Flagged Student Action Plan:

Tier 3 districts must complete the flagged student action plan and upload the plan into Catamaran. The questions will guide districts through considerations for developing an action plan for each flagged student.

Districts will need to complete the chart below AND an Educational Benefit Review for all flagged students.

Intermediate school districts (ISDs) may require Tier 2 districts to complete the flagged student action plan.

# Demographic Information

**Do NOT include the student’s name.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| District: |  |
| School: |  |
| Name of person completing form: |  |
| Position of person completing form: |  |
| Student’s State ID Number (UIC): |  |
| Student’s Current Grade: |  |
| Date the IEP Team determined that the student meets the criteria for participation in the alternate assessment: |  |
| MARSE Disability Category: |  |
| * Does the student have a primary disability of Specific Learning Disability? [MARSE Rules for this Disability Category](http://C://Users/mozdenc/Downloads/R%20340.1701%20to%20R%20340.1873%20(6).pdf) explicitly rules out the student from having any Cognitive Impairment. | Yes or No |
| * Does the student have a primary disability of Speech Impairment, Emotional Impairment, Other Health Impairment, Hearing Impairment, or Visual Impairment? Students with these disabilities will rarely, if ever, also have the Most Significant Cognitive Disability. | Yes or no |
| * + Does the student have a primary disability of Autism Spectrum Disorder, Cognitive Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury, Physical Impairment, or Severe Multiple Impairments? Please note that about half of all students with these disabilities will also have the Most Significant Cognitive Disability. | Yes or No |

# Criterion-Relevant Sources to Make Decisions

This next section involves gathering and using criterion-relevant sources of information to make decisions about what assessment is most appropriate for the student. Alternate assessments are for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, whose majority of instruction in a subject is rooted within Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations.

The definition of a student with the most significant cognitive disabilities is:

Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities, have a disability or multiple disabilities that **significantly impact intellectual functioning**.

**AND**

**Significantly impact adaptive behaviors,** which are essential to live independently and to function safely in daily life. When adaptive behaviors **are significantly impacted**, the individual is unlikely to develop the skills necessary to live independently and function safely in daily life.

**AND**

Significant cognitive disabilities impact students both in and out of the classroom and across multiple life domains, including academic domains.  This means that the students **have extensive support needs to demonstrate learning** **and generalize skills** across academic and life settings.

**AND**

Students with the Most Significant Cognitive Disabilities are supported with an Individualized Education Program (IEP) and the **primary instruction and summative educational goals are based on Michigan’s alternate content standards** in English language arts (ELA), mathematics, science and/or social studies.

**For each criterion,** several sources of relevant information **may** be used and considered, **but all of the following must be** **reviewed** in order to make appropriate testing decisions. These criteria include:

* Cognitive Functioning
* Adaptive Functioning
* Level of Support Needs
* Primary Instruction

