

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

Area	Support Available	Guidance Needed	Assistance Needed	Coaching Required	Direction Required
Priority Area 1: High Expectations and Beliefs					
Indicator 1: Graduation	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 2: Dropout	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% above the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% above the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% above the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 8: Parent Involvement	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 14A: Post High Survey	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA had no responses.
Indicator 14B: Post High Survey	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA had no responses.
Indicator 14C: Post High Survey	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA had no responses.
LEA Focus on Student Results	The LEA has selected one or more goals in the PIP that address student outcomes, from indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and/or 14 and is collecting and reporting data that demonstrates improved outcomes.	The LEA has selected one or more goals in the PIP that address student outcomes, from indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and/or 14 and is collecting and reporting data that does not demonstrate improved outcomes.	The LEA has selected one or more goals in the PIP that address student outcomes, from indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and/or 14 but is not collecting or reporting data that demonstrates improved outcomes.	Data available to the LEA demonstrates typical results for students with disabilities, but the LEA does not address strategies to improve student outcomes in the PIP from indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and/or 14.	Data available to the LEA demonstrates failure to improve outcomes for students with disabilities, but the PIP does not address student outcomes from indicators 1, 2, 3, 7, and/or 14.
Priority Area 2: Content Knowledge and Effective Instruction					
Indicator 3A: Numeracy Grades 3-8 (Annual Measurable Objectives)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3A: Numeracy Grade 10 (Annual Measurable Objectives)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3A: Literacy Grades 3-8 (Annual	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

Measurable Objectives)					
Indicator 3A: Literacy Grade 10 (Annual Measurable Objectives)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Indicator 3B: Numeracy Grades 3-8 (Participation)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3B: Numeracy Grade 10 (Participation)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3B: Literacy Grades 3-8 (Participation)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3B: Literacy Grade 10 (Participation)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3C: Numeracy Grades 3-8 (Proficiency)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3C: Numeracy Grade 10 (Proficiency)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grades 3-8 (Proficiency)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 3: Literacy Grade 10 (Proficiency)	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

Indicator 7: Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 1	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 7: Positive Social Relationships Summary Statement 2	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 7: Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 1	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 7: Knowledge and Skills Summary Statement 2	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 7: Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 1	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Indicator 7: Ability to Meet Needs Summary Statement 2	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% below the State target.	The LEA is 11% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 15% below the State target.
Priority Area 3: Multi-Tiered System of Supports in Secondary Settings					
Indicator 4a: Suspension & Expulsion Rate	The LEA meets the State target.	The LEA is 0.01% TO 0.1% above the State target.	The LEA is 0.1% to 0.5% above the State target.	The LEA is 0.6% to 1.0% above the State target.	The LEA is more than 1.1% above the State target.
Indicator 4b: Suspension & Expulsion by Race/Ethnicity	The LEA has no suspensions of students with disabilities for 10 days or more.	The LEA has suspensions or expulsions of students with disabilities for 10 days or more, but not at a disproportionate rate.	The LEA has suspensions or expulsions of students with disabilities in one or more race/ethnicity category at a rate that is potentially disproportionate.	Following a review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices, the LEA is found to have disproportionate representation in the suspension or expulsion of students with disabilities in one or more race/ethnicity categories.	The LEA demonstrates significant disproportionality in the suspension or expulsion of students with disabilities from specific race/ethnic categories over multiple years.

