State Education Resource Center

IEP Rubric

Developed by SERC, Middletown, Connecticut
Revised 2013

SERC
EQUITY. EXCELLENCE. EDUCATION.

The Overview

Connecticut's State Education Resource Center (SERC) has developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) Rubric that measures the quality of IEP development for students with disabilities in the following categories:

- Gap Analysis of Present Level of Performance
- Levels of Support: Supplemental Instruction, Accommodations, and Modifications
- IEP Goals and Objectives
- Types of Support and Placement

The IEP Rubric defines fourteen indicators needed for quality IEP development. The rubric is designed to be analyzed holistically as well as in the four categories and their individual indicators. A school data team can analyze the data in a variety of ways to discern trends in practices, which can be used to inform professional learning and systemic strategic planning. The rubric is constructed on the premise that all students are entitled to the general education curriculum within the least restrictive environment, and therefore the design of an IEP is focused on student outcomes based in the general education curriculum. Supports operate on a continuum specifically targeted to meet the unique needs of a student. The purpose of the rubric is to provide educators and families a means to assess the quality of an IEP by shifting the IEP from a mere list of legal or compliance tasks to an instructional tool that can be used to guide teams of people in how to support a student in achieving the same general education standards as nondisabled peers.

The Quality Levels

SERC's IEP rubric has four levels of measure: promising practice, progressing, emerging, and unacceptable. The highest level, **promising practice**, is the measure of quality that promotes genuine access, participation, and progress in the general education curriculum and settings, while actively supporting the unique needs of a student. High expectations are set for each student, and the IEP actively seeks to close academic gaps. Since educational practices are continuously evolving, promising practice purposefully denotes an endless ceiling of quality. **Progressing** is the measure of quality by which an IEP supports educational benefit to facilitate a student's access to, participation in, and progress in the general education curriculum and settings. The IEP incorporates the elements of effective instructional practices into the design of how supports are organized and implemented. **Emerging** is the measure of quality by which the IEP meets a low threshold of compliance and educational benefit. The IEP is often missing critical elements needed to support its use as an instructional plan. The IEP also focuses on "special education" as a separate support system, rather than an embedded support system within the context of the general education curriculum. **Unacceptable** is the measure that generally does not meet even the basics of procedural compliance for an IEP or merits any educational benefit.

The Scoring

SERC's IEP Rubric uses an analytical rubric scoring method. A range of points are used to score each indicator: 3) promising practice, 2) progressing, 1) emerging and 0) unacceptable. Each indicator is scored and then totaled within each of the four category areas for a category score. The four category scores are then totaled for a single score.

The Training of Scorers

Using this tool with fidelity requires scorers to be trained. The training provides scorers with a working knowledge of the content of the rubric and the technical knowledge to use the instrument with reliability. The training sessions include a process for calibration of scorers that estimates their inter-rater reliability as a means to check for fidelity. For further information on the training process, contact Kimberly Mearman, Ph.D,, Assistant Director for Program Development & Research/Program Evaluation, SERC, at (860) 632-1485, ext. 289 or at mearman@ctserc.org.

Gap Analysis of Present Level of Performance

Indicator 1

The IEP uses comprehensive general education-driven assessments and benchmarks to isolate and target specially designed instruction to address missing concepts, skills, or strategies that assist students in making progress in general education.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The assessments are not based on the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum. • The assessments are not technically sound or reliable. • The IEP uses a narrow scope of assessments. • The assessment process uses only standardized assessments, making no reference to general education or does not use a comprehensive assessment process to determine the unique needs of the student. • There is no evidence of a comparative analysis between the demands of the general education standards and the unique needs of the individual student. • There are no or very vague statements of the student's present level of performance as it relates to the general education curriculum.	• The assessments are based on the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum. • The assessments are technically sound and reliable. • The IEP uses an assessment process mostly reliant on standardized assessments. • The assessment process makes references to general education assessments, but relies on standardized assessments that determine the unique needs of the student. • There is little evidence of a comparative analysis between the demands of the general education standards and the unique needs of the individual student. • There are general statements of the student's present level of performance as it aligns to the general education curriculum.	• The assessments are based on the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum. • The assessments are technically sound and reliable. • The IEP uses a comprehensive assessment process, including general education curriculum-based assessments and standardized assessments. • The assessment process uses a mix of general education assessments and standardized assessments to determine the unique needs of the student. • There is some evidence of a comparative analysis between the demands of the general education standards and the unique needs of the individual student. • There are specific statements of the student's present level of performance as it relates to the general education curriculum.	• The assessments are based on the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum. • The assessments are technically sound and reliable and provide continuous monitoring information. • The IEP uses a relevant, comprehensive assessment process driven by general education curriculum-based assessments, district-wide formative and summative assessments, and standardized assessments. • The assessment process focuses on general education assessments, supplemented with additional assessments that can isolate and determine the unique needs of the student related to the disability. • There is extensive evidence of a comparative analysis between the demands of the general education standards and the unique needs of the individual student. • There are specific statements of the student's present level of performance as it specifically relates to the student's access to, participation in, and progress in the general education curriculum.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 2