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Cognitive (Intellectual) Functioning** | |
| Instrument(s) used to determine intellectual functioning: |  |
| Date of most recent evaluation that included intellectual (cognitive) testing: |  |
| Data obtained from the instrument(s)   * Detailed IQ subtest scores and the full scale IQ composite score (e.g., Verbal, Non-Verbal, Working Memory, Processing Speed, Fluid Reasoning, Organizing and Sequencing Information, Executive Functioning, etc.) * For each relevant cognitive skill, please rate the student’s current level of functioning, from *Not Limited* to *Most Significant Cognitive Limitations*. * Is there any reason to believe that a sub-score or non-verbal score is a more accurate reflection of the student’s abilities? For instance, does the student have a communication impairment, Autism, Hearing Impairment, or any other impairment that may slow their response times? Is there a large discrepancy between their sub-scores? If yes, a non-verbal or General Ability Index sub-scores will usually be a more accurate reflection of the student’s cognitive functioning. | Not Limited  Mild Cognitive Limitation  Moderate to Significant Cognitive Limitation  Most Significant Cognitive Limitations |
| Data obtained from clinical/licensed professionals, such as those recorded in the most recent Review of Existing Evaluation Data (REED):   * If a valid score of cognitive functioning is not available, or if instrument data seem dated or from an earlier developmental time period, did a licensed professional, such as a school psychologist or clinical psychologist observe and provide their professional judgement of the student’s likely cognitive functioning level? * Were observations made across multiple settings to get a more accurate reflection of the student’s cognitive abilities? * Based on this type of data, please rate the student’s current level of functioning, from *Not Limited* to *Most Significant Cognitive Limitations*. | Not Limited  Mild Cognitive Limitation  Moderate to Significant Cognitive Limitation  Most Significant Cognitive Limitations |
| Data obtained from Present Level of Academic Achievement and Functional Performance (PLAAFP), or other Educational Reviews used in lieu of more timely or criterion-relevant data on the student’s cognitive functioning:   * Academic performance is not the same as cognitive functioning. * What efforts were made to accurately discern the student’s cognitive abilities from instructional and educational goals, and/or from their current academic performance? * How is this information being used to supplement older or earlier direct measures of the students cognitive functioning to discern the student’s present cognitive functioning levels? | Not Limited  Mild Cognitive Limitation    Moderate to Significant Cognitive Limitation    Most Significant Cognitive Limitations |
| **Overall,** based on the most relevant and accurate data available on the student’s cognitive functioning, please rate the student’s current level of functioning, from *Not Limited* to *Most Significant Cognitive Limitations*. | Not Limited  Mild Cognitive Limitation  Moderate to Significant Cognitive Limitation  Most Significant Cognitive Limitations |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adaptive Functioning (Daily Living/Behavioral Skills)** | |
| Instrument(s) used to determine adaptive behavior deficits: |  |
| Data from Parents: Do these include parent observations? | Yes or No |
| Data from Licensed Professionals: | Yes or No |
| Data from Teachers of Record: | Yes or No |
| Date of most recent evaluation(s) that included an adaptive behavior rating scale: |  |
| Data obtained from the adaptive behavior instrument(s):  Include numeric scores for the overall, General Adaptive Index, as well as specific sub-domains/areas, such as the Conceptual, Social, and Practical functioning levels. |  |
| Are these scores similar across observers (parents and teachers, etc.)? If large discrepancies across observers exist, how are these reconciled to determine the students adaptive functioning level? Are averages being used; the highest score across observers being used; or are observations from a licensed professional being used to trump other observer’s scores? |  |
| If the overall adaptive functioning scores are in the normal range, are there any sub-domain scores considerably lower than the others? |  |
| What is the student’s Adaptive Skill levels in the   * Conceptual Domain? * Social Domain? * Practical Domain? * Overall or General Adaptive Skill Levels?   For each, please rate the students adaptive functioning level on a scale from *Not Limited*, to *Most Significant Deficit*. | Not Limited  Mild to Moderate Deficits  Moderate to Significant Deficits  Most Significant Deficits |
| Overall, based on the most relevant data available on the student’s adaptive functioning, does the evidence support a conclusion that the student has significant deficits in adaptive behavior? | Yes or No |
| * Does the student’s IEP address adaptive behavior deficits? | Yes or No |
| * Where in the IEP are adaptive behavior deficits addressed? |  |
| * What information in the PLAAFP pertaining to adaptive behavior supports the assessment decision? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Extensive Support Needs Across Academic and Daily Life Settings** |  |
| How extensive are the student’s instructional supports? List examples of the type of supports needed, then rate the overall level of instructional supports provided to the student, on a scale from *None* to *Extensive.* | None  Light  Moderate  Extensive |
| How extensive are the student’s accommodations and modifications for gauging his or her learning? List examples of the type of supports needed, then rate the overall level of accommodations/modifications, using the scale provided. | None  Light  Moderate  Extensive |
| How extensive is the student’s use of Assistive Technology? List examples of the type of supports needed/provided. Then, rate the overall level of use of assistive technology, using the scale provided. | None  Light  Moderate  Extensive |
| What was the date, if any, that the IEP team determined that the student will likely not be able to live independently? Has this determination been updated to reflect the most recent evidence on the students adaptive functioning and level of support needs? |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Majority of Instruction and Summative Educational Goals Alignment to Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations?** |  |
| Does the majority of the student’s instruction and curriculum for each subject align to Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations or to general grade level content standards?   * Math * English Language Arts * Science * Social Studies |  |
| Does the majority of the student’s summative educational goals for each subject apex within Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations?   * Math * English Language Arts * Science * Social Studies |  |
| If the student is meeting or exceeding Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations, what efforts are being made to ensure that high instructional expectations are being set for the student?  If the student is meeting or exceeding the Functional Independence level of Michigan’s Alternate Content Expectations, what are the district’s plans for providing more rigorous instruction and educational goals, based on general grade level standards? |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Summary of Educational Benefit Review: |
| Recommendations made to IEP Team for consideration based upon review: |