



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

This worksheet contains two tables. The first table is a legend that explains the meaning of the colors used in the second table and spans columns A through E. The second table spans columns A through G. The header rows are 3 and 7.

Color Key

Color Key	Green (G)	Yellow (Y)	Orange (O)	Blue (B)
Meaning	No Changes to Factor	Factor Points Changed	Factor Conditions & Points Changed	New Factor Conditions Added

FFY 2023 vs 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
(Y) A: SPP/APR Indicator 4B Performance (Long-term Suspensions)	The LEA met Indicator 4B's minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year and was not identified, e.g., did not have a risk rate above the threshold.	4	The LEA met Indicator 4B minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year and was not identified with significant discrepancy.	8	↑ 4	Points doubled to reflect factor complexity and enhance differentiation (4→8)
	The LEA met Indicator 4B's minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year and had at least one risk rate at or above the threshold.	1	The LEA met Indicator 4B minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year and was identified with significant discrepancy.	2	↑ 1	Points doubled to maintain proportional increase (1→2)
	The LEA was evaluated and identified for significant discrepancy for two consecutive years, including the most recent.	0	The LEA was evaluated and identified for significant discrepancy for two consecutive years, including the most recent.	0	⇒ 0	No change





FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	The LEA did not meet Indicator 4B's minimum N- or cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year.	Not Applicable	The LEA did not meet Indicator 4B minimum N- or cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year.	Not Applicable	-	—
(Y) B: SPP/APR Indicators 9 and 10 Performance (Disproportionate Representation)	The LEA had at least one racial or ethnic group meet Indicators 9 or 10's minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation for three consecutive years and was not identified, e.g. the evaluated group(s) did not have risk ratios above the threshold for three consecutive years.	4	At least one racial or ethnic group within the LEA met Indicators 9 or 10 minimum N- and cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year and the LEA was not identified with disproportionate representation.	8	↑	4 Points doubled to reflect factor complexity and enhance differentiation (4→8)
	The LEA was identified for disproportionate representation in the most recent year and was found compliant following a review of policies, practices, and procedures.	1	The LEA was identified for disproportionate representation in the most recent year and was found compliant following a review of policies, practices, and procedures.	2	↑	1 Points doubled to maintain proportional increase (1→2)
	The LEA was identified for disproportionate representation in the most recent year and was found not compliant following a review of policies, practices, and procedures.	0	The LEA was identified for disproportionate representation in the most recent year and was found not compliant following a review of policies, practices, and procedures.	0	⇒	0 No change



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	No group within the LEA met Indicator 9 or 10's minimum N- or cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year. This includes vocational-technical schools and other LEAs identified as disproportionate for identification and placement.	Not Applicable	No group within the LEA met Indicator 9 or 10 minimum N- or cell size requirements for evaluation in the most recent year.	Not Applicable	-	—
(O) C: SPP/APR Indicator 11 Performance (Child Find)	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 100% of students with parental consent to evaluate.	4	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 100% of students with parental consent to evaluate.	6		2 Points increased to enhance variation (+2)
	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 95 to 99.9% of students with parental consent to evaluate.	3	For LEAs that reported six (6) or more students with parental consent to evaluate: The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 95.0% to 99.9% of students. For LEAs that reported five (5) or fewer students with parental consent to evaluate: The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for all but one (1) student.	5		2 Split by reporting volume (6+ vs. ≤ 5); allows better differentiation by LEA evaluation activity; points increased (+2)






FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 80 to 94.9% of students with parental consent to evaluate.	2	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 80.0% to 94.9% of students.	4	↑ 2	Points increased proportionally with other conditions (+2)
			The LEA reported delayed IEP implementation for all students with parental consent to evaluate; all reported delays were due to valid reasons.	3	New	Previously "Not Applicable"; allows LEAs with valid delays to earn points
	The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for less than 80% of students with parental consent to evaluate.	1	For LEAs that reported six (6) or more students with parental consent to evaluate: The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for 50.0% to 79.9% of students.	1	⇒ 0	Narrowed to accommodate new extreme noncompliance condition
			For LEAs that reported six (6) or more students with parental consent to evaluate: The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation for fewer than 50.0% of students. For LEAs that reported five (5) or fewer students with parental consent: The LEA failed to meet the State-mandated timeline for two (2) or more students.	0	New	Penalizes severe noncompliance; previously <80% was un-differentiated