The IEP contains explicit statements determining the student's strengths as related to the student's progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• There are no or vague, superficial statements about the student's strengths.	• There are general statements about the student's strengths related to academic learning.	• There are general statements about the student's capacity and strengths to participate and progress in general education curriculum.	• There are explicit statements about the student's capacity and strengths to participate and progress in general education curriculum.
• There are no statements about how the student can participate in the general education settings or curriculum.	• There are vague statements about the student's strengths and how the student can participate in general education settings.	• There are general statements about how the student can be successful in general education curriculum.	• There are statements about the student's strengths that can be useful to a general education teacher in understanding how the student can progress in general education curriculum.
• The student's strengths have no relationship to the general education curriculum, instruction, or environment and are comparative to peers.	• The student's strengths have no relationship to general education curriculum, instruction, or environment and are not comparative to peers.	• The student's strengths are relative to how he or she can participate in general education curriculum and are not comparative to peers.	• The student's strengths are relative to how he or she can participate in general education curriculum and are not comparative to peers.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 3

The IEP has an explicit statement of how the dynamic between manifestation of the student's disability and general education curriculum, instruction, or environment affects access to, participation in, and progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The assessment process lists concerns, but is not necessarily related to the disability. • The assessment process states that the disability in and of itself affects access to, participation in, and/or progress in the general education curriculum. • There is a vague statement of the impacts related to the disability itself and/or services needed.	• The assessment process determines concerns related to the disability. • The assessment process states how the disability affects access to, participation in, and/or progress in the general education curriculum. • There is a vague statement of how the disability impacts participation and progress in the general education curriculum.	• The assessment process generally lists manifestations of the disability. • The assessment process states how the manifestations of the disability affect access to, participation in, and/or progress in the general education curriculum. • The statement of impact connects to specially designed instruction listed in the IEP.	• The assessment process specifically isolates the manifestations and the instructional and environmental barriers of the disability. • The assessment process specifically states how the manifestations of the disability interact with environmental and instructional barriers to access, participate, and/or progress in the general education curriculum. • The statement of impact explicitly leads the IEP in the determination of the specially designed instruction.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Scoring for Gap Analysis of Present Level of Performance

☐ **/9 Total Score for Gap Analysis**

Quality Level	Score	Interpretation
Promising Practice	8-9	The assessment process is driven by examining how the student performs within the general education curriculum. The assessment process explicitly identifies barriers that affect access to, participation in, and progress in the general education curriculum. The unique needs of the student are specifically isolated and defined. There a number of assessment tools used that can serve to continuously monitor student progress over time. The information in the IEP is recorded clearly with specific statements that are useful and explicitly lead to the development of the specially designed instruction.
Progressing	5-7	The assessment process contains a comprehensive examination of how the unique profile of the student compares to the general education curriculum. There is a mix of assessment tools and types used to determine areas of strength and need, but the recorded information can appear disjointed. The information flows logically, and it is predictable as to what the IEP goals should contained based on this information.
Emerging	2-4	The assessment process relies heavily on standardized assessments and with a focus on aspects of the disability. The assessment process references the general education curriculum or assessments, but does not provide a full picture of how well the student is performing in the general education curriculum. The information recorded provides some broad understandings, but is vague.
Unacceptable	0-1	There is one or more of the following concerns with the assessment process: the process does not use the age-appropriate assessments or curriculum; there are very little or no technically reliable assessments used; and/or the assessment process is very narrow in scope and does not meet the standards for comprehensive assessment. The assessment process is disability-driven with little to no reference to the general education curriculum. Information recorded is superficial, very vague, and maybe comparative to peers.

