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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 be routinely used during instruction and 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 required testing accommodations are provided during test administrations, and the usage of these accommodations is documented and kept on file.

In October 2009, North Carolina submitted a comprehensive plan for monitoring the use of testing accommodations in local school systems to the United States Department of Education (USED) as required by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. The plan fulfilled the requirement for USED Peer Review Section 4, Critical Element 4.6 which requires “evidence of a system for monitoring the implementation and effectiveness of accommodations.” 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 of Exceptional Children and K–12 Curriculum and Instruction, along with other staff from Academic Services and Instructional Support.
Accommodations Monitoring

Effective 2009–10, schools are required to conduct local accommodations monitoring by completing a *Review of Accommodations Used During Testing* form (see Appendix) for each student at each test administration where testing accommodations are required. Completion of the form includes recording required testing accommodations before testing, documenting if and how test administrators provided accommodations, and documenting if and how the students use the accommodations during the testing session.

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

**Desk Monitoring**

Desk monitoring is the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction’s (NCDPI) 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, CECAS, and LEA-approved third-party accommodations management systems). This process assisted in the selection of school systems that would potentially require and receive targeted accommodations monitoring.

**Pre-site Review**

School systems 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 before 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 45 calendar days of the visits, the NCDPI teams provided a report to superintendents of the school systems that received on-site monitoring visits. The report 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 the on-site visits for the 2011–12 school year came from a part random, part purposeful sampling. For the random sampling, two LEAs/charter schools were selected randomly from each of the six regions considered representative of the geographical/educational regions of the state. For the purposeful sampling, reported accommodations-related concerns from NCDPI and field staff were considered in selecting LEAs/schools. Desk monitoring reduced the sample to five LEAs and facilitated the subsequent selection of the schools within the five LEAs that would receive the on-site visits. The selection totaled five schools across the LEAs, including one elementary school, one middle school, two high schools, and one charter school.

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 (i.e., Individualized Education Programs, Section 504 Plans, limited English proficiency 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 fall of 2011 and spring of 2012, interdisciplinary teams from the NCPDI conducted on-site visits to monitor testing accommodations in five schools across five LEAs in North Carolina. The table below displays the team members the NCDPI authorized to conduct the visits.

Table 1. Accommodations Monitoring On-Site Team Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Division</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Beaudry</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Farley</td>
<td>NCDPI/Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Monitoring Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helga Fasciano</td>
<td>NCDPI/K–12 Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>Section Chief, K–12 Program Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gallagher</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Test Development Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobbie Grammer</td>
<td>NCDPI/Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Monitoring Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Lanier</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope Lung</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine McBride</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Psychometrician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Miller</td>
<td>NCDPI/Office of Charter Schools</td>
<td>Charter Schools Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Perkis</td>
<td>NCDPI/Accountability</td>
<td>Testing Policy Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael Ragin</td>
<td>NCDPI/Exceptional Children</td>
<td>Deaf Education &amp; Audiology Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadja Trez</td>
<td>NCDPI/K–12 Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>ESL, Title III Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Winton</td>
<td>NCDPI/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 before the monitoring visits, LEAs and schools submitted testing plans electronically to the NCDPI. Based on this information, the NCDPI selected twenty-five (25) accommodated test administrations and reviewed documentation for the students in those administrations on day one of the visits. The table below describes activities that took place during the five on-site visits.

Table 2. On-Site Monitoring Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Review of current LEA and school testing plans provided during on-site visits  
• Review of the records of fifty-three students, which included:  
  o *Review of Accommodations Used During Testing* forms  
  o Thirty-eight Individualized Education Programs (IEPs)  
  o Ten Section 504 Plans  
  o Five Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Plans  
• Interviews of the following staff:  
  o Three Principals  
  o Three School Test Coordinators  
| • Observation of sixteen accommodated test administrations:  
  • Five for the End-of-Grade Test of Mathematics–Calculator Inactive  
  • One for the End-of-Course Test of Algebra II  
  • Seven for the End-of-Course Test of Biology  
  • Three for the *NCEXTEND2* Test of Reading  
• Observation of one standard test administration:  
  • One for the End-of-Course Test of Algebra II  
• Observation of thirty-eight students receiving testing accommodations during test administrations:  
  o Twenty-seven students with an IEP only  
  o Seven students with a Section 504 Plan only  
  o Four students with LEP documentation only  
• Interviews of the following staff:  
  o Seven Test Administrators/Teachers  
  o Three Test Administrators  
  o Three Proctors/Teachers  
  o Seven Proctors |
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.
- All data requested were available and well organized at most schools.

