

## 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#

570 - Madison County

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

Pirtle Bernice

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.* \*

2

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.* \*

1.89

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.* \*

2.06

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

1.8

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

1.7

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

1.6

## 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.* \*

1.95

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.* \*

1.86

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.* \*

2.05

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

1.78

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

1.68

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

1.58

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

### 16. Science Participation Rates 2020-21 \*

1.66

### 17. Science Participation Rates 2021-22 \*

1.88

### 18. Science Participation Rates 2022-23 \*

1.85

### 19. Science Participation Rates 2023-24 \*

1.78

### 20. Science Participation Rates 2024-25 \*

1.68

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

1.58

## 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**. \*

6.3

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

4.5

## 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? \*

In making decisions regarding assessment participation, IEP teams must first determine if a student demonstrates a significant cognitive disability. The IEP team uses the three criteria considerations to ensure decisions are based on a holistic view of the whole child and not concentrate purely on an IQ score as there are many factors that can impact assessment performance. Additionally, the district provided district-wide training on Alternate Assessment (1%) participation & Implementation. In addition to the training, JMCSS has access to the PowerPoint, Rubric, data, and Diploma Decision-Making Guide that the district uses for one-one training or group training.

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

IEP teams utilize multiple sources of data to determine whether a student meets the criteria for participation in the alternate assessment, ensuring decisions are comprehensive and not based on a single measure. The data reviewed include: -Cognitive Assessment Data: Results from individually administered, standardized cognitive assessments (e.g., full-scale IQ scores), including subtest analysis and evaluator interpretation. -Adaptive Behavior Data: Standardized adaptive behavior scales (e.g., Vineland, ABAS) that measure functioning across domains such as communication, daily living skills, and socialization. -Academic Achievement Data: Performance on state and district assessments, curriculum-based measures, and progress monitoring data aligned to grade-level standards. -Instructional Data: Documentation demonstrating that the student is receiving instruction aligned to alternate academic achievement standards (AA-AAAS), not grade-level standards. -IEP Goals and Progress Data: Evidence showing that the student's goals are substantially modified and focused on functional and foundational skills rather than grade-level expectations. -Classroom Performance and Work Samples: Observational data, teacher input, and student work that reflect the level and complexity of skills demonstrated across settings. -Disability Impact Documentation: Evaluation reports and present levels of performance that clearly describe how the disability significantly impacts cognitive functioning and adaptive behavior. State-Provided Alternate Assessment Participation Guidelines: Use of the state rubric and decision-making tools to ensure alignment with eligibility criteria. This multi-source approach ensures that decisions are data-driven, individualized, and aligned with federal expectations that only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities participate in alternate assessments.

## Process for Determining Alternate Assessment Eligibility:

### Criterion One

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

Adaptive behavior data play a critical role in determining eligibility for alternate assessment participation and are considered alongside cognitive data to provide a complete picture of the student's functioning. IEP teams review standardized adaptive behavior assessments that evaluate the student's performance in key domains, including: - Conceptual Skills (e.g., communication, understanding of language, functional academics) -Social Skills (e.g., interpersonal interactions, social awareness, self-regulation) -Practical/Daily Living Skills (e.g., personal care, independence, safety, use of community resources) The IEP team analyzes whether the student demonstrates significant deficits across multiple adaptive domains, which is a defining characteristic of a significant cognitive disability. These deficits must be pervasive, consistent over time, and evident across environments (school, home, and community), rather than situational or influenced by external factors such as lack of instruction, attendance issues, or language differences. -Adaptive behavior data are also used to: -Confirm the level of independence and need for extensive supports in daily functioning -Validate alignment between the student's instructional program and alternate academic achievement standards -Ensure that the student's needs cannot be appropriately met through general education standards, even with accommodations and supports IEP teams document how adaptive behavior results support (or do not support) eligibility for alternate assessment. If adaptive functioning does not reflect significant and pervasive needs, the team must reconsider participation in the alternate assessment to ensure compliance with the 1% requirement.

