

2025-26 Alternative Assessment Justification

Local Educational Agency (LEA) Justification and Assurances for Exceeding the 1.0 Percent Cap

Purpose

In accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and 34 C.F.R. § 200.6(c), local educational agencies (LEAs) contributing to the state exceeding the 1.0 percent cap must submit a justification and assurances.

1. Select LEA Name and ID#

140 - Clay County

2. Enter the Last Name, First Name of the individual submitting this form.

Dailey, Alicia

3. Identify your role within the LEA. Special Education Director

- a. Special Education Director
- b. Special Education Coordinator
- c. Other

ELA Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through 2025-26

4. **ELA Participation Rates 2020-21** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.32

5. **ELA Participation Rates 2021-22** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.91

6. **ELA Participation Rates 2022-23** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.38

7. **ELA Participation Rates 2023-24** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.5

8. **ELA Participation Rates 2024-25** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.48

9. **ELA Participation Rates 2025-26** **2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data.* *

1.48

Math Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through

10. **Math Participation Rates 2020-21** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.33

11. **Math Participation Rates 2021-22** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.93

12. **Math Participation Rates 2022-23** *Note: Prior to the 2023-24 SY, Tennessee participated in the Multi-State Alternate Assessment (MSAA) in English language arts (ELA) and mathematics. Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

0.38

13. **Math Participation Rates 2023-24** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.47

14. **Math Participation Rates 2024-25** *Note: Beginning in the 2023-24 SY, the Dynamic Learning Maps (OLM) embedded alternate assessment replaced the MSAA.* *

1.32

15. **Math Participation Rates 2025-26** **2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data.* *

1.32

Science Participation Rates for School Years 2020-21 through 2025-26

16. Science Participation Rates 2020-21 *

0.56

17. Science Participation Rates 2021-22 *

0.73

18. Science Participation Rates 2022-23 *

0.57

19. Science Participation Rates 2023-24 *

1.32

20. Science Participation Rates 2024-25 *

1.92

21. Science Participation Rates 2025-26 *2025-26 is an estimated participation rate using LEA assessment provisioning data. *

1.92

Number of Students Scoring

To calculate: Log into KITE - Reports - Alternate Assessment Reports - Year 2025 - LEA Name and select the .PDF file. The first table in the report provides the number of students scoring Advanced by grade and subject. Calculate the total number of students scoring Advanced for each subject.

22. In school year 2024-25, list the total number of students scoring "Advanced" for **ELA**. *

0

23. In school year 2024-25, list the total number of students scoring "Advanced" for **Math**.

0

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

Criterion One

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion One: The student has a significant cognitive disability. Only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities should be considered for the alternate assessment.

You must also describe the process for reviewing alternate assessment eligibility for any student scoring Advanced in at least one subject. Advanced performance scores may indicate that the student's skills exceed the eligibility criteria and should prompt a review of the student's continued participation in the alternate assessment.

In the questions below, describe the process used to ensure the IEP team considers only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities (approximately 1.0 percent of the student population).

24. How are IEP teams informed of the criterion and expectations for determining if the student meets expectations for participation? *

When discussing the possibility of alt assessment for a student the team is informed that the student must show significantly below average cognitive and adaptive behaviors as well as demonstrating the lack of ability to progress in the gen ed regular curriculum.

25. What data are used to make the determination (e.g., cognitive and adaptive behavior data)? *

The team uses individually administered cognitive assessments such as the TONY IV for students who are nonverbal and the WISC V for verbal. For adaptive behavior, the students, parents, and teacher complete the Vineland -3 and or the BASC-3.

26. How is adaptive behavior data incorporated into the decision-making process? *

Adaptive behavior is essential to the process in that a student must show significantly below adaptive behavior from the teacher and the parents Vineland-3 or BASC-3. Adaptive behaviors are considered just as important a piece of the assessment as the cognitive piece.