Levels of Support: Supplemental Instruction, Accommodations, Modifications

Indicator 1

Based on the gap analysis and areas of need, direct supplemental instruction is designed to address missing skills, concepts, or strategies that will assist the student in participating and making progress in the general education curriculum.

| Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The gap analysis does not list skills, concepts, and/or strategies.	• The gap analysis vaguely lists skills, concepts, and/or strategies.	• The gap analysis states the student's missing skills, concepts, and/or strategies that are needed to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.	• The gap analysis specifically isolates the student's missing skills, concepts, and/or strategies that are needed to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.
• The IEP states instruction on skills, concepts, and/or strategies that do not align with the gap analysis or does not state any instruction on skills, concepts, and/or strategies.	• The IEP states instruction on skills, concepts, and/or strategies that loosely aligns with the gap analysis.	• The IEP states instruction on skills, concepts, and/or strategies that aligns with the gap analysis.	• The IEP states explicit instruction on skills, concepts, and/or strategies that directly connect with the gap analysis.
• The IEP states instruction for skills, concepts, and/or strategies that is instead of the core general education curriculum.	• The IEP states instruction for skills, concepts, and/or strategies that is in addition to the core general education curriculum.	• The IEP states instruction for skills, concepts, and/or strategies that is in addition to the core general education curriculum and expands learning for the student.	• The IEP states instruction for skills, concepts, and/or strategies that expands the methods and intensity of the core general education curriculum, explicitly connected to closing the gaps, and expands the depth of instruction and learning for the student.
• The IEP states supplemental instruction that is not sound.	• The IEP states supplemental instruction that is sound.	• The IEP states supplemental instruction that is sound, evidence-based practice and likely to result in student progress.	• The IEP states supplemental instruction that is sound, evidence-based practice and strongly connected to student progress in the general education curriculum.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 2 A

Based on the gap analysis and areas of need, accommodations are designed to assist the student in access to, participation in, and making progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The gap analysis does not state barriers for the student.	• The gap analysis vaguely states barriers for the student.	• The gap analysis generally states barriers for the student to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.	• The gap analysis specifically isolates barriers for the student to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.
• The IEP states accommodations that do not align with the gap analysis.	• The IEP states accommodations that loosely align with the gap analysis.	• The IEP states accommodations that align with the gap analysis.	• The IEP states explicit accommodations that directly connect with the gap analysis.
• The IEP does not provide details on how, when, how often, and to what degree accommodations will be used.	• The IEP provides vague details on how, when, how often, and to what degree accommodations will be used by educators.	• The IEP provides general details on how, when, how often, and to what degree accommodations and assistive technology will be used in the general education curriculum and/or settings.	• The IEP provides specific details on how, when, how often, and to what degree accommodations and assistive technology will be used in instruction of the core general education curriculum explicitly connected to access to the general education curriculum.
• The IEP does not state how the student will use the accommodations.	• The IEP states how the student will use the accommodations.	• The IEP states how the student will use the accommodations to participate in the general education curriculum.	• The IEP states how the student will learn to use the accommodations independently to participate meaningfully in the general education curriculum.
• The IEP states accommodations that are not sound.	• The IEP states accommodations that are sound.	• The IEP states accommodations that are sound, evidence-based practice.	• The IEP states accommodations that are sound, evidence-based practice and strongly connected to student progress in the general education curriculum.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 2 B

Based on the gap analysis and areas of need, assistive technology is designed to assist the student in access to, participation in, and making progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The gap analysis does not state barriers for the student.	• The gap analysis vaguely states barriers for the student.	• The gap analysis generally states barriers for the student to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.	• The gap analysis specifically isolates barriers for the student to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.
☐ *The next one is marked as **Not Applicable** if there is assistive technology used*			
• The IEP has no statements, other than the check box, that demonstrate that assistive technology was considered not necessary or that the gap analysis infers that assistive technology is needed to address the barriers.	• The IEP has vague inferences that demonstrate that assistive technology was considered not necessary or that the gap analysis infers that assistive technology is not needed to address the barriers.	• The IEP has general statements that demonstrate that assistive technology was considered not necessary and/or that the gap analysis demonstrates that assistive technology is not needed to address the barriers.	• The IEP has specific statements that demonstrate that assistive technology was considered not necessary and that the gap analysis clearly demonstrates that assistive technology is not needed to address the barriers.
☐ *The next four are marked as **Not Applicable** if there is **no** assistive technology used*			
• The IEP states assistive technology that does not align with the gap analysis. • The IEP does not provide details on how, when, how often, and to what degree assistive technology will be used. • The IEP does not state how the student will use the assistive technology. • The IEP states the use of assistive technology that is not sound.	• The IEP states assistive technology that loosely aligns with the gap analysis. • The IEP provides vague details on how, when, how often, and to what degree assistive technology will be used by educators. • The IEP states how the student will use the assistive technology. • The IEP states the use of assistive technology that is sound.	• The IEP states assistive technology that aligns with the gap analysis. • The IEP provides general details on how, when, how often, and to what degree assistive technology and assistive technology will be used in the general education curriculum and/or settings. • The IEP states how the student will use the assistive technology to participate in the general education curriculum. • The IEP states the use of assistive technology that is sound, evidence-based practice.	• The IEP states explicit assistive technology that directly connects with the gap analysis. • The IEP provides specific details on how, when, how often, and to what degree assistive technology will be used in instruction of the core general education curriculum explicitly connected to access to the general education curriculum. • The IEP states how the student will learn to use the assistive technology independently to participate meaningfully in the general education curriculum. • The IEP states the use of assistive technology that is sound, evidence-based practice and is strongly connected to student progress in the general education curriculum.
☐ **Majority of the elements = 0**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 1**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 2**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 3

