed the State’s guidelines for participation in the Alternate Assessment (34 CFR § 200.6(c)(4)).

What is the process the LEA has in place to reduce participation in alternate assessments not solely to meet federal requirements but to ensure each student has access to rigorous curriculum and assessments that prepare them for future success?

Here are some resources:

- [Equity in Special Education: Disproportionality](#)
- [National Center for Educational Outcomes Disproportionality Guidance](#)
- [NMPED Identity, Equity and Transformation](#)
- [Disproportionality Calculator from NCEO](#)

Disproportionality Trends	Data Summary	Area of Concern? (Y/N)	Root Cause:
<p>Disproportionality</p> <p>A. How are participation rates different for subgroups (e.g. African-American, Native American, Hispanic, Asian, Caucasian, English Learners, Economically Disadvantaged) compared to other subgroups?</p> <p>B. Are trends evident that show participation of a subgroup increasing or decreasing over time (i.e., three years)?</p> <p>C. Are there high numbers of students consistently performing above or near proficient in content areas on the alternate assessment?</p> <p>D. Is there a particular disability identified for the DLM? Example, all “specific learning disabilities” are MSDC; Examine First Contact Survey for patterns and trends.</p> <p>E. What other factors within the district may be causing a higher number of students being alternately assessed (enrollment changes, expansion of services, other)?</p>	<p>Data Summary:</p>	<p>Area of Concern? (Y/N)</p>	<p>Root Cause:</p>

Section E: Summarize disproportionality trends for participation in the alternate assessment.

What is working?

What needs to change?

By signing you attest to being part of the data review and Alternate Assessment Root Cause Report.

School District Representative (Name/Date) _____

Special Education Director (Name/Date) _____

Intervention Specialist (Name/Date) _____

General Education Teacher (Name/Date) _____

Parent/Guardian (Name/Date) _____

NOTE:

*This Root Cause Tool was modeled after the Ohio Department of Education’s Root Cause Tool and Process.
See Citation Section