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility: Criterion Two

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion Two: The student is learning content linked to (derived from) state content standards. All students, regardless of the assessment or the least restrictive environment (LRE) should receive standards-aligned instruction that is rigorous, meaningful, and sufficient in duration to increase student outcomes. Special education services are provided in addition to, not in place of, standards-based instruction.

In the questions below, describe the evidence used to ensure the student was provided access to grade-level, standards-aligned instruction. This should include an explanation of the process used to ensure the student received instruction aligned to grade-level standards at an appropriate level of rigor, intensity, and duration comparable to their peers.

27. How does the IEP team ensure the student's performance and skill level are due to a significant cognitive disability rather than an instructional disadvantage? *

To show that the student has had consistent access to grade-level, standards-aligned instruction—and that their performance reflects a significant cognitive disability rather than limited instruction—the IEP team relies on multiple sources of evidence and a deliberate review process. First, the team documents that the student has been taught using the same grade-level academic standards as peers, with appropriate accommodations and supports. This includes lesson plans aligned to state standards, curriculum maps, and instructional materials that reflect grade-level expectations. Work samples, classroom assessments, and progress monitoring data demonstrate that the student has been exposed to rigorous content over time, even if accessed through adapted methods (e.g., scaffolding, assistive technology, modified presentation). Service logs and schedules also show that instruction was provided with sufficient intensity and duration comparable to peers, including time in general education settings when appropriate. Second, the IEP team reviews data from multiple settings and over an extended period. This includes universal screening results, benchmark assessments, formative and summative classroom data, and progress monitoring within tiered supports (such as RTI frameworks). The team looks for evidence that the student received increasingly intensive interventions that were evidence-based and delivered with fidelity. Documentation of intervention type, frequency, duration, and student response helps confirm that lack of progress is not due to insufficient or inconsistent instruction. Third, fidelity of instruction is considered. The team ensures that qualified personnel delivered instruction aligned to grade-level standards and that the student had equitable access to instructional resources. Attendance records, participation data, and any interruptions to instruction are reviewed to rule out external factors such as excessive absences or gaps in opportunity to learn. To determine that the student's performance is due to a significant cognitive disability rather than an instructional disadvantage, the IEP team triangulates multiple data points. This includes comprehensive evaluation results (e.g., cognitive assessments, adaptive behavior scales), showing significantly below-average intellectual functioning and deficits in adaptive skills across environments. These results are consistent over time and corroborated by classroom performance data and lack of adequate response to well-implemented interventions. Finally, the team ensures that exclusionary factors are ruled out. They verify that the student's learning difficulties are not primarily due to limited English proficiency, cultural or environmental factors, sensory impairments, or lack of appropriate instruction. This conclusion is supported by documentation of consistent, standards-aligned instruction, targeted interventions, and persistent low performance despite these supports. Together, this body of evidence demonstrates that the student has had meaningful access to grade-level instruction and that their learning profile reflects a significant cognitive disability rather than an instructional gap.

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

Criterion Two

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

28. What data are used to make an informed determination? *

Maps testing, AimswebPlus testing, formative/summative classroom test, teacher input, interventionist input, admin input.
Once the decision is made to start the determination testing then the school psy will review all testing data to see if the student qualifies or does not qualify.

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility: Criterion Three

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

Criterion Three: The student requires extensive direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

In the questions below, describe the process used to determine that the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports.

