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Introduction

In accordance with the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004* (IDEA) and the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB), all students must participate in state assessments with or without accommodations. The accommodations approved for state testing must have been routinely used during instruction and on similar classroom assessments that measure the same content. The state, LEAs, and schools must monitor the use of all instructional and testing accommodations. The purpose of this monitoring is to ensure that required testing accommodations are provided during test administrations and the usage of these accommodations.

In October 2009, the United States Department of Education (USED) approved North Carolina’s comprehensive plan for monitoring the use of testing accommodations in local school systems. The state plan consists of four phases: (1) desk monitoring; (2) pre-site review; (3) on-site monitoring; and (4) state response and targeted assistance. The North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) Division of Accountability Services is responsible for conducting all monitoring activities, with assistance and participation from the Divisions for Exceptional Children, K–12 Curriculum and Instruction, and other staff from Academic Services and Instructional Support.
Accommodations Monitoring

Beginning in 2009–10, schools were required to conduct local accommodations monitoring through use of the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form (see Appendix), completing one form for each student at each test administration where testing accommodations were required. Completion of the form included recording required testing accommodations prior to testing and documenting if and how test administrators provided accommodations and if and how the students used them during the testing session.

In addition to this local monitoring, some schools underwent targeted accommodations monitoring by the state. Following is a brief summary of the four phases of the North Carolina Testing Program’s monitoring process for 2009–2010. Additional details appear in the 2009–2010 Plan for Monitoring the Use of State Testing Accommodations (i.e., http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/policyoperations/accommmonitorplan.pdf).

Desk Monitoring
Desk monitoring is the NCDPI’s ongoing process for the monitoring of testing accommodations through the use of data collected via student answer sheets, the Online Testing Irregularity Submission System (OTISS), and online data entry systems for required accommodations documentation (i.e., NC WISE and CECAS). This process assisted in the selection of school systems that would potentially require and receive targeted accommodations monitoring.

Pre-site Review
School systems that the NCDPI’s desk monitoring identified as having issues related to testing accommodations were selected to undergo a pre-site review. The pre-site review consisted of an examination of additional existing data (e.g., LEA and school testing plans) to determine which school systems and schools required an on-site monitoring visit. The review assisted in determining whether to request additional documentation prior to the on-site visit and on the day of the visit. Part of the pre-site review process was to select the NCDPI monitoring teams and assign team members’ roles.

On-Site Monitoring
Interdisciplinary teams from the NCDPI conducted on-site visits to monitor accommodations. The teams consisted of at least two Testing/Accountability staff members and staff representing the areas of Exceptional Children, English as a Second Language, and/or Section 504. Each on-site visit took place over two days. The review of accommodations documentation and, if time-permitted, staff interviews occurred on day one. The teams observed accommodated testing sessions and conducted staff interviews on day two.

State Response and Targeted Assistance
Within 60 calendar days of the visits, the teams provided a response in the form of a letter and a report to LEA superintendents of the school systems that had received on-site monitoring visits. The response summarized the monitoring activities, findings, recommendations, required actions, targeted assistance, and possible sanctions. It also provided additional information regarding follow-up visits, requirements for the submission of additional documentation for review, if necessary, and applicable timelines.
Sample

The local education agencies (LEAs) selected for possible participation in on-site visits for the 2009–10 school year came from a random sampling. One LEA was selected randomly from each of the six regions considered representative of the geographical/educational regions of the state. Desk monitoring reduced the sample to four LEAs and facilitated the subsequent selection of the schools within the four LEAs that would receive the on-site visits. The selection totaled six schools across the LEAs, including two elementary schools, two middle schools, and two high schools.

A review of testing schedules submitted during pre-site review led to selection of those accommodated testing sessions targeted for possible observation during the on-site visits. Criteria included the type of accommodations provided within each session and the associated accommodations documentation. The objective was to target a wide variety of testing accommodations and to include students with all types of accommodations documentation. The state selected a larger number of testing sessions than was necessary for observation during the pre-site review in order to have back-ups in the event of conflicts or student absences.
On-site Visit Methodology for Monitoring Accommodations

Teams
In the spring of 2010, interdisciplinary teams from the NCPDI conducted on-site visits to monitor accommodations in six schools across four LEAs in North Carolina. The table below displays the team members that the NCDPI authorized to conduct the visits. All team members are employees of the NCDPI.