## 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? \*

The IEP team ensures that a student's performance is not the result of an instructional disadvantage by systematically verifying that the student has had consistent access to high-quality, standards-aligned instruction prior to considering alternate assessment eligibility. The team engages in a comprehensive review process that includes:

- Verification of Standards-Based Instruction: Documentation confirms the student has received instruction aligned to Tennessee grade-level academic standards, with appropriate scaffolds, accommodations, and supports.
- Review of Instructional History: The team examines the student's educational history, including prior placements, service delivery models, attendance, and access to core instruction, to rule out gaps in opportunity to learn.
- Analysis of Intervention Data: The IEP team reviews RTI<sup>2</sup> data, including Tier II and Tier III interventions, to ensure that the student has received targeted, evidence-based interventions with fidelity over time.
- Fidelity of Implementation: Documentation (e.g., walkthroughs, lesson plans, service logs) is reviewed to confirm that instruction and interventions were implemented as designed and with sufficient intensity and duration.
- Consideration of Exclusionary Factors: The team ensures that the student's academic performance is not primarily due to factors such as excessive absences, lack of appropriate instruction, language differences, cultural factors, or environmental/economic disadvantage.
- Progress Monitoring Trends: The IEP team analyzes longitudinal data to determine whether the student demonstrates minimal or no progress despite sustained, research-based instruction and interventions.
- Alignment to Alternate Academic Achievement Standards: The team confirms that the student requires substantially modified instruction linked to grade-level standards, rather than grade-level instruction with accommodations alone.

Through this structured review, the IEP team ensures that eligibility decisions are based on the presence of a significant cognitive disability, rather than a lack of access to appropriate instruction or supports.

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

The IEP team utilizes multiple data sources to ensure decisions are informed, comprehensive, and aligned to state and federal expectations. These data sources include:

- Standards-Aligned Instructional Evidence: Lesson plans, curriculum materials, and pacing guides demonstrating access to grade-level Tennessee Academic Standards, including documentation of scaffolds and differentiation.
- Progress Monitoring Data: Data from curriculum-based measures, IEP goal tracking, and intervention progress monitoring (e.g., RTI<sup>2</sup> data, AimswebPlus) showing the student's response to instruction over time.
- State and District Assessment Data: Results from statewide assessments, benchmark assessments, and district screeners that reflect performance relative to grade-level expectations.
- Intervention Documentation: Records of evidence-based interventions, including frequency, duration, group size, and fidelity of implementation.
- IEP Documentation: Present levels of performance,



# 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.

goals, service delivery, and accommodations that reflect alignment to standards and the level of support required. -Evaluation Reports: Psychoeducational evaluations and reevaluation data that describe the student's learning profile and support needs.

-Alternate Assessment Participation Rubric and Guidance Tools: State-provided criteria used to ensure alignment with eligibility expectations. By utilizing these data sources, the IEP team ensures that the student has been provided meaningful access to rigorous, standards-based instruction and that any limited progress is attributable to the nature of the student's disability, not an instructional gap.

## 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? \*

The IEP team uses multiple sources of data to determine whether a student requires extensive, direct individualized instruction and substantial supports to achieve measurable gains. These data sources ensure decisions are comprehensive, individualized, and aligned to the student's demonstrated needs: -IEP Present Levels of Performance (PLOP): Detailed documentation of the student's current academic and functional performance, including the level of independence and support required. -Progress Monitoring Data: Ongoing data (e.g., AimswebPlus, curriculum-based measures, IEP goal tracking) demonstrating the student's rate of progress with and without intensive supports. -IEP Goal Performance: Evidence that the student requires highly individualized, functional, and foundational goals that are substantially modified from grade-level expectations. Instructional Data: Documentation of the need for repeated, explicit instruction, task analysis, systematic prompting, and individualized pacing to support skill acquisition. -Service Delivery Data: Frequency, duration, and intensity of special education and related services, including small group or one-on-one instruction. -Behavioral Data (if applicable): Functional Behavior Assessments (FBAs), Behavior Intervention Plans (BIPs), and data reflecting the need for intensive behavioral supports. -Adaptive Behavior Data: Evidence of significant limitations in daily functioning that require ongoing adult assistance and supervision. -Evaluation Reports: Psychoeducational and reevaluation data that describe the student's learning characteristics and support needs across environments. These data collectively demonstrate that the student requires extensive, sustained, and individualized supports beyond what is typical in general education or resource settings, even with accommodations and standard interventions.