29. What data are used to support this determination? *

To determine that the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports, the IEP team follows a structured, data-driven process that examines the student's response to instruction over time and across settings. The process begins with a review of the student's access to grade-level, standards-aligned instruction, including the use of appropriate accommodations and differentiation in the general education setting. When the student demonstrates persistent difficulty, the team implements increasingly intensive, evidence-based interventions (e.g., through an RTI/MTSS framework). These interventions are delivered with clearly defined frequency, duration, and instructional strategies, and their implementation is monitored for fidelity. Throughout this process, the team collects and analyzes multiple sources of data to evaluate the student's progress. Progress monitoring data is central, showing the student's rate of improvement over time in targeted skill areas. Despite receiving high-quality instruction and targeted interventions, the student demonstrates minimal or slow progress compared to expected rates and to similarly supported peers. Additional data used to support this determination include: Classroom performance data: Work samples, formative and summative assessments, and grades that reflect significant gaps in mastering grade-level standards, even with supports. Universal screening and benchmark assessments: Results indicating performance well below grade-level expectations across multiple content areas. Diagnostic and norm-referenced assessments: Standardized testing that shows significantly below-average performance in academic and/or cognitive domains. Adaptive behavior assessments: Measures indicating substantial support needs in daily functioning, communication, and social skills that impact learning. Observation data: Documentation from multiple educators and service providers highlighting the student's need for repeated instruction, prompting, task breakdown, and individualized supports to engage with content. Intervention data: Records of intervention type, intensity, duration, and fidelity, demonstrating that increasingly intensive supports have been provided without sufficient progress. Service delivery records: Evidence of the amount and type of specialized instruction already provided (e.g., small group, one-on-one, related services) and the student's response to those supports. The IEP team looks for consistent patterns across these data sources—specifically, that the student requires instruction that is more explicit, more frequent, more individualized, and of longer duration than what is typically provided to peers, including those receiving general education interventions. The team also compares the student's rate of progress to expected growth trajectories and determines that meaningful gains occur only when substantial supports are in place. After all this data has been reviewed the student will then have comprehensive testing from the school psychologist using individually administered cognitive assessments such as the TONY IV for students who are nonverbal and the WISC V. For adaptive behavior the students parents and teacher complete the Vineland -3 and or the BASC-3. Finally, the team documents that the student's needs cannot be met through general education supports alone and that the intensity of instruction required goes beyond typical differentiation or supplemental interventions. This comprehensive review supports the conclusion that the student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains in the grade- and age-appropriate curriculum.

30. How do IEP teams determine the type and level of supports needed, including for students whose least restrictive environment (LRE) is a highly modified special education setting for all or part of the day? *

IEP teams determine the type and level of supports through a structured, data-based decision-making process that centers on the student's unique needs while ensuring access to grade-level, standards-aligned instruction. To identify the type and level of supports, the team begins by reviewing comprehensive data: present levels of academic achievement and functional performance (PLAAFP), progress monitoring, evaluation results (cognitive, academic, adaptive), classroom performance, and observations across settings. The team analyzes how the student performs with varying levels of support—such as whole group, small group, and one-on-one instruction—to identify what conditions lead to meaningful progress. The team then considers a continuum of supports, including: Accommodations (e.g., extended time, visual supports, assistive technology), Modifications (e.g., adjusted complexity or breadth of content when appropriate), Specialized instruction (explicit, systematic teaching strategies), Related services (e.g., speech, occupational

Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

Criterion Three

In this section, describe the processes in place to ensure the IEP team is making informed, data-based decisions aligned to the alternate assessment participation criteria. Please note that completion of the Alternate Assessment Worksheet in TN PULSE alone is not sufficient evidence.

therapy), Environmental supports (structured routines, reduced distractions). For students whose LRE includes a highly modified special education setting for all or part of the day, the team documents why less restrictive settings, even with supplementary aids and services, are not sufficient. This determination is based on evidence that the student requires: Frequent, intensive, and individualized instruction, A significantly reduced student-to-teacher ratio, Ongoing prompting, repetition, and scaffolding, Specialized methodologies not feasible in a general education setting for the majority of the day. The team ensures that placement decisions are driven by the student's needs—not the setting itself—and that the student still has opportunities for interaction with nondisabled peers to the maximum extent appropriate.