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	The LEA reported zero students with parental consent to evaluate for special education services, or all students reported had a valid reason for delay.	Not Applicable	The LEA reported no students with parental consent to evaluate for special education services during the reporting period.	Not Applicable	-	LEAs with all valid delays moved to separate scoreable condition
(O) D: SPP/APR Indicator 12 Performance (Age 3 Transition)	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 100% of children referred from Part C.	4	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 100% of children referred from Part C.	6	 2	Points increased (+2) to weigh this compliance indicator more heavily
	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 95 to 99.9% of children referred from Part C.	3	For LEAs that reported six (6) or more Part C referrals: The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 95.0% to 99.9% of children. For LEAs that reported five (5) or fewer Part C referrals: The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for all but one (1) child.	5	 2	Split by reporting volume (6+ vs ≤5); allows better differentiation by LEA referral activity; points increased (+2)
	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 80 to 94.9% of children referred from Part C.	2	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for 80.0% to 94.9% of children referred from Part C.	4	 2	Points increased proportionally with other conditions (+2)



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
			The LEA reported delayed IEP implementation for all Part C referrals; all reported delays were due to valid reasons.	3	New	Previously "Not Applicable"; allows LEAs with valid delays to earn points
	The LEA met the Federal timeline for evaluation and IEP implementation for less than 80% of children referred from Part C.	1	For LEAs that reported six (6) or more Part C referrals: The LEA met the State-mandated timeline for evaluation for 50.0% to 79.9% of children.	1	⇒ 0	Narrowed to accommodate new extreme noncompliance condition
			For LEAs that reported six (6) or more Part C referrals: The LEA met the evaluation timeline for fewer than 50% of children. For LEAs that reported five (5) or fewer Part C referrals: The LEA failed to meet the evaluation timeline for two (2) or more children.	0	New	Identifies extreme noncompliance
	The LEA reported zero students referred from Part C, or all students reported had a valid reason for delay.	Not Applicable	The LEA reported no Part C referrals during the reporting period.	Not Applicable	-	Condition narrowed to exclude LEAs with all valid delays.
(B) E: SPP/APR Indicator 13 Performance (Age 16 Transition)	100% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary information and evidence of student participation in the process.	4	The LEA ensured that 100% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary components and documented student participation.	4	⇒ 0	Language revised to emphasize LEA obligation; no scoring change



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	At least 95% of IEPs monitored included all required postsecondary information and evidence of student participation in the process.	3	The LEA ensured that at least 95% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary components and documented student participation.	3	→ 0	Language revised for consistency; no scoring change
	Between 80 and 94.9% of IEPs monitored included all required postsecondary information and evidence of student participation in the process.	2	The LEA ensured that 80.0% to 94.9% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary components and documented student participation.	2	→ 0	Language revised for consistency; no scoring change
	Less than 80% of the IEPs monitored included all required postsecondary information and evidence of student participation in the process.	1	The LEA ensured that 50.0% to 79.9% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary components and documented student participation.	1	→ 0	Narrowed to accommodate new extreme noncompliance condition
			The LEA ensured that fewer than 50.0% of monitored IEPs included all required postsecondary components and documented student participation.	0	New	Penalizes severe noncompliance; previously <80% was undifferentiated
	The LEA was not included in the monitoring cohort or does not serve students in grades 10 and above.	Not Applicable	The LEA was not included in this year's monitoring cohort or does not serve students in grades 10 and above.	Not Applicable	-	—



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
(G) F: Compliance with Alternate Assessment (DLM) Participation Rate Cap	The LEA kept participation in the DLM to a minimum, less than 1%, in all content areas (English language arts, mathematics, and science).	4	The LEA kept participation in the DLM to a minimum, less than 1%, in all content areas (English language arts, mathematics, and science).	4	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA allowed 1 to 1.24% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	3	The LEA allowed 1 to 1.24% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	3	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA allowed 1.25 to 1.49% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	2	The LEA allowed 1.25 to 1.49% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	2	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA allowed 1.5 to 1.99% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	1	The LEA allowed 1.5 to 1.99% of students to participate in one or more content-area DLM.	1	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA allowed participation in one or more content-area DLM to reach 2%.	0	The LEA allowed participation in one or more content-area DLM to reach 2%.	0	⇒ 0	No change
	none	Not Applicable	This factor is applicable to all LEAs.	Not Applicable	-	—
(G) G: SPP/APR Indicator 5A Performance (LRE)	The LEA served at least 60% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	4	The LEA served at least 60% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	4	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA served between 45 and 59.9% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	3	The LEA served between 45 and 59.9% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	3	⇒ 0	No change