#### 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 collaborative, data-driven process that considers the student's unique learning profile, response to instruction, and level of independence across settings. This process includes: -Analysis of Student Response to Instruction: Reviewing how the student performs with varying levels of support (e.g., independent, prompted, modeled, or hand-over-hand assistance). -Task Analysis and Skill Breakdown: Identifying the specific steps required for skill acquisition and determining the level of instructional support needed at each step. -Consideration of Instructional Supports: Determining the need for evidence-based strategies such as systematic instruction, repeated practice, visual supports, assistive technology, and augmentative communication systems. -LRE Considerations: For students in highly modified settings, the team ensures that: Instruction remains linked to grade-level standards (AA-AAAS) -Opportunities for interaction with nondisabled peers are considered and documented Continuous Data Review: Supports are adjusted based on progress monitoring data to ensure they are effective and lead to measurable gains. This process ensures that supports are individualized, data-based, and aligned to both the student's disability-related needs and access to the general education curriculum.

#### 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? \*

The IEP team distinguishes between disability-related supports and universally available instructional supports by carefully analyzing the intensity, frequency, and individualization of the supports required: Individual/Universal

# 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.

Supports: Any student These include general classroom strategies such as differentiated instruction, flexible grouping, extended time, and teacher clarification. These supports are typically available to any student and do not require specialized instruction. -Disability-Specific Supports (Individualized): These are supports that are: Intensive and individualized, not routinely provided to all students documented in the IEP as necessary for the student to access and make progress in the curriculum -Required consistently across settings (e.g., school, home, community) Beyond typical accommodations, such as: -One-on-one or very small group instruction -Systematic prompting (e.g., least-to-most, most-to-least prompting) -Task analysis and repeated explicit instruction -Assistive technology or augmentative communication systems The team uses observational data, progress monitoring, and evaluation results to determine whether the student can perform tasks with only universal supports or requires specialized, intensive supports to demonstrate learning. The IEP clearly documents the supports required and provides justification based on data, ensuring alignment with alternate assessment eligibility criteria. Through this process, the IEP team ensures that eligibility decisions are based on true disability-related needs for extensive support, rather than access to supports that are typically available within 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.

A review of JMCSS alternate assessment participation data by primary disability category indicates that participation is heavily concentrated among students with Intellectual Disabilities (49.69%) and Autism (31.06%). While it is expected that students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are more likely to participate in the alternate assessment, these percentages suggest a potential overrepresentation within these categories that warrants continued review to ensure full alignment with the 1% participation requirement and eligibility criteria. When compared to the overall LEA population demographics, which include a majority-minority student population (approximately 65% minority enrollment), the district continues to monitor whether alternate assessment participation reflects proportional representation across racial and demographic groups. Any variance between overall enrollment demographics and alternate assessment participation may indicate potential disproportionality related to race, disability category, or access to rigorous instruction. JMCSS will implement the following multi-tiered plan to ensure equitable and appropriate participation in alternate assessments:

1. Strengthen IEP Team Decision-Making Provide targeted training for IEP teams on the three alternate assessment criteria, emphasizing:
  - Distinction between significant cognitive disability vs. low academic performance
  - Requirement for standards-aligned instruction (Criterion Two)
  - Documentation of extensive, individualized supports (Criterion Three)Utilize state-provided rubrics, decision-making tools, and diploma guidance consistently across all schools.
2. Conduct Ongoing Data Monitoring and Audits Perform quarterly audits of alternate assessment participation by:
  - Disability category
  - Race/ethnicityUse TN Pulse and internal data systems to identify patterns, trends, and outliers. Require schools with elevated participation rates to complete a justification review and corrective action plan, if needed.
3. Review Students with Advanced Scores Implement a formal review process for any student scoring Advanced on the alternate assessment to determine continued eligibility and ensure alignment with participation criteria.
4. Align LRE and Assessment Decisions Reinforce that placement decisions (LRE) are separate from assessment decisions. Ensure students are not placed in alternate assessments based on:
  - Setting (e.g., self-contained classroom)
  - Behavioral needs alone
  - Convenience or historical placement patterns

Through these actions, JMCSS is committed to ensuring that only students with the most significant cognitive disabilities participate in the alternate assessment, while actively addressing and reducing any disproportionality across disability categories and demographic groups.