Based on the gap analysis and areas of need, modifications are designed to assist the student in access, participation, and making progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The gap analysis does not state areas where the general education content or standards need to be adjusted.	• The gap analysis vaguely states areas where the general education content or standards need to be adjusted.	• The gap analysis generally states areas where the general education content or standards need to be adjusted in order for the student to participate or make progress in the general education curriculum.	• The gap analysis specifically isolates areas where the general education content or standards need to be adjusted in order for the student to participate and make progress in the general education curriculum.
• There is no evidence that the use of supplemental instruction and accommodations are used before the need for modifications, the IEP almost exclusively relies on modifications as the specially designed instruction, and the modifications do not align with the gap analysis.	• There is little or loose evidence that the use of supplemental instruction and accommodations are used before the need for modifications that loosely align with the gap analysis.	• There is general evidence that the use of supplemental instruction and accommodations, including assistive technology, are used before the need for modifications, and modifications are few and used only because they are necessary and align with the gap analysis.	• There is strong evidence that the use of supplemental instruction and accommodations, including assistive technology, are used before the need for modifications, and modifications are few, targeted, and used only because they are absolutely necessary to close gaps in the general education curriculum that directly connect with the gap analysis.
☐ *The next two are marked as **Not Applicable** if there are no modifications used*			
• The IEP does not state how, when, how often, and to what degree the modifications will be used.	• The IEP provides vague details on how, when, how often, and to what degree the modifications will be used by educators.	• The IEP provides general details on how, when, how often, and to what degree the modifications will be used in the general education curriculum.	• The IEP provides specific details on how, when, how often, and to what degree the modifications will be used in instruction of the core general education curriculum, explicitly connected to making progress in the general education curriculum.
• The IEP states modifications that are not sound and/or do not relate to the general education curriculum.	• The IEP states modifications that are sound and connect with the general education curriculum.	• The IEP states modifications that are sound, "promising practice" connected to progress in the general education curriculum.	• The IEP states modifications that are sound, "best practice" and are strongly connected to student progress in the general education curriculum.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 4

The IEP states supports that are needed for school personnel to implement the supplemental instruction, accommodations, and modifications.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The IEP does not state supports that are needed for school personnel to implement the IEP. • The supports for personnel are not connected to the supplemental instruction, accommodations, and modifications.	• The IEP vaguely states supports that are needed for school personnel to implement the IEP. • The supports for personnel are vaguely connected to the supplemental instruction, accommodations, and modifications.	• The IEP generally states supports, such as consultation, professional learning, or indirect student supports that are needed for school personnel to implement the IEP. • The supports for personnel are connected to the supplemental instruction, accommodations, and modifications.	• The IEP specifically states supports, such as consultation, professional learning, or indirect student supports that are needed for school personnel to implement the IEP. • The supports for personnel are explicitly connected to the supplemental instruction, accommodations, and modifications with explicit connections as to how those supports provide for the student's progress in the general education curriculum.
☐ **Majority of the elements = 0**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 1**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 2**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 3**

Scoring for Levels of Support: Supplemental Instruction, Accommodations, Modifications