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	The LEA served more than 30% but less than 45% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	1	The LEA served more than 30% but less than 45% of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	1	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA served 30% or less of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	0	The LEA served 30% or less of K-12 students with IEPs inside the general education class 80% or more of the day.	0	⇒ 0	No change
	none	Not Applicable	This factor is applicable to all LEAs.	Not Applicable	-	—
(B) H: Successfully Addressed Noncompliance Within 1 Year			The LEA was compliant on all applicable indicators in the previous accountability cycle.	4	New	Previously "Not Applicable"; rewards strong compliance and makes factor applicable to all LEAs
	The LEA was identified for noncompliance in the previous accountability cycle and corrected all issues of noncompliance within one year.	1	The LEA was identified for noncompliance in the previous accountability cycle and corrected all issues of noncompliance within one year.	1	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA was identified for noncompliance in the previous accountability cycle and did not correct all issues of noncompliance within one year.	0	The LEA was identified for noncompliance in the previous accountability cycle and did not correct all issues of noncompliance within one year.	0	⇒ 0	No change



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	The LEA was not identified as noncompliant in the previous accountability cycle.	Not Applicable	This factor is applicable to all LEAs.	Not Applicable	-	Changed to applicable for all LEAs (see top condition)
(G) I: SPP/APR Indicators 8 and 14 Participation	The LEA was included in the cohort for Indicator 8 and/or 14 and submitted all required materials by the deadline.	2	The LEA was included in the cohort for Indicator 8 and/or 14 and submitted all required materials by the deadline.	2	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA was included in the cohort for Indicator 8 and/or 14 and failed to submit required materials by the deadline.	0	The LEA was included in the cohort for Indicator 8 and/or 14 and failed to submit required materials by the deadline.	0	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA was not included in the cohort for either Indicator 8 or 14.	Not Applicable	The LEA was not included in the cohort for either Indicator.	Not Applicable	-	—
(G) J: Data Quality	The LEA's student management data submissions used to determine Child Count (i.e., the Fall SID Management (and Special Education submissions) did not contain errors	2	The LEA's data submissions used for Child Count did not contain errors.	2	⇒ 0	No change
	One of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count contained errors, but the error rate did not exceed 1.5%.	1.5	One of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count contained errors, but the error rate did not exceed 1.5%.	1.5	⇒ 0	No change



FY 2023 vs. 2024 Determinations Rubric Comparison

Factor	FFY 2023 Conditions	FFY 2023 Points	FFY 2024 Conditions	FFY 2024 Points	Change	Notes
	Both of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count contained errors but neither had an error rate of more than 1.5%.	1	Both of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count contained errors but neither had an error rate of more than 1.5%.	1	⇒ 0	No change
	At least one of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count had an error rate greater than 1.5%.	0.5	At least one of the LEA's data submissions used for Child Count had an error rate greater than 1.5%.	0.5	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA failed to upload and/or certify at least one of the two data submissions used to calculate Child Count.	0	The LEA failed to upload and/or certify at least one of the two data submissions used to calculate Child Count.	0	⇒ 0	No change
		Not Applicable	This factor is applicable to all LEAs.	Not Applicable	-	—
(G) K: Timely IDEA Part B Grant Submissions	The LEA submitted its IDEA grant application and final expenditure report by the due dates.	2	The LEA submitted its IDEA grant application and final expenditure report by the due dates.	2	⇒ 0	No change
	The LEA did not submit its IDEA grant application and/or final expenditure report by the due dates.	0	The LEA did not submit its IDEA grant application and/or final expenditure report by the due dates.	0	⇒ 0	No change
	none	Not Applicable	This factor is applicable to all LEAs.	Not Applicable	-	—

end of worksheet