*(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? \*

MCSS ensures that parents are fully informed of alternate assessment eligibility criteria and the implications of participation through a structured and transparent communication process. This includes: -Prior Written Notice (PWN): Parents receive clear written notice whenever alternate assessment participation is proposed or changed, outlining the rationale, data considered, and implications for instruction and diploma pathways. -IEP Meeting Discussion: During the IEP meeting, the team reviews the three eligibility criteria in parent-friendly language and explains how the student's data align to each criterion. -Multiple Communication Methods: Information is shared through written documentation, verbal explanation, and, when needed, interpreters or translated materials to ensure understanding.

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

Parents are integral members of the IEP team and are actively included in all decisions related to alternate assessment participation. JMCSS ensures meaningful parent participation through the following practices: -Timely Meeting Notification: Parents receive advance written notice (10-day district expectation unless waived) of IEP meetings to allow adequate time for preparation. -Flexible Scheduling: Meetings are scheduled at mutually agreed-upon times, with options for in-person, virtual, or phone participation to maximize accessibility. -Active Engagement During Meetings: Parents are provided opportunities to share input, concerns, and insights regarding their child's performance and needs. The IEP team reviews all relevant data collaboratively, ensuring parents understand how decisions are made.

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? \*JMCSS has established systematic processes to ensure that alternate assessment participation is reviewed at least annually and reconsidered as needed: Annual IEP Review Requirement: Alternate assessment participation is a required discussion point during every annual IEP meeting. The team re-evaluates the student's eligibility using current data and the three criteria.

## 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.\* JMCSS ensures that students participating in the alternate assessment are provided standards-based, rigorous instruction and make appropriate academic progress through a comprehensive system of policies, procedures, and practices aligned with the expectations outlined in *Endrew F. v. Douglas County School District* and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
1. Standards-Based Instructional Expectations All students, including those participating in alternate assessments, receive instruction linked to Tennessee grade-level standards, using Alternate Academic Achievement Standards (AA-AAAS) where appropriate. Special education services are delivered in addition to, not in place of, core instruction, ensuring access to the general education curriculum. Teachers are required to implement rigorous, meaningful instruction with appropriate scaffolds, modifications, and supports to promote engagement and skill development.
  2. Individualized IEP Development Aligned to *Endrew F.* Standards IEPs are developed to be reasonably calculated to enable progress appropriate in light of the student's circumstances, consistent with *Endrew F.* Goals are:
    - Standards-aligned (linked to grade-level expectations)
    - Measurable and data-driven
    - Designed to promote both academic and functional growth
    - Present Levels of Performance (PLOP) include detailed baseline data to inform goal development and instructional planning.
  3. Progress Monitoring and Data-Driven Instruction The district utilizes ongoing progress monitoring systems (e.g., AimswebPlus, curriculum-based measures, and IEP goal tracking) to assess student growth. Progress is reviewed:
    - At regular intervals aligned with grading periods
    - More frequently if specified in the IEP
    - Data are used to:
      - Adjust instruction and supports
      - Determine effectiveness of interventions
      - Inform IEP revisions when progress is not sufficient
  4. Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (RTI<sup>2</sup>) Integration Students are provided access to evidence-based interventions through RTI<sup>2</sup>, including Tier II and Tier III supports when appropriate. -Intervention data are used to ensure that lack of progress is not due to insufficient instruction or intervention, but reflects the impact of the student's disability.

## 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. \*
- JMCSS is committed to lowering our numbers for the 1% Alternate Assessment. We need support with understanding what qualifies a student as "Most Cognitive Significant." Most IEP teams struggle with this language and truly understand what it means.