31. How does the IEP team distinguish between supports required due to the student's disability and supports that are available as part of the instructional environment? *

To distinguish between supports required due to the student's disability and those available in the general instructional environment, the IEP team carefully analyzes baseline expectations and compares them to the student's demonstrated needs: Core instructional supports are those that any student might receive (e.g., high-quality instruction, general differentiation, classroom management routines, access to grade-level materials). These are not considered individualized supports. Disability-related supports are those that go beyond typical classroom practices and are necessary for the student to access, engage in, and make progress in the curriculum. These are identified when data show that the student cannot make adequate progress with general supports alone. To make this distinction, the team: Reviews how the student responds to typical classroom supports versus targeted, individualized interventions. Examines whether the support is consistently required, intensive, and specialized (e.g., systematic prompting, task analysis, individualized behavior plans). Considers whether the support must be delivered by specially trained personnel or requires specialized design (hallmarks of special education). Uses progress data to confirm that the student only demonstrates meaningful gains when these individualized supports are in place. Finally, the team documents this distinction clearly in the IEP by linking each support to specific needs identified in the PLAAFP and to measurable annual goals. This ensures that all supports included are necessary for the student's access and progress, rather than simply features of the general education environment.

Disproportionality

Using data by primary eligibility (disability) category and demographic groups, describe LEA patterns of participation in the alternate assessment, including any disproportionate participation and a plan for reducing or eliminating disproportionality. Include a description of the LEA population demographics as compared to statewide demographics.

32. Describe any identified disproportionality in alternate assessment participation and the LEA's plan to address and reduce disproportionate participation, as applicable.

Based on our current LEA data we do not show a disproportionality in our distribution.

*(For example, if the LEA student population is evenly distributed among White, Black, and Hispanic students, the alternate assessment participation data should reflect a similar distribution across those groups.) **

Informed Parent Participation

Students who participate in alternate assessments are significantly less likely to earn a traditional diploma due to the highly modified content and potential for lower expectations.

In the questions below, describe the processes and practices used to ensure parents are fully informed of the eligibility requirements and implications of alternate assessment participation.

33. How are parents informed of the eligibility criteria and implications of participation? *

Ensuring that parents are fully informed about the eligibility criteria and implications of alternate assessment participation is a critical component of ethical and compliant special education practice. Our LEA uses a multi-layered, ongoing communication process to support meaningful parent understanding and participation in decision-making. Parents are first introduced to alternate assessment eligibility during the IEP process. The IEP team—including special education teachers, general education teachers, administrators, and related service providers—reviews the state-established participation criteria in clear, family-friendly language. Teams explain that eligibility is limited to students with the most significant cognitive disabilities and emphasize that this decision is not based on disability category, placement, or service intensity alone. To ensure clarity, parents are provided with written guidance documents that outline both the eligibility requirements and the implications of participation. These materials include explanations that alternate assessments are aligned to alternate academic achievement standards, which differ significantly from grade-level expectations. Parents are explicitly informed that participation may impact the student's ability to earn a traditional high school diploma and could influence postsecondary opportunities. In addition to written materials, IEP teams engage in intentional, two-way conversations with parents. Staff use examples, comparison charts (standard vs. alternate assessment), and, when appropriate, student-specific data to illustrate how the decision affects instruction and long-term outcomes. Opportunities for questions are built into every step of the process, and interpreters or translated materials are provided when needed to ensure accessibility. The LEA also reinforces this information through prior written notice (PWN), which documents the team's decision and the rationale behind it. Parents receive this notice following the IEP meeting, ensuring they have a formal record of the discussion, including the potential consequences of alternate assessment participation. To further strengthen understanding, the LEA offers parent training sessions, informational meetings, and access to school-based staff (such as case managers or instructional coaches) who can provide ongoing support. Follow-up communication is encouraged, and parents are reminded that they are equal members of the IEP team with the right to revisit and discuss decisions at any time. Through these consistent, transparent, and collaborative practices, the LEA ensures that parents are not only informed of the eligibility criteria and implications of alternate assessments, but are also empowered to make decisions that align with their child's needs and long-term goals.