Table 1. Accommodations Monitoring On-Site Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Perkis</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Team Lead, 4 visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Tesh</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Team Lead, 2 visits)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elissa Brown</td>
<td>Academic Services and Instructional Support</td>
<td>Director, Section 504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Dowless</td>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Monitoring Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Fasciano</td>
<td>K–12 Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>Section Chief, K–12 Program Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lanier</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Educational Research and Evaluation Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Marino</td>
<td>Curriculum, Instruction, &amp; Technology</td>
<td>ESL/Title III Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Martin-McCoy</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Massengill</td>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Monitoring Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine McBride</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Psychometrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Ragin</td>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Deaf Education &amp; Audiology Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Rose</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Test Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Scriven</td>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Monitoring Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Swiger</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Taylor</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Psychometrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivanna Mann Thrower</td>
<td>K–12 Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>ESL/Title III Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Winton</td>
<td>Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Section Chief, Instructional Support and Related Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-Site Monitoring Activities

As part of the pre-site review conducted prior to the monitoring visits, LEAs and schools submitted testing plans electronically to the NCDPI. Based on this information, the NCDPI selected forty-six (46) accommodated test administrations for which review of student documentation took place on day 1 of the visits. The table below describes activities that took place during the six on-site visits.

Table 2. On-Site Monitoring Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review of current LEA and school testing plans provided during on-site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review of the records of ninety-two (92) students, which included Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms and:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Sixty-one (61) Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Eighteen (18) Section 504 Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Seventeen (17) Limited English Proficiency (LEP) documentation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews of the following staff:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Three (3) Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Four (4) School Test Coordinators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Observation of twenty-nine (29) accommodated test administrations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fourteen (14) for the End-of-Grade Test of Reading Comprehension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Five (5) for the End-of-Grade Test of Mathematics–Calculator Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three (3) for the End-of-Course Test of Algebra I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Three (3) for the End-of-Course Test of Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One (1) for the End-of-Course Test of Civics and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Two (2) for the End-of-Course Test of Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One (1) for the NCEXTEND2 Alternate Assessment of Occupational Life Skills I and II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Observation of sixty-seven (67) students receiving testing accommodations during test administrations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Forty-three (43) students with an IEP only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Two (2) students with an IEP and LEP documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Fourteen (14) students with a Section 504 Plan only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Two (2) students with a Section 504 Plan and LEP documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Six (6) students with LEP documentation only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews of the following staff:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Three (3) Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Three (3) School Test Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Seven (7) Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Nine (9) Test Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Six (6) Proctors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commendations and On-Site Findings

Commendations

On-Site Visits

- LEA and school staff members were cooperative and accommodating during all visits.
- Work spaces provided were pleasant and met the needs of the monitoring teams.

Training

- Teams reported that all test administrators received training prior to testing.
- Teams reported that all proctors received training prior to testing.
- Interviewed staff reported that the electronic presentation of Test Administrator’s Manual took place in multiple schools to facilitate LEA- and school-level test administrators’ training.
- Multiple schools reported the provision of training on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms. One LEA test coordinator shared with the monitoring team a Review of Accommodations Used During Testing user’s guide that she had created for the school system.
- Two schools within one LEA reported that the LEA EC director provided school-wide training on instructional accommodations at the beginning of the school year. Staff interviewed at these two schools reported much involvement from the LEA test coordinator, LEA EC director, principals, and school test coordinators in creating a cohesive accommodations process.
- Multiple schools reported the provision of separate testing accommodations training for test administrators prior to testing.

Accommodations Procedures

- One school reported a mock run-through of the EOG test in March to practice both the provision of and use by students of testing accommodations, and to ensure a good match between the students, test administrators, and proctors.
- Two schools within one LEA reported that there is a formal process for evaluating the provision of, appropriateness of, and use of instructional accommodations every nine weeks. Teams observed the forms used in this process.
- Teams observed the use of Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms in all testing sessions monitored during the visits.

Testing Procedures & Test Security

Teams observed:
- Secure storage areas for testing materials during all visits.
- Well-organized checkout/check-in processes for testing materials at most schools.
- Well-maintained test security throughout all observations.
- Very detailed LEA and school testing plans provided by most schools.
- Test administrators and proctors managing testing sessions well during all visits.