Training
- It was reported all test administrators received training before testing at all schools.
- It was reported all proctors received training before testing at all schools.
- It was reported separate testing accommodations training for test administrators was provided before testing at all schools.
- At most schools, it was reported school-wide training on instructional accommodations was provided at the beginning of the school year.

Accommodations Procedures
- One LEA reported local accommodations monitoring checks at each school occurred at least three times during the school year.
- Some schools reported using benchmark and mock run-through tests to practice the provision of testing accommodations and their use by students to ensure a good match between students, test administrators, and proctors.
- Most schools reported there are multiple procedures in place to ensure test administrators are aware of and prepared for providing all necessary testing accommodations to students on testing day.
- 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.
- Teams observed well-organized check out/in processes for testing materials at most schools.
- Teams observed well-maintained test security throughout most observations.
- Teams were provided very detailed LEA and school testing plans by most schools.
- Test administrators and proctors managed testing sessions well during most visits.

Student Documentation
- Most reviewed records were well-organized and easy to navigate.
- Some schools used state-provided Section 504 and LEP testing accommodations charts.
On-Site Findings

On-Site Finding #1

Review of the records of fifty-three (53) students revealed a total of two (2) discrepancies in accommodations documentation. These discrepancies occurred at two (2) of the five (5) total schools that received an on-site monitoring visit. One discrepancy existed between required accommodations specified on a student’s Section 504 Plan and those specified on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form and school testing schedule, and one discrepancy existed between required accommodations specified on a student’s LEP plan/documentation and those specified on the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form and school testing schedule.

Both of these discrepancies were corrected before the test administration after being brought to the attention of the school test coordinators by the monitoring teams.

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

Required Action
- Process for ensuring correct documentation of testing accommodations on Section 504 Plans and LEP plans/documentation.

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

Evidence of Required Action
- By a specified date, submit a written process for ensuring accuracy of testing accommodations documentation on the Section 504 Plan/LEP plan.

Necessary Outcome
- Accurate documentation of testing accommodations on Section 504 Plans/LEP plans.
On-Site Finding #2
Review of student IEPs, Section 504 Plans, and LEP plans/documentation produced some concerns about the section of the forms in which testing accommodations are recorded. The concerns were as follows:

1. Necessary details for the provision of an accommodation not documented.
2. Documentation of accommodations that are not valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations.

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

**Required Action**
- Add the necessary details regarding the provision of testing accommodations to student’s Section 504 Plans/LEP plans.
- Adhere to the list of valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations for students with disabilities within Section 504 Plans.

**Resources for Required Action**

**Evidence of Required Action**
- Before a specified date, submit a written summary of initiatives taken toward the required action and examples of corrected student documentation.

**Necessary Outcome**
- Section 504 Plans and LEP plans/documentation must include specific details regarding the provision of required testing accommodations.
- Testing accommodations documented in plans must adhere to the list of valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations for students with disabilities.
On-Site Finding #3
The findings from observation of sixteen (16) accommodated testing sessions consisting of a total of thirty-eight (38) 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># 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>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Testing Sessions (by Student Request)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Testing Sessions (More Frequent Breaks)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Extended Time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Extended Time (by Student Request)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Marks in Test Book</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Reads Test Aloud to Self</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud (All)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud (By Student Request)</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4**</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing in a Separate Room (One-on-One)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing in a Separate Room (Small Group)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing in a Separate Room (by Student Request)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-to-Word Bilingual Dictionary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>97 (94%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>83 (81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One student had the Test Administrator Reads Test Aloud – by Student Request and Scheduled Extended Time (by Student Request) accommodations listed as instructional accommodations on his Section 504 Plan, but they were not documented under testing accommodations. Therefore,
this student was not included in the totals for the ‘# Required,’ as these were not actually required testing accommodations for the student.