34. How are parents included in the IEP team decision-making process? *

Parents are actively included as equal members of the IEP team when determining whether a student should participate in alternate assessment. The LEA ensures their involvement is meaningful, informed, and ongoing throughout the decision-making process. Parents are invited to all IEP meetings with sufficient notice and are encouraged to participate either in person, virtually, or by phone to reduce barriers to attendance. Prior to the meeting, families are provided with relevant information, including evaluation data, progress reports, and guidance documents related to alternate assessment eligibility. This allows parents time to review information and come prepared with questions or concerns. During the IEP meeting, the team facilitates collaborative discussion by using clear, family-friendly language and avoiding technical jargon. Parents are guided through the state's alternate assessment participation criteria and are included in reviewing multiple data sources, such as cognitive assessments, adaptive behavior, classroom performance, and progress toward IEP goals. The team ensures that parents understand how this data informs the decision and how it relates specifically to their child. Parents are encouraged to share their insights about their child's strengths, needs, and long-term goals. Their input is intentionally solicited and documented as part of the decision-making process. Staff create space for questions, provide clarification as needed, and may use comparison tools (e.g., general vs. alternate assessment expectations) to support understanding. The LEA emphasizes that the decision is made by consensus whenever possible, reinforcing that parents are equal partners in the process—not passive participants. If parents need additional time to consider the information, the team offers follow-up meetings or continued discussion before finalizing decisions. After the meeting, parents receive Prior Written Notice (PWN), which documents the team's decision, the data used, and the rationale behind it. This ensures transparency and provides an opportunity for parents to revisit the information or request further discussion if needed. Additionally, the LEA provides ongoing access to case managers, teachers, and support staff so parents can ask questions or revisit decisions at any time. Interpreters, translated materials, and other supports are provided to ensure all families can fully engage. Through these intentional practices, the LEA ensures that parents are not only present but are active, informed, and valued contributors in the IEP team's decision-making process regarding alternate assessment participation.

35. Participation in the alternate assessment must be reviewed at least annually. Students may transition to the general assessments

at any time, as determined by the IEP team.

What processes are in place to ensure these decisions are fully discussed and reviewed at least annually? *The LEA has established structured, consistent processes to ensure that participation in alternate assessment is fully reviewed, discussed, and documented at least annually, with a strong emphasis on data-driven decision-making and meaningful parent involvement. Alternate assessment participation is formally reviewed during each annual IEP meeting. As part of the required IEP development process, the team revisits the state's participation criteria and carefully examines current student data, including academic progress, cognitive and adaptive functioning, and progress toward IEP goals. This ensures that the decision remains appropriate based on the student's present levels of performance rather than prior placement or historical decisions. To guide consistency, the LEA utilizes a standardized alternate assessment eligibility checklist or decision-making tool aligned with state criteria. This tool is reviewed during the meeting and requires the team—including parents—to confirm that the student continues to meet all eligibility requirements. This prevents automatic continuation and ensures thoughtful reconsideration each year. The IEP team engages in intentional discussion comparing the student's access to grade-level standards versus alternate academic achievement standards. Teams consider whether the student could meaningfully participate in general assessments, with or without accommodations, and whether a transition back to general assessment is appropriate. This conversation is documented within the IEP to reflect that options were thoroughly explored. Parents are actively included in this annual review, with clear explanations provided regarding any changes in expectations, instruction, or long-term outcomes. Staff ensure that parents understand that students may transition to general assessment at any time if appropriate, reinforcing that this decision is flexible and responsive to student growth. Additionally, the LEA has internal monitoring procedures to ensure compliance. Special education administrators and case managers review IEPs to verify that alternate assessment decisions are updated annually and supported by current data. If concerns are identified, teams are required to reconvene to revisit the decision. Finally, Prior Written Notice (PWN) is provided following each IEP meeting, documenting the team's decision, the data considered, and the rationale for continuing or changing assessment participation. This ensures transparency and provides families with a clear record of the discussion. Through these systematic practices—annual IEP review, use of decision-making tools, active parent engagement, and administrative oversight—the LEA ensures that alternate assessment participation is not static, but instead thoughtfully reviewed each year to align with the student's evolving needs and potential.

