

Reevaluation Rubric

This document is meant to provide quick guidance to meet required components of Reevaluations. Practitioners should see the [Reevaluations for Special Education](#) webpage for detailed information on quality evaluations.

Component/ Iowa Administrative Code	Meets Requirements	Does not Meet Standard
Timeline Compliance and Parent Participation: Reevaluations must occur at least once every three years, unless the parent and public agency agree that a reevaluation is unnecessary. Each public agency must take steps to ensure that the parents of a child with a disability are present at each IEP team meeting. (IAC- 41.303(2)(b), 41.322)	The Meeting was held on/before the due date (or an Agreement was finalized prior to the due date). Parents were contacted to schedule the meeting early enough to ensure they can attend, and the meeting was scheduled at a mutually agreed-upon time/place. Parent(s) were provided a meeting notice prior to the meeting date. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The Meeting Notice was sent 10 days before the meeting. If the reevaluation was unnecessary, parents were contacted prior to the team completing the Agreement form, and was NOT completed right before the due date.	The meeting was not held on time or determined unnecessary prior to the due date. The parent was not afforded the opportunity to attend at a mutually agreed-upon time.
Data Review: The team reviewed existing data including: evaluations and information provided by the parents, current classroom-based, local, or state assessments, classroom-based observations, and observations by teachers	Data was reviewed by the AEA in conjunction with the LEA, including parent input prior to the meeting due date and documented in the Reevaluation. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Teams completed the existing data review approximately	There is no documentation of a data review or contact attempts to parent for input, or data was reviewed after the

and related service providers. (IAC- 41.305(1)(a))	60 days prior to the due date, and spoke to parents in regard to their concerns. This data is clearly documented in the Reevaluation Report prior to the meeting.	meeting was due.
Additional Data and Notice/Consent: On the basis of the review of existing data, identify what additional data, if any, are needed to determine: Whether the child continues to have a disability and the educational needs of the child, the present levels of academic achievement and related developmental needs of the child, whether the child continues to need special education and related services, and whether any additions or modifications to special education and related services are needed. (IAC- 41.305(1)(b)) If the team determined no additional data were needed, parent(s) were notified of the reason for the decision and their right to request assessment. If additional data was needed, the Consent form explains the evaluation procedures and was provided for parent(s) to sign. (IAC- 41.305(4), 41.304(1))	The team reviewed the existing data and, after receiving parent input, discussed if additional data was needed in the context of the questions in the left column. The Notice/Consent form clearly documents decisions in regard to additional data and it was provided to parents prior to the meeting with sufficient time for them to respond (i.e. the Notice/Consent form was not created the day before or day of the meeting). <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Approximately 2 months prior to the meeting due date, the AEA and LEA should review existing data and speak to parent(s) to determine if there are any new concerns in current or new domains. Parent(s) were provided Notice or Consent approximately 60 days prior to the meeting due date to allow time to complete additional assessments or respond to the decision that additional assessments were not needed or there were no concerns in new domains.	The Notice/Consent form was created the day of, or after the meeting occurred or was due and/or did not indicate reasons for decisions, and/or parents were not notified.

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 Reevaluation contains multiple sources of data per domain/concern, including but not limited to any local, state, or classroom assessments, strategies used, and parent input. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Other relevant data can include, but is not limited to: Grades, additional interviews and observations, summary of interventions (whether general education or special education), accommodations, attendance, adaptive or social skills, student strengths in areas of concern.	The Reevaluation contained one or less data source in each area of concern.
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/documentated to assess the student in their native language or in an alternative mode of communication. Only those trained 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.
Assessments: Tests were tailored to the specific areas of need and in all areas related to the suspected disability. If the child has a sensory impairment, the test was administered so the	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	Assessments did not match the areas of concern/disability. If the student has a sensory impairment,

results accurately reflect their aptitude/achievement/etc. (IAC- 41-304(3)(b-d))	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.	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 record such progress. (IAC- 41.314(2))	Since Iowa law requires disability determinations to be demonstrated by progress and discrepancy, the Reevaluation Report must contain a summary of the student's progress monitoring results. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> Progress is summarized over the last three years by outlining the goals, baseline, growth from year to year, and strengths/weaknesses within each goal area. If the Reevaluation contained a new domain/area of concern, progress monitoring used during intervention is provided. Progress monitoring is provided visually (via graphs or similar if applicable). E.g. Graphs from the past three IEP years were printed and provided to the team.	There is no documentation of the student's progress monitoring results.
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.	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 discussed as a team to determine if the student is eligible, and if so, to guide the creation of the new IEP.	The Reevaluation report did not have enough data for the team to determine all the student's educational needs.

(IAC- 41-304(3)(f-g))	<i>Additional Considerations:</i> If required components of the evaluation are missing, the report documents attempts made at gathering comprehensive data.	
Exclusionary Factors: Lack of appropriate instruction in reading or math or limited English proficiency was considered. (IAC- 41.306(2)(a))	In the Exclusionary Factors section, a Yes/No is answered for each question and an answer provided via drop-down menu. If yes is chosen, there is information provided as to why. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> If the student is an English Learner, their progress/performance on ELPA is documented. If the student has a high rate of absenteeism, their attendance is documented and reasons why this is not an exclusionary factor are provided.	If yes was selected for any question, data was not provided as to why.
Eligibility Determination: In interpreting data to determine if a child is a child with a disability and the educational needs, the public agency must: 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	All required data was provided in the report, and the team discussed if the student was still discrepant/unique from peers, reviewed their progress since the last reevaluation and determined their needs. This was documented in the Reevaluation Report after the team has determined eligibility. <i>Additional Considerations:</i> The team also outlined in the PWN for the Reevaluation the decisions that were made around the eligibility decision. AEA or LEA are encouraged to take detailed notes during the eligibility discussion as a way to	There is no documentation or discussion in regard to progress, discrepancy, and/or need, and/or there is no documentation the parent received the final report and PWN.

disability (progress and discrepancy) and need for special education. A copy of the evaluation report and documentation of determination of eligibility was provided to the parent(s). <i>(IAC- 41.306(1 and 3))</i>	document that the data in the Reevaluation Report was “carefully considered.” The parent being provided the report is documented.	
Reevaluation/IEP Team: The team included parent(s), one general education teacher, one special education teacher, LEA representative, AEA representative, and any other individuals with knowledge/expertise of the child, and the child when appropriate. If a member did not attend, the parent and school agreed in writing. If parent(s) did not attend, attempts to ensure parent participation are documented. <i>IAC-41.321(1 and 5), 41.322(3 and 4),</i>	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. (LEA representatives are not serving as an AEA). <i>Additional Considerations:</i> 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, or the team rescheduled so parent(s) could attend.	Not all members were invited and/or present, and/or parents were not offered their right to reschedule when all members could attend, and/or attempts to ensure parent participation are not documented.