**The accommodations of Multiple Testing Sessions (by Student Request), Scheduled Extended Time (by Student Request), and Testing in a Separate Room (by Student Request) are not valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations. Therefore, correct vs. incorrect provision of the accommodations is non-applicable.**

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-fifth of the accommodations provided during the observed testing sessions. The accommodations most frequently unused were the Scheduled Extended Time and Word-to-Word Bilingual Dictionary accommodations. 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.

There were multiple issues observed at one school related to the documentation and provision of testing accommodations, as can be seen in Table 3 with the corresponding footnote documentation. These issues stemmed from a lack of documentation in the school testing schedule, incorrect information on testing accommodations being provided to a test administrator, incorrect use/lack of use of the Review of Accommodations Used During Testing form, and the documentation of invalid testing accommodations on Section 504 Plans.

At another school, students were incorrectly provided the Multiple Testing Sessions accommodation. These students were provided with extended breaks of five minutes, while the IEP did not document the break length was to differ from the standard administration of a two-minute break.

The following actions and evidence were required of the two schools that incorrectly provided the testing accommodations:

**Required Actions**
- Process for ensuring correct documentation of students requiring testing accommodations on the school testing schedule.
- Adhere to the list of valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations for students with disabilities within Section 504 Plans.
• Documentation for all students with Section 504 Plans requiring testing accommodations must be reviewed and corrected before spring 2012 end-of-course testing.
• Process for ensuring test administrators are properly informed of the required testing accommodations to be provided during their testing session(s).

Resources for Required Actions


Evidence of Required Actions

• By a specified date, submit written processes for ensuring accuracy of the testing schedule to include students with accommodations.
• By a specified date, submit a written summary of actions taken toward the required actions and examples of corrected student documentation.
• By a specified date, submit written processes for informing test administrators of the required testing accommodations to be provided during their testing session(s).

Necessary Outcomes

• Accurate documentation of all testing sessions, including students requiring testing accommodations, on the school testing calendar.
• Testing accommodations documented in Section 504 Plans must adhere to the list of valid North Carolina state-approved testing accommodations for students with disabilities.
• Test administrators must be accurately informed, through use of a documented and systematic process, of required testing accommodations to be provided during their testing session.
On-Site Finding #4

Observation of seventeen (17) testing sessions revealed four (4) sessions which contained some policy and operational concerns. These concerns were as follows:

1. Failure to follow local procedures at the conclusion of the 150 minutes of estimated testing time.
2. Failure to follow the script as written in the Test Administrator’s Manual.
3. Use of inaccurate timing device.
4. Noise disruption by school staff during testing.

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

Required Actions

- Written procedures in the school testing plan for test administrators to adhere to for test administrations that continue beyond the estimated testing time.
- Test administrator’s training on procedures to adhere to for test administrations that continue beyond the estimated testing time.
- Test administrator’s training that includes an emphasis on reading directions verbatim from the Test Administrator’s Manual.
- Written procedures in the school testing plan for maintaining a proper, quiet testing environment within the school.
- Complete and submit testing irregularity reports in the Online Testing Irregularity Submission System (OTISS).

Resources for Required Actions

- Testing Students with Disabilities publication
- End-of-Course Test Administrator’s Manual
- OTISS

Evidence of Required Actions

- By a specified date, submit sign-in sheets, agenda, and handouts from the test administrators’ training to include emphasis on reading the testing directions’ script.
- By a specified date, submit the school testing plan with written procedures for test administrators to adhere to for test administrations that continue beyond the estimated testing time.
- By a specified date, submit the school testing plan with written procedures for maintaining a proper, quiet testing environment within the school.
- The OTISS reports, completed by a specified date.

Necessary Outcomes

- Test administrators must follow the directions in the Test Administrator’s Manual to include reading the testing script as written, with the exception of any necessary omissions/modifications for students with testing accommodations related to timing.
- Local procedures for test administrations that continue beyond the estimated test administration time must be developed and must be adhered to by test administrators.
• Local procedures for maintaining a proper, quiet testing environment within the school.

