

February 26, 2016

This narrative is to provide information about the AIM Assessment Team and the rescreening process utilized by the AIM Assessment Team.

The AIM Assessment team (AAT) is comprised of the following members:

AIM Elementary Teacher – Steve Kelleher (Korematsu)  
AIM Secondary Teacher – Jeff Bryant (Holmes Jr. High)  
Site Principal – Gay Bourguignon (Patwin)  
School Psychologist – April Seto (Districtwide)  
Director of Curriculum, Assessment & Learning – Stephanie Gregson  
Associate Superintendent of Instructional Services – Clark Bryant

The teacher and principal positions were randomly selected from all AIM teachers and all principals.

The AIM Assessment Team met on December 10 and 11, 2015, in the South Conference Room at the District Office. The meeting was facilitated by Stephanie Gregson. The first step of the AAT was to develop norms to guide the team during the two days of meetings. A “Parking Lot” was established to record any notes, questions, and the schedule for the day.

### Norms

- Confidentiality
- Time limit of 5 minutes per student discussion, then place on review list for continued discussion
- Regular breaks
- Respect the process
- Conversation stays on topic
- Respectful conversation
- Assume positive intent

The role/purpose of the AAT was then shared and discussed and roles and responsibilities of members were reviewed with the team members. A general overview was provided. It was noted that this was a new process and the AAT may decide to add in new elements to enhance the process as agreed upon by the team. The AAT began to work through the process as outlined below. At the end of the first day, the AAT debriefed and made notes of the next steps for the following day.

The AAT adhered to the following process to determine who would be rescreened and to identify the most appropriate assessment:

Process:

1. Review OLSAT scores of all 3<sup>rd</sup> graders
  - a. Those scoring 96% were placed on the AIM-Identified list
2. Review of students with low socio-economic status (SES)
3. Review of English Learners (EL)
4. Review of students with no risk factors & scored in the standard error of measurement (SEOM), 91-95%
5. Review of Special Education and 504 students

The following data was used to help determine the most appropriate assessment for rescreening and if there were discrepant indicators. The data was displayed on the widescreen so the AAT could jointly review each student. The data consisted of:

- OLSAT scores
- CELDT scores
- SES status
- Special Education status
- IEP At a Glance documents for all Special Education students
- Special Education cognitive testing scores when available
- 504 information
- HOPE Scale scores
- Report card marks
- Student achievement data located in Illuminate
- Teacher notes during OLSAT administration
- Teacher notes on HOPE Scale form

The following is the criteria used to determine appropriate rescreening assessment and if the student was a candidate for rescreening.

Criteria:

All student data was reviewed for each student, the criteria below provided a starting place for the AAT in making rescreening decisions.

Risk Factor/Group of Students	Criteria	Rescreening assessment options
SES	OSLAT score – low verbal, high nonverbal OLSAT score – high verbal, low nonverbal Low CELDT, low SES	Naglieri (NNAT) CogAT TONI
EL	CELDT levels 1-2 CELDT levels 3-5 Newcomers	TONI NNAT TONI
Special Ed	Student by student case based on IEP information. Speech may not have been considered a risk factor depending on speech goals.	
SEOM	No risk factors and scoring in the SEOM in either total, verbal or nonverbal	CogAT

On December 11, the AAT finalized the rescreening decisions and conducted a final review through all students to ensure thoroughness of the process. The AAT debriefed the entire two days and made notes of strengths and areas of modification for the following year.

Overall, the AAT felt the process was extremely thorough, the protocols worked well for the decision-making process. The team worked very well together to ensure the appropriate rescreening decisions were made for each 3<sup>rd</sup> grade OLSAT test taker. Below are the identification, re-screening and non-rescreening numbers:

(Numbers reflective of the AAT findings and do not take into consideration families who opted out of rescreening.)

- AIM Identified through OLSAT – 55
- AIM Identified through WISC scores on IEP – 1
- AIM Identified based on previous school district scores – 1
- Rescreening through TONI – 41
- Rescreening through NNAT – 130
- Rescreening through CogAT – 47
- Not candidates for rescreening - 311

The AAT identified areas of strength in the process and modifications/additions for next year:

Strengths	Areas of Change/Modifications
<p>Protocol/process worked well – use year to year Decision making process worked well – use year to year</p> <p>Use of large screen for whole group discussion Redundancies of looking at multiple risk factors Designated rescreening standard criteria Team worked well together Final sweep of all students List of Special Ed students with IEP at a glance Consistent language for next year ex: no discrepancies</p>	<p>AAT preview assessments Give psychologist access to all 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in SEIS so they can look up scores and disabilities beyond the IEP at a glance 2-year rotating cycle for members of AAT</p> <p>AAT to meet in May to review overall data/process</p>

Once results were communicated, three student cases were referred back to the AAT for another review. From these three student cases, one student was identified to be rescreened due to discrepant indicators. The other two student cases were not found to have any discrepant indicators or risk factors and were not rescreened.

Next Steps:

The AAT will be meeting in May to review data and rescreening process to ensure thoroughness and effectiveness.