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

Indicator 5a: Access to General Curriculum	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 5b: Access to General Curriculum	The LEA is at or below the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 3% above the State target.	The LEA is 4% to 5% above the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% above the State target.	The LEA is more than 10% above the State target.
Indicator 5c: Access to General Curriculum	The LEA is at or below the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 2% above the State target.	The LEA is 2% to 5% above the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 10% above the State target.	The LEA is more than 10% above the State target.
Indicator 6A: Preschool Settings	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 30% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 30% below the State target.
Indicator 6B: Preschool Settings	The LEA is at or below the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% above the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% above the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 30% above the State target.	The LEA is more than 30% above the State target.
General Supervision					
Indicator 9: Disproportionality	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	There is a potential for disproportionality within the LEA.	The LEA has disproportionality based on a review of the LEA's policies and procedures.	After one year of implementing CEIS, the LEA continues to have disproportionality.	After two or more years of implementing CEIS, the LEA continues to have disproportionality.
Indicator 10: Disproportionality	There is no disproportionality suspected within the LEA.	There is a potential for disproportionality within the LEA.	The LEA has disproportionality based on a review of the LEA's policies and procedures.	After one year of implementing CEIS, the LEA continues to have disproportionality.	After two or more years of implementing CEIS, the LEA continues to have disproportionality.
Indicator 11: Child Find/Initial Evaluation	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 12: C to B Transition	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Plans	The LEA meets or exceeds the State target.	The LEA is 1% to 5% below the State target.	The LEA is 6% to 15% below the State target.	The LEA is 16% to 25% below the State target.	The LEA is more than 25% below the State target.
Determination History	The LEA is in "meets requirements" for 5 of the prior 5 years.	The LEA is in "meets requirements" for 4 of the prior 5 years.	The LEA is in "meets requirements" for 3 of the prior 5 years.	The LEA is in "meets requirements" for 2 of the prior 5 years.	The LEA is in "meets requirements" for 1 of the prior 5 years.
Quality of the Program Improvement Plan	The LEA has submitted a Program Improvement Plan, which addresses the areas of USOE identified need as well as areas of LEA selected focus.	The LEA has submitted a Program Improvement Plan. The plan addresses only areas of LEA selected focus or areas of USOE identified need.	The LEA has submitted a Program Improvement Plan. The plan does not address all areas of identified need.	The LEA has submitted a Program Improvement Plan. The plan does not address all areas of identified need. The action steps are not measurable.	The LEA has not submitted a Program Improvement Plan or the plan does not address required actions from the 2015 result driven accountability letter.
Progress toward meeting PIP Goals	The LEA provided evidence of progress toward	The LEA provided evidence of progress toward	The LEA provided evidence of progress toward	The LEA provided evidence of progress toward	The LEA did not provide evidence of progress

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

(2016-2017)	achievement of all goals identified in the PIP.	achievement for 75% or more of the goals identified in the PIP.	achievement for at least 50% of the goals identified in the PIP.	achievement of less than 50% of the goals identified in the PIP.	toward achievement of any goals identified in the PIP.
Findings of Noncompliance	The LEA had no findings of noncompliance in the prior school year.	The LEA had very few findings of noncompliance in the prior school year. Compliance rates are 90% or higher for all reviewed areas.	The LEA had some findings of noncompliance in the prior school year. Compliance rates are 61% to 89% for reviewed areas.	The LEA had several findings of noncompliance in the prior school year. Compliance rates are 60% or lower in reviewed areas.	The LEA had several findings of noncompliance in the prior school year. Compliance rates are 60% or lower in reviewed areas. The noncompliance could demonstrate a pattern indicating a systemic denial of FAPE.
LEA Internal Monitoring	The LEA is using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system) to review a representative sample of IEP files annually.	The LEA is using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system) to review fewer IEP files than is required for a representative sample annually.	The LEA is using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system) to review a representative sample of IEP files less than annually.	The LEA is using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system) to review fewer files than is required for a representative sample, and is reviewing less than annually.	The LEA is not using the UPIPS self-monitoring system (or other USOE-approved LEA system).
Dispute Resolution	The LEA has no complaints or due process proceedings with findings.	The LEA has one or more complaints or due process proceedings with no findings.	The LEA has one or more complaints or due process proceedings with minimal findings that are corrected within one year.	The LEA has one or more complaints or due process proceedings with substantive and/or multiple findings that are corrected within one year.	The LEA has one or more complaints or due process proceedings with substantive or multiple findings that resulted in a denial of FAPE.
Fiscal	There are no concerns related to the use of special education funds, as identified in the FiCAM Risk Rubric.	The LEA has one or two areas of concern related to the use of special education funds, as identified in the FiCAM Risk Rubric.	The LEA has three to five areas of concern related to the use of special education funds, as identified in the FiCAM Risk Rubric.	The LEA has a finding of fiscal noncompliance related to the use of special education funds.	The LEA has multiple findings of fiscal noncompliance related to the use of special education funds.
Data Timeliness	All USOE required reports were submitted on or before the deadline.	All USOE required reports were submitted, but one to three were submitted late.	All USOE required reports were submitted, but three or more were submitted late.	One to three USOE required reports were not submitted.	Three or more USOE required reports were not submitted.

2015–2016 RDA Program Implementation Evaluation Rubric

Risk scores were adjusted to the next lower level when the LEA demonstrated at least 10% improvement over prior year results.