Additional State Follow-Up

The NCDPI informed LEAs and schools that it may conduct follow-up monitoring during the 2011–12 school year to provide additional targeted assistance, monitor the progress of the required actions, and measure the specified necessary outcomes.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The 2011–12 school year marks the third year of the NCDPI’s statewide accommodations monitoring system that was put into place in response to requirements from the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The comprehensive system of monitoring includes (1) statewide training focused on instructional and testing accommodations; (2) emphasis on collaboration among all involved program areas, accommodations data collection and monitoring at the local and state levels; and (3) targeted on-site monitoring visits conducted by the NCDPI.

A great deal of valuable information was collected through the accommodations monitoring on-site visits conducted in 2011–12. Many commendable accommodations monitoring practices were observed during the monitoring visits that will be shared statewide as exemplars. Areas in need of more targeted support were also identified through the on-site visits. The NCDPI was able to provide feedback to the participating LEAs and schools to assist in improving their accommodations processes and procedures. The visits also allowed the NCDPI to collect valuable information that can be of use in refining future accommodations policies and training.

Several themes emerged during the on-site visits that 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
Collaboration is essential in the implementation of an effective system of accommodations provision and monitoring. A comprehensive accommodations system requires participation from testing, EC, Section 504, LEP, and instructional staff, as well as participation and support from leadership. In addition, the system must include a focus on both instructional and testing accommodations.

A comprehensive accommodations system must also include a focus on 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 calendar days prior to testing so 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. 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 emphasize the importance of collaboration in making both instructional and testing accommodations decisions for students.

Accommodations Documentation
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 locations makes it important to ensure this information remains 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 strongly 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 advised.

Data collected and compared from the on-site accommodations monitoring visits in 2009–10, 2010–11, and 2011–12 show an improvement in the accuracy of accommodations documentation. In 2009–10, 21% (19/92) of student’s accommodations records reviewed during on-site monitoring visits contained some type of discrepancy in the documentation. This number decreased to 7% (5/71) of records containing a discrepancy in 2010–11. The number decreased even further to 4% (2/53) of records containing a discrepancy in 2011–12. This improvement may be due to the efforts associated with the accommodations monitoring system.

During the collaboration of individuals from different areas in making accommodations decisions, 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 accommodations documentation include designated areas to record the required details on how to provide these accommodations.

Accommodations Decisions and Provision
An issue that continues to be apparent in 2011–12 from data collected during the second year (i.e., 2010–11) of accommodations monitoring is the large number of required testing
accommodations not being used by students during testing. Nineteen percent of testing accommodations were not used by students observed during 2011–12 monitoring visits. 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 obtain data on whether and how students used their required and provided testing accommodations. When used, this information allows schools to fine-tune accommodations decisions and ensure only accommodations truly needed by students are recorded 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.
## Appendix: Review of Accommodations Used During Testing Form

### Review of Accommodations Used During Testing

Complete one form per test. Prior to testing, complete column 1. During testing, complete the remainder of the form. Completed forms should be kept in the student's IEP folder and/or Section 504/LEP/Transitory Impairment documentation to be accessible for future reference.

**NOTE:** While the list below includes all state-approved accommodations, some do not apply to students identified solely as LEP.

Test accommodations should be consistent with the accommodations used routinely during classroom instruction and on similar classroom assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Retest</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### To Be Completed Prior to Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Accommodations Documented on Student's IEP/Section 504 Plan/LEP Plan/Transitory Impairment Documentation</th>
<th>To Be Completed During Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example:</td>
<td>Description of specific details of how this accommodation was provided to the student during testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Administrator reads test aloud (in English) Specify: ○ Read by student request ○ Read everything ○ Other</td>
<td>Did the student receive the accommodation? If yes, how did he/she use it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Braille Edition</td>
<td></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 Technology Devices Specify: ○ Braille Writer/Print and Stylus (Braille Paper)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crammer Aids</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dotation to a Braille</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter/Translator/Sign/Oral Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboarding Devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnification Devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word-for-Word Bilingual (English/Native Language)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary/Translation/Vocabulary/Language (LEP only)</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/Computer reads test aloud (in English) Specify: ○ Read by student request ○ Read everything ○ Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Home Testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Testing Sessions Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled Extended Time Amount:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing is a Separate Room Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special NCDPI Approved Accommodations(s) Specify:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Printed name of person completing this portion of form: ________________________________

Signature of person completing this portion of form: ________________________________

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

This form is available in electronic format at http://www.ncpublicschools.org/accountability/lepest/.