

Initial Evaluation Rubric

This document is meant to provide quick guidance to meet required components of Educational Evaluation Reports (EERs) based on the Iowa Administrative Code 281-41 (which mimics IDEA). Practitioners should see the State's [Special Education Eligibility and Evaluation Standards](#) for detailed information on completing quality evaluations.

Component/ Iowa Administrative Code	Meets Requirements	Does not Meet Standard
Timeline Compliance: Eligibility Meeting was held on/before 60 day timeline from receiving signed Consent. Exception: the parent repeatedly failed or refused to produce the child for the evaluation or the child enrolled in another public agency after the evaluation began, but before eligibility was determined. (IAC- 41.301(3))	The meeting was held on/before the due date. If exceptions: If the parent did not produce the child for evaluation, the team documented attempts to assess the student. If the student moved during evaluation, attempts were made to contact the receiving school or provide parent(s) with data to provide to the receiving school. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> If the student moved within the state, AEA personnel should make the appropriate contacts with the new team and attempt to support them with finishing the evaluation prior to the due date. If the student moved to another state, the AEA evaluation facilitator should ensure all evaluation documents and data are entered into the EER and uploaded to documentation prior to exiting the student. Consider adding a statement to the EER that the evaluation was not completed due to the student moving out of state.	The meeting was not held on time and there were no documented exceptions for the late meeting.

Content of Full and Individual Initial Evaluation: The evaluation contained an objective definition of the presenting problem, behaviors of concern, or suspected disability (IAC- 41.301(6)(a))	The Concerns Summary section contains an objective description of the presenting problem identified during the Disability Suspect process. If behaviors are a concern, the Summary contains an operational definition of the behavior, as well as examples and non-examples. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> In addition to being objective, the concerns are also measurable, focus on alterable variables of the individual and environment, and describe the degree of discrepancy between demands/expectations for all children and the learner's performance. The descriptions of concerns are also outlined in other areas of the evaluation (Learner Performance Summary, Intervention).	There is limited, or no, information on all of the presenting problems being evaluated.
Content Continued: The evaluation report documented the student's strengths or areas of competence relevant to the presenting problem, behavior of concern, or suspected disability. (IAC- 41.301(6)(c))	The strengths and skills of the student are clearly outlined in the Strengths Summary box, both as it relates to the presenting problem(s), <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Other strengths that may not relate directly to the concerns are also noted. Information on strengths comes from parents, teachers, student, and others knowledgeable of the student.	There are no strengths listed, or the strengths are not related to the areas of concern.
Content Continued: The evaluation contained an analysis of existing information about the individual, including: - Evaluations and information provided by the parent(s) - Current classroom-based, local, or state assessments - Classroom-based observations - Observations by teachers and	The evaluation contained all required components. Parents were asked for any private evaluation reports, as well as interviewed in regard to the student's background, strengths, skills, and their concerns. All existing assessment data was entered, evaluators observed the student in the classroom and/or intervention, and summarized observations by school staff. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Even if not evaluating in the area of Academics, assessment data (as described in code) is entered to show the impact on	The evaluation was missing one or more of the required components.

related service providers (IAC- 41.301(6)(b) and 41.305(1)(a))	progress/performance in the general curriculum. Observations were conducted in both the classroom and during the student's intervention. If it is not feasible to observe an intervention due to the nature (e.g. a 1:1 counseling session), observations from the interventionist were summarized.	
Content Continued: The evaluation included additional information needed to design interventions intended to resolve the presenting problem, including, if appropriate, evaluation of health, vision, hearing, social/emotional status, general intelligence, academic performance, communicative status, adaptive behavior, and motor abilities. (IAC- 41.301(6)(d) and 41.311(2))	The Learner Performance section contained all relevant data needed to support design of the intervention. If some recommended components were not part of the EER, they are ruled out in the Disability Suspect. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The Intervention section described how the intervention was matched to the learner's performance concerns, as well as if the intervention was implemented with integrity and if the strategy was effective. A learner's performance during intervention is considered when documenting recommendations in the Needs section.	Interventions were not provided, or the report does not describe how interventions were matched to concerns, or how they were implemented or if effective.
Conduct of Evaluation: The evaluation included a variety of assessment tools/strategies to gather relevant functional, developmental, and academic information about the child, including information provided by the parent. There was more than one measure or assessment and technically sound instruments were used. (IAC- 41.304 (2))	The Evaluation contains at least two sources of data per area of concern, and includes assessments and parent input. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The Evaluation contains multiple sources of data per domain/concern, including but not limited to any local, state, or classroom assessments, strategies used, and parent input. Other data could include (but is not limited to): grades, interviews, observations, summary of interventions (whether general education or special education), accommodations, attendance, etc.	The Evaluation contained one or less data source in each area of concern, and/or did not include parent input.