Student Documentation

- Most reviewed records were well-organized and easy to navigate.
- Teams observed that one LEA had created forms to ensure alignment between the accommodations language and documentation details in IEPs, Section 504 Plans, and LEP documentation.
On-Site Findings

On-Site Finding #1
Review of the records of ninety-two (92) students revealed a total of nineteen (19) discrepancies in accommodations documentation. These discrepancies occurred at four (4) out of the six (6) total schools that received an on-site monitoring visit. Fifteen (15) discrepancies existed between required accommodations specified on student IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP documentation and those specified on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form and school testing schedule. Four (4) discrepancies existed between required accommodations specified on student IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP documentation and those specified on the school testing schedule.

Sixteen (16) of these discrepancies were corrected prior to the test administration after being brought to the attention of the school test coordinators by the monitoring teams. Owing to one (1) discrepancy, a school did not provide a required testing accommodation, and subsequently, a testing irregularity occurred. Further details regarding requirements for the investigation of this testing irregularity, as well as the retesting options for this student, appear in On-Site Finding #2.

Two (2) discrepancies resulted in the provision of an accommodation that was not required on the students’ LEP documentation (Testing in a Separate Room—Small Group), but was necessary in order to provide an accompanying required accommodation (Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud—By Student Request). The monitoring report provided this school feedback that it must specify the accommodation of Testing in a Separate Room on student accommodation documentation if the student is required to receive the Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud accommodation.

The following actions and evidence were required of the schools in which teams observed testing accommodations discrepancies:

Required Action
- Process for ensuring the congruence of information within student IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP documentation, the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms, and the testing schedule that outlines accommodations to be provided to individual students at the school level.
- School-level training for all certified staff on the completion of and use of the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form.

Resources for Required Action
- Monitoring Accommodations Webinar training sessions provided by the NCDPI on July 13, August 17, and September 7, 2010.

Plan for Required Action
- Submit written plan for the required action of this finding by September 30, 2010.
- The plan must include (1) specific activities developed in response to required action, (2) a timeline for the implementation of these activities, and (3) personnel responsible for the implementation of the activities.
Evidence of Required Action

• By November 30, 2010 (high schools), or April 29, 2011 (elementary and middle schools), submit revised school testing plan that outlines a process for ensuring congruence of information within student IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP documentation, the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms, and the school testing schedule that outlines accommodations to be provided to individual students.

• By November 30, 2010 (high schools), or April 29, 2011 (elementary and middle schools), submit sign-in sheets, agenda, and handouts from training on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form.

Necessary Outcome

• Elimination of discrepancies between required accommodations specified on student IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP documentation and those documented on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form and school testing schedule for the 2010–11 school year.
On-Site Finding #2
The findings from observation of twenty-nine (29) testing sessions consisting of a total of sixty-seven (67) students to receive accommodations appear in the following table.

Table 3. Testing Accommodations—Required, Provided, and Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation</th>
<th># Required</th>
<th># Provided Correctly</th>
<th># Provided Incorrectly</th>
<th># Not Provided</th>
<th># Not Observed</th>
<th># Used by Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistive Technology Devices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter/Transliterator Signs/Cues Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification Devices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Testing Sessions</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Extended Time</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Marks in Test Book</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reads Test Aloud to Self</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud (All)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud (By Student Request)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing in a Separate Room</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-to-Word Bilingual Dictionary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Ubi DUO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Snacks as Needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>188</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![1](Students received the accommodation of Multiple Testing Sessions, completing half of the test on the day of the observation and half of the test on a future date. The second testing session was not observed; therefore, the Scheduled Extended Time accommodation was not observed.

2The student’s IEP specified that everything, including numbers and formulas, was to be read aloud; however, the test administrator did not read aloud math expressions or cost amounts.

3Two students received the accommodation of Testing in a Separate Room—Small Group although it was not specified in their LEP documentation. They were provided with this accommodation to allow for the provision of the Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud—By Student Request accommodation that was required based on their LEP documentation.

As evidenced in Table 3, schools provided the majority of the testing accommodations as required by student documentation and in accordance with state accommodations guidelines.

Many students did not use the testing accommodations required by their IEPs, Section 504 Plans, and/or LEP documentation and provided to them during the observed test administrations. Overall, students did not use approximately one-third of the required accommodations during the observed testing sessions. Test administrators documented this information for each student on the Review of Accommodations Used.
During Testing forms completed during or after testing. Review and consideration of these forms should take place at the students’ next IEP/Section 504/LEP team meetings during which instructional and testing accommodations decisions are made.

