# Results Driven Accountability Local Determinations Scoring Rubric Section 616 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act for FFY2016

## Overview

The Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) is required pursuant to the 2006 federal implementing regulations for the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act* (IDEA 2004), at 34 C.F.R. §300.600(a)(2), to make determinations for each school division based on submitted Annual Performance Report (APR) data. States consider division performance on certain results and compliance indicators, including:

* Indicator 1: Graduation
* Indicator 3: Participation and Performance in Statewide Assessment
* Indicator 4B: Significant Discrepancy in the Rate of Suspension by Race
* Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation in Special Education
* Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disabilities Categories
* Indicator 11: Initial Evaluation Timeline
* Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition
* Indicator 13: Secondary Transition
* General Supervision: Correction of Noncompliance
* Accurate and timely data submissions related to IDEA Part B
* Audit findings with regard to the use of IDEA Part B Funds

These determinations are a way of designating the status of each Local Education Agency (LEA) into one of the following four categories, as outlined in Section 616 (d) of IDEA 2004:

* Meets Requirements
* Needs Assistance
* Needs Intervention
* Needs Substantial Interventions

## Criteria for LEA Determination

### **Indicator 1:** Percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a Standard or Advanced Studies Diploma

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 1 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 4 | ≥ 52.00% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 3 | 42.00 – 51.99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 2 | 32.00 – 41.99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 22.00 – 31.99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 21.99% |

### **Indicator 3B:** Percentage of students with disabilities participating in mathematics and English reading statewide assessment

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 3B Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 4 | ≥ 95% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 3 | 85 – 94% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 2 | 75 – 84% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 65 – 74% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 64% |

### **Indicator 3C:** Performance of students with disabilities on English reading statewide assessment

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 3C (English) Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 4 | ≥ 66% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 3 | 56 – 65% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 2 | 46 – 55% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 36 – 45% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤35% |

### **Indicator 3C:** Performance of students with disabilities on mathematics reading statewide assessment

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 3C (Mathematics) Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 4 | ≥ 65% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 3 | 55 – 64% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 2 | 45 – 54% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 35 – 44% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 34% |

### **Indicator 4B:** Division identified with significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions, by race/ethnicity, of greater than ten days in a school year and policies, procedures or practices contributed to the significant discrepancy

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 4B Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | LEA is not identified with significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension by race/ethnicity. |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | LEA is identified with significant discrepancy in the rate of suspension by race/ethnicity. |

### **Indicator 9:** Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 9 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | LEA does not have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in any racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services. |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | LEA does have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for a particular racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services. |

### **Indicator 10:** Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is a result of inappropriate identification.

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 10 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | LEA does not have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification in any racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services. |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | LEA does have disproportionate representation due to inappropriate identification for a particular racial/ethnic group receiving special education or related services. |

### **Indicator 11:** Percentage of children with parental consent for initial evaluation, who were evaluated and eligibility determined within 65 business days.

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 11 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | 100% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 90 – 99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 89% |

### **Indicator 12:** Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age three, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 12 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | 100% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 90 – 99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 89% |

### **Indicator 13:** Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.

Data Source: Data submitted for the FFY2016 SPP/APR

| Indicator 13 Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | 100% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 90 – 99% |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | ≤ 89% |

### **General Supervision:** Uncorrected noncompliance

Data Source: VDOE ODRAS/FPM (i.e., state complaints, due process hearings, and on-site monitoring)

| General Supervision Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | LEA had no uncorrected noncompliance from the previous year |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | LEA has 1 instance of uncorrected noncompliance from the previous year |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | LEA has 2+ instances of uncorrected noncompliance from the previous year |

### **Accurate Data**

Data Source: Data submission related to Part B of IDEA

| Accurate Data Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | Data submitted are accurate |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 1-3 reports not submitted accurately |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | 4+ reports are not submitted accurately OR 2 or more years of inaccurate reports |

### **Timely Data**

Data Source: Data submission related to Part B of IDEA

| Timely Data Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | Data submitted are timely |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | 1-3 reports not submitted timely |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | 4+ reports are not submitted timely OR 2 or more years of untimely reports |

### **Audit findings with regard to the use of Part B funds**

Data Source: VDOE Office of Program Administration and Accountability/Special Education Financial and Data Services

| Audit findings with regard to the use of Part B funds Determination | Points | Criteria |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | 2 | No audit findings; OR  Audit findings that have been addressed through a corrective action plan that has been reviewed and accepted by the VDOE |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 1 | Audit findings that have not been addressed through a corrective action plan; OR  Audit findings that have not been reviewed and accepted by the VDOE. |
| Does Not Meet Requirements | 0 | Unresolved audit findings cited in the previous year’s audits. |

### **Overall LEA Determination**

| Determination | Points |
| --- | --- |
| Meets Requirements | ≥ 80% |
| Needs Assistance | 65% – 79% |
| Needs Intervention | 55 – 64% |
| Needs Substantial Intervention | ≤ 54% |

**Results Driven Accountability (RDA)** – RDA is intended to balance focus on improving educational results and outcomes for students with disabilities. RDA provides greater supports to local education agencies in improving results for children and youth with disabilities, and their families. For additional information pertaining to RDA and Monitoring Part B of IDEA by the Virginia Department of Education, Division of Special Education and Student Services visit [Results Driven Accountability (RDA)](http://www.doe.virginia.gov/special_ed/program_improvement/results_driven_accountability/index.shtml).