Assessments Chosen: The tests administered were not discriminatory on a racial or cultural basis, provided in the child's native language or other mode of communication unless clearly not feasible, were reliable/valid, administered by trained/knowledgeable personnel, and in accordance with any instructions provided by the procedure of the assessment. (IAC- 41.304(3)(a))	If the student was not a native English speaker or minimally verbal, attempts were made/documented to assess the student in their native language or in an alternative mode of communication. Only those trained/with appropriate licensure administered the assessments. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> If it was not feasible to provide assessments in the student's native language or another mode of communication, the evaluation documents attempts made and describes why this was not feasible.	Inappropriate assessments were used and/or not administered in compliance with the assessment procedures. If assessments were not delivered in the child's mode of communication, there was no explanation as to why it wasn't feasible.
Assessments: Tests were tailored to the specific areas of need and in all areas related to the suspected disability. If the child had a sensory impairment, the test was administered so the results accurately reflect their aptitude/achievement/etc. (IAC- 41-304(3)(b-d))	When administering additional assessments, the assessments were chosen to match the areas of concern and/or relative to the suspected disability. Tests for sensory impairments were selected if needed, or accommodations were used in accordance with assessment procedures, and documented. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> A variety of assessments were used for each area of concern, including comprehensive, standardized, diagnostic, skill-specific, and/or curriculum-based.	Assessments did not match the areas of concern/disability. If the student had a sensory impairment, attempts were not made to accommodate.
Progress Monitoring: Each public agency shall engage in progress monitoring of each individual's progress as the department may require during the process of evaluating whether a child is an eligible individual and shall	The Evaluation report contained a summary of the student's progress monitoring results, documented Rate of Growth/Improvement, and compared to the intervention group and/or expected progress rates (if applicable). The progress monitoring collection was regular and frequent, and displayed to illustrate trends.	There is no documentation of the student's progress monitoring results.

record such progress. (IAC- 41.314(2))	<i>Additional Considerations:</i> The report contains a description of the progress monitoring plan. If feasible, the progress monitoring is provided in graph format.	
Comprehensive: The evaluation was sufficiently comprehensive to identify all the child's special education and related services needs, whether or not linked to the disability category and provided relevant information that directly assists in determining the educational needs. (IAC- 41-304(3)(f-g))	Multiple sources of data (as described above) were used to determine what the student needs to access/make progress in the general curriculum and to progress toward goals. The needs of the student are described in detail and compared to grade-level expectations in the Needs section of the EER. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> If required components of the evaluation are missing, the report documents attempts made at gathering comprehensive data, and reasons why it was not feasible during the evaluation period (see also Exceptions from IAC- 41.301(3))	The Evaluation report did not have enough data for the team to determine progress, discrepancy, and/or needs in order to determine if the child has a disability and if they have a need for specially designed instruction.
Exclusionary Factors: Lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math or limited English proficiency was considered. (IAC- 41.306(2)(a))	In the Additional Factors section, the team documented reasons why these were/were not a primary reason for the learning problems. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The student's attendance is documented when considered lack of appropriate instruction. If the student is an English Learner, their progress/performance on ELPA is documented. If possible, their performance is compared to other EL peers and/or True Peers (peers with similar age, language, country of birth, and years in the US school system)	There was not data or reasoning described as to why an exclusionary factor was or wasn't selected.
Eligibility Determination: In interpreting data to determine if a child is a child with a disability and the educational needs, the public agency must:	All required, and additional data, was provided in the report, and the team discussed if the student is discrepant/unique from peers, reviewed their progress during intervention, and determined their needs. This was documented in the EER.	There is no documentation or discussion in regard to progress, discrepancy, and/or

Draw upon information from a variety of sources, including tests, parent input, teacher recommendations, and information about the child's physical condition, social/cultural background, and adaptive behavior. Information obtained from these sources was documented and carefully considered. Eligibility was determined based on the child's disability (progress and discrepancy) and need for special education. (IAC- 41.306(3))	<i>Additional Considerations:</i> The team also outlined in a PWN the conversations that were discussed around the eligibility decision. AEA or LEA are encouraged to take detailed notes during the eligibility meeting as a way to document that the data in the EER was "carefully considered."	need. There is no documentation that the parent was provided a final copy of the report.
Eligibility Team and Documentation: The team included a group of qualified professionals and the parent(s). A copy of the evaluation report and documentation of determination of eligibility was provided to the parent(s) at no cost. (IAC- 41.306(1))	All required members (including parent, an AEA representative, general education teacher, etc.) attended the meeting and provided input in regard to the student's performance, eligibility, and needs. The parent being provided the report is documented. If the parent(s) did not attend, the attempts to contact parent(s) are documented in the Contact Log in ACHIEVE and/or in the PWN. Other modes to ensure participation (such as video/phone call) were offered. Teams rescheduled to another day/time in an attempt to have parent attendance. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The parent(s) was provided a draft of the EER report at least a few days prior to the meeting and provided a final copy shortly after the meeting. If eligible, an Initial IEP Meeting is held within 30 days.	Not all members were invited and/or present, and/or attempts to ensure parent participation are not documented, and/or an AEA member was not in attendance.