Two (2) discrepancies in accommodations documentation resulted in the provision of an accommodation that was not required on the students’ LEP documentation (Testing in a Separate Room—Small Group), but was necessary in order to provide an accompanying required accommodation (Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud—By Student Request). The monitoring report provided this school feedback that the accommodation of Testing in a Separate Room must be specified on student accommodation documentation if the student is required to receive the Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud accommodation.

During one observed testing session, a required testing accommodation (Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud—All) was provided incorrectly to the student. The following actions and evidence were required of the school that incorrectly provided the testing accommodation:

**Required Action**
- Test administrator’s training that includes an emphasis placed on the provision of testing accommodations, including the Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud accommodation.

**Resources for Required Action**
- Testing Students with Disabilities publication
  (i.e., http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/policyoperations/tswd/tswd.pdf)
- Testing Accommodations: North Carolina Testing Program Powerpoint
  (i.e., http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/policies/tswd/ under Presentations)

**Plan for Required Action**
- Submit written plan for the required action of this finding by September 30, 2010. The plan must include (1) specific activities developed in response to required action, (2) a timeline for the implementation of these activities, and (3) personnel responsible for the implementation of the activities.

**Evidence of Required Action**
- By November 30, 2010, submit sign-in sheets, agenda, and handouts from test administrator’s training.

**Necessary Outcome**
- Test administrators must provide testing accommodations as required by student documentation and in accordance with state accommodations guidelines.
Administrators did not provide two required testing accommodations during observed testing sessions. The following actions and evidence were required of the schools in which this occurred:

**Required Action**
- The school test coordinator must conduct a thorough investigation and complete the Report of Testing Irregularity provided through the Online Testing Irregularity Submission System (OTISS).
- The school test coordinator must notify the parent or guardian that a required testing accommodation was not provided and offer the opportunity for retest. If requested, the student must be retested on another secure form of the test as soon as possible.
- If the student is retested, the initial administration must be declared a misadministration and the score invalidated. The results are not to be included in the student’s permanent record, used for placement decisions, or used for student or school accountability.
- The NCDPI will hold school testing data for 2009–10 until this issue is resolved. The school system must resolve this issue by July 15, 2010, in order for the data to be included in the August release of ABCs/AYP.
- The school system must submit written documentation of this action along with the OTISS irregularity no later than July 15, 2010.
- Owing to the time-sensitive nature of this required action, the school test coordinator has been contacted so that steps can be taken to address this issue.

**Resources for Required Action**
- *Test Administrator’s Manual*
- *OTISS*

**Evidence of Required Action**
- Submission of testing irregularity into OTISS including, but not limited to, evidence of notification to parent (e.g., copy of letter), parent’s written response to the notification, and retest date and scores, if applicable.

**Necessary Outcome**
- The school system must make every effort to provide students with appropriate testing accommodations as required by their accommodations documentation.
On-Site Finding #3
Observation of twenty-nine (29) testing sessions revealed four (4) sessions which contained some policy and operational concerns. These concerns relate to the following:

1. Failure to provide the test administrator with appropriate numbers of testing materials and booklets to facilitate the accommodated testing session.
2. Failure to provide testing accommodations in accordance with state accommodations guidelines.
3. Failure to provide the appropriate directive subsections from the Test Administrator’s Manual that correspond with certain testing accommodations.
4. Failure to record correct testing times in a location viewable by all students.

The following actions and evidence were required of the schools in which teams had policy and operational concerns:

Required Action
- Test administrator’s training that includes an emphasis placed on timekeeping and recording.
- Test administrator’s training that includes an emphasis placed on reading appropriate directions from the Test Administrator’s Manual for accommodated testing sessions.

Resources for Required Action
- Test Coordinator’s Handbook
- Test Administrator’s Manual

Plan for Required Action
- Submit written plan for the required action of this finding by September 30, 2010.
- The plan must include (1) specific activities developed in response to required action, (2) a timeline for the implementation of these activities, and (3) personnel responsible for the implementation of the activities.

Evidence of Required Action
- By November 30, 2010 (high schools), or April 29, 2011 (elementary and middle schools), submit sign-in sheets, agenda, and handouts from test administrator’s training.