☐ **/15 Total Score for Levels of Support**

Quality Level	Scores	Interpretation
Promising Practice	12-15	There are explicit links between the specific barriers and gaps isolated in the gap analysis and the selected specially designed instruction. The supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology are supported by solid research that indicates success in promoting progress in the general education curriculum. They are recorded with very specific details on when, how, and where they are to be implemented. The plan includes specific supports that are needed to support educators in implementing the plan with fidelity. The design of the supplemental instruction expands the core general education instruction and has the potential to close instructional gaps. The design of accommodations/assistive technology removes environmental and instructional barriers. The plan supports the student's independent use of accommodations/assistive technology. Modifications are only as necessary, if at all. The plan clearly outlines how modifications are used to close instructional gaps, rather than increase them.
Progressing	8-11	There is alignment between the gap analysis and the selected specially designed instruction. The supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology are supported by research that indicates potential growth in the general education curriculum. They are recorded with general details on when, how, and where they are to be implemented. The plan includes general supports that are needed to support educators in implementation. The design of the supplemental instruction is clearly in addition to the core general education instruction and will support learning and growth for a student aligned with the general education curriculum. The design of accommodations/assistive technology supports the removal of environmental and instructional barriers. The plan supports the student's use of accommodations/assistive technology to participate in instruction and socially. Modifications are used sparingly, if at all.
Emerging	4-7	There is loose alignment between the gap analysis and specially designed instruction. The supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology are logical in their use to support growth and learning. They are recorded with vague or unclear details on when, how, and where they are to be implemented. The plan includes vague description of supports that are needed to support educators in implementation. The design of the supplemental instruction is in addition to the core general education instruction. The design of accommodations/assistive technology provides some the removal of environmental and instructional barriers. The plan lists how the student can use the accommodations/assistive technology. Modifications, if listed, are throughout the plan.
Unacceptable	0-3	There is no alignment between the gap analysis and specially designed instruction. The supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology tend to feel more like a checklist or a set program of items provided for many students rather than individualized to needs. They are recorded with little or no details on when, how, and where they are to be implemented. The plan includes little or no description of supports that are needed to support educators in implementation. The design of the supplemental instruction replaces the core general education instruction or is not present in the plan. The design of accommodations/assistive technology is not connected to any barriers or is not present in the plan. Modifications are relied upon heavily throughout the plan and even replace the use of supplemental instruction and accommodations.

IEP Goals & Objectives

Indicator 1

IEP goals and objectives are: Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Specific.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• IEP goals and objectives are not written in observable and measurable language. • IEP goals and objectives do not have defined mastery of learning that encompasses a scope of growth over the course of one year.	• IEP goals and objectives are written in observable and measurable language. • IEP goals and objectives use appropriate criteria of measurement and broad methods of assessment that measure the learning as defined in the IEP goals and objectives.	• IEP goals and objectives are written in observable and measurable language that defines what the student will learn and the conditions for the instruction. • IEP goals and objectives use appropriate criteria of measurement and methods of assessment that specifically measure the learning as defined in the IEP goals and objectives.	• IEP goals and objectives are written in observable and measurable language that explicitly defines what the student will learn and the conditions for the instruction. • IEP goals and objectives use specific and appropriate criteria of measurement and methods of student progress monitoring that specifically measure the learning as defined in the IEP goals and objectives.
☐ **Majority of the elements = 0**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 1**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 2**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 2

IEP goals and objectives detail specific conditions for learning, a statement of how the student will demonstrate the learning, and a performance measure that is relevant to this demonstration of learning.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• IEP goals and objectives are not written with details as to where, when, how, how often, and to what degree the IEP goals and objectives will be implemented. • IEP goals and objectives do not provide details about the conditions under which the goal and objectives will be taught and implemented. • IEP goals and objectives do not provide details on how the student will perform or demonstrate the skills, concepts, or strategies. • IEP goals and objectives do not use specific and appropriate criteria of measurement or define methods of assessments that measure the learning as defined in the IEP goals and objectives.	• IEP goals and objectives are written with vague or missing details as to where, when, how, how often, and to what degree the IEP goals and objectives will be implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide vague details about the conditions under which the goal and objectives will be taught and implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide vague details on how the student will perform or demonstrate the skills, concepts, or strategies. • IEP goals and objectives have defined mastery of learning loosely based on present level of performance and benchmarks that encompasses an achievable scope of growth over the course of one year.	• IEP goals and objectives are written with general details as to where, when, how, how often, and to what degree the IEP goals and objectives will be implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide general details about the conditions under which the goal and objectives will be taught and implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide general details on how the student will perform or demonstrate the skills, concepts, or strategies. • IEP goals and objectives have defined mastery of learning based on present level of performance and specific benchmarks that encompasses a relevant and achievable scope of growth over the course of one year.	• IEP goals and objectives are written with explicit details as to where, when, how, how often, and to what degree the IEP goals and objectives will