Ensuring Students Are Making Academic Progress

In *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District*, the U.S. Supreme Court clarified that an IEP must be "reasonably calculated to enable a child to make progress appropriate in light of the child's circumstances." Additionally, the U.S. Department of Education denied the state's 2024-25 waiver request, noting that it did "not find that approving the waiver will advance student academic achievement, as required in section 8401(b)(1)(C) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)."

Thus, LEAs that contribute to the state exceeding the 1.0 percent cap must provide assurances that students participating in alternate assessments are provided access to and engagement in standards-based instruction and are making appropriate academic progress.

36. Describe the policies, procedures, and practices used in your LEA to ensure students are provided instruction that meets the requirements set forth by ESEA and *Endrew F.*, and that students make appropriate academic progress.*

The LEA has established clear policies, procedures, and instructional practices to ensure that all students participating in alternate assessments receive standards-based instruction and make meaningful academic progress in alignment with the expectations set forth in *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District* and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). At the policy level, the LEA requires that all IEPs be developed with a direct connection to state academic content standards. For students participating in alternate assessments, IEP goals are aligned to alternate academic achievement standards, ensuring access to grade-level content in a modified but rigorous format. The LEA emphasizes that placement in alternate assessment does not reduce the expectation for growth; rather, instruction must be intentionally designed to promote ambitious and achievable progress based on the student's individual circumstances. Procedurally, IEP teams use multiple sources of data—including present levels of academic achievement, progress monitoring data, and evaluation results—to develop measurable annual goals that are "reasonably calculated" to enable appropriate progress. Goals are written to be specific, data-driven, and standards-aligned, with clearly defined methods for measuring progress. Teams are trained to ensure that goals reflect high expectations and avoid limiting student potential. Instructionally, the LEA implements evidence-based practices tailored to students with significant cognitive disabilities. This includes the use of adapted curriculum resources, systematic and explicit instruction, task analysis, and frequent opportunities for guided and independent practice. Special education teachers are supported through ongoing professional development focused on standards-based instruction, alternate standards alignment, and strategies for increasing student engagement and rigor. To ensure access and engagement, students are provided with appropriate accommodations, assistive technology, and supports that allow them to meaningfully participate in instruction aligned to content standards. Collaboration between general and special education staff is encouraged to promote inclusive practices and exposure to grade-level content whenever appropriate. Progress monitoring is a critical component of ensuring appropriate academic growth. Teachers collect and analyze data on a regular basis to determine whether students are making sufficient progress toward their IEP goals. If progress is not adequate, instructional strategies, supports, or goals are adjusted promptly. This ongoing review process ensures that instruction remains responsive and effective. The LEA also has oversight procedures in place to ensure compliance and quality. Administrators and special education leaders review IEPs and instructional practices to confirm alignment with standards and adherence to legal requirements. Targeted coaching and support are provided when gaps are identified. Finally, the LEA prioritizes parent involvement by regularly communicating student progress and ensuring families understand how instruction aligns with standards and supports long-term outcomes. Parents are included in all IEP decisions and are informed partners in monitoring progress. Through these aligned policies, data-driven procedures, evidence-based instructional practices, and ongoing monitoring, the LEA ensures that students participating in alternate assessments receive rigorous, standards-based instruction and make meaningful academic progress consistent with the expectations of ESEA and the *Endrew F.* decision.

Ensuring Students Are Making Academic Progress

Support Requested

37. Please describe any support needed from the department to assist in meeting the requirements outlined in this form. All reasonable requests will be considered. * None at this time.