Necessary Outcome
- Test administrators must follow the directions as written in the Test Administrator’s Manual, especially those referring to recording test administration times in a location viewable by all students, reading the appropriate subsections of directions for accommodated test administrations, and providing testing accommodations in accordance with state accommodations guidelines.
**On-Site Finding #4**

Review of student Section 504 Plans and LEP documentation produced some concerns about the section of the forms in which testing accommodations are recorded. The concerns relate to the following:

1. Use of language that is not consistent with the state-approved testing accommodations language.
2. Lack of a designated place on the form to enter detailed information on how to provide required testing accommodations (e.g., amount of *Scheduled Extended Time*).
3. Inclusion of testing accommodations on LEP documentation that are not state-approved for students identified as LEP only.

The following actions and evidence were required of the schools in which the teams had concerns about accommodations documentation:

**Required Action**
- Amend testing accommodations section of Section 504 Plan and/or LEP documentation to align with the language of state-approved testing accommodations.
- Amend testing accommodations section of Section 504 Plan and/or LEP documentation to include a designated space for entering specific information on how required testing accommodations must be provided.
- Amend testing accommodations section of LEP documentation to remove accommodations that are not state-approved for students identified as LEP only.

**Resources for Required Action**
- Refer to the Testing Accommodations page of the NCDPI Web site (i.e., http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/policies/accom) for examples of a Section 504 Plan and LEP documentation that meet these criteria.
- Refer to the Testing Students Identified as Limited English Proficient publication (i.e., http://www.ncpublicschools.org/docs/accountability/policyoperations/lep/lepaccommodations.pdf) for information on state-approved testing accommodations for students identified as LEP.

**Plan for Required Action**
- Submit written plan for the required action of this finding by September 30, 2010.
- The plan must include (1) specific activities developed in response to required action, (2) a timeline for the implementation of these activities, and (3) personnel responsible for the implementation of the activities.

**Evidence of Required Action**
- By November 30, 2010, submit Section 504 Plans and LEP documentation with required actions in place.

**Necessary Outcome**
- Testing accommodations language on Section 504 Plans and LEP documentation that is in alignment with the language of state-approved testing accommodations.
• Designated space on Section 504 Plans and LEP documentation for entering specific information on how required testing accommodations must be provided.
• Removal of accommodations from LEP documentation that are not state-approved for students identified as LEP only.

Additional State Follow-Up

The NCDPI informed LEAs and schools that it may conduct follow-up monitoring during the 2010–11 school year to provide additional targeted assistance, monitor the progress of the required actions, and measure the specified necessary outcomes.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The accommodations monitoring on-site visits that took place during the spring of 2010 taught many valuable lessons. The information obtained through the on-site visits has allowed the NCDPI to provide feedback to the participating LEAs and schools that might improve their accommodations processes and procedures. In addition, the state has collected valuable information that can be of use in refining accommodations policies and training.

Several themes emerged during the on-site visits that when addressed will aid the fine-tuning of accommodations publications and policies and the provision of accommodations training and guidance to the field: namely, (1) accommodations systems and training, (2) accommodations documentation, and (3) accommodations decisions and provision.

Accommodations Systems and Training

It was apparent during the on-site visits that collaboration is vital in ensuring the success of a comprehensive accommodations system across an LEA and at a school. A comprehensive accommodations system must include the awareness and integration of both instructional and testing accommodations. Implementation of such a system requires participation from testing staff, EC staff, Section 504 staff, LEP staff, and instructional staff, as well as participation and support from leadership.

The NCDPI has modeled this collaboration through its provision of accommodations webinars in the spring and summer of 2010 that involved the cooperation and participation of staff members representing Accountability, Exceptional Children, Section 504, and English as a Second Language. An upcoming effort to further promote collaboration among LEA and school staff—the Joint Accommodations Meeting—will take place on September 14, 2010, and will include participation of LEA staff from each disciplinary area.

In order for an accommodations system to be comprehensive, it must include both instructional and testing accommodations. An interdisciplinary team of individuals familiar with the student must make decisions regarding both types of accommodations, taking into account the needs of the whole child. Instructional accommodations must be routinely used for at least 30 days prior to testing so that students will be familiar with and comfortable using the accommodations provided to them during testing.

For implementation of a successful comprehensive accommodations system, school staff must receive training on both instructional and testing accommodations. Through the on-site monitoring visits, observers found that the main focus in some schools is on testing accommodations training for test administrators just prior to testing. Because the students’ need for instructional accommodations and their routine use of them must play a large part in determining testing accommodations, it is important to train all instructional staff on accommodations early in the school year. Involvement in the training by testing staff, Exceptional Children staff, Section 504 staff, English as a Second Language staff, and instructional staff will again emphasize the importance of collaboration in making both instructional and testing accommodations decisions for students.
Accommodations Documentation

During the collaboration of individuals from different areas to make decision regarding accommodations, it is important to maintain consistency in the language used when discussing and documenting these accommodations. Regardless of the type of plan or documentation under which a student requires a testing accommodation, the state-approved language for testing accommodations and the guidelines for providing them remain the same. It is necessary that LEAs ensure alignment of the language used on their testing accommodations documentation with the state-approved language. In addition, some accommodations require details as to how the accommodation must be provided (e.g., the amount of Scheduled Extended Time); therefore, it is also essential that accommodations documentation include designated areas to record the required details on how to provide these accommodations.

The state requires the documentation of accommodations in a number of places depending on individual student need, such as IEPs, Section 504 Plans, LEP documentation, and transitory impairment documentation. Additionally, Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms are completed to document required testing accommodations and to monitor accommodations provided and used during testing. Recording accommodations information in these various places makes it important to ensure that this information remain accurate across all forms of documentation. This is especially important because testing schedules, including documents used to plan for the provision of testing accommodations, will be based on one or more of these documentation sources. LEAs and schools are firmly encouraged to create a local plan for ensuring the accuracy of information recorded on all types of accommodations documentation. In addition, a local plan to ensure incorporation of accurate accommodations information into the school testing schedule is strongly advised.

Accommodations Decisions and Provision

An issue apparent from collected accommodations monitoring data was that a large number of required testing accommodations are not being used by students during testing. The provision of extra testing accommodations can put unnecessary burdens on a school because of the additional staff, testing locations, and time required. With the use of the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms, schools now obtain data on whether and how students used their required and provided testing accommodations. This information will allow schools to fine-tune accommodations decisions and ensure the recording of only accommodations truly needed by the students in their accommodations documentation. During meetings where accommodations decisions are made, the IEP/Section 504/LEP/transitory impairment teams should review the data and comments recorded on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing forms completed during prior test administrations.

When providing testing accommodations, it is important to follow the state-approved guidelines for testing accommodations as provided in the Testing Students with Disabilities and Testing Students Identified with Limited English Proficiency publications. From observations of accommodated testing sessions during the on-site monitoring visits, it was evident that the accommodations guidelines are potentially open to some interpretation. Observers saw that some accommodations are being interpreted and provided differently from LEA to LEA and from school to school. The NCDPI will use the data collected and information learned to refine the accommodations guidelines published annually. The goal will be to ensure that guidance provided by the state is clear, straightforward, and easily interpretable, with the aim of increasing the standardization of accommodations provision across the state.
# Review of Accommodations Used During Testing

This form is to be completed in its entirety. Prior to testing, the accommodations that are documented on the student's IEP/Section 504 Plan, or LEP documentation are to be checked off. After testing, the test administrator must complete the remaining columns regarding what actually took place during testing. Completed forms should be kept in the student's IEP folder or Section 504 or LEP documentation so that it is accessible for future meetings and in case of auditing/monitoring of accommodations use. NOTE: While the list below includes all accommodations, some do not apply to students identified as LEP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Choose one or more of the following:</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Test Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EC (IEP) □</td>
<td>□ LEP □</td>
<td>□ 504 Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To Be Completed Prior to Testing</th>
<th>To Be Completed After Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations Documented on Student's IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP Documentation</td>
<td>Was this accommodation provided to student during testing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Braille Edition</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Large Print Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ One Test Item Per Page Edition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Assistive Technologies/Devices (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Braille Writer/Slates and Stylus (and Braille Paper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Crammer Ataxia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Dictation to a Scribe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Interpreter/Translator Signs/Cues Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Keyboading Devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Magnification Devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Student Marks Answers in Test Book</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Student Reads Test Aloud to Self</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud (Specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Hospital/Home Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Multiple Testing Sessions (Explain:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Scheduled Extended Time (Estimated Amount:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Testing in a Separate Room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Other (Specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Describe if and how the student used this accommodation.

Comments/Considerations for next IEP/504/LEP team meeting:

Printed name of person completing form: ____________________________  This form is available in electronic format at [http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/policies/fact](http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/policies/fact).

Signature of person completing form: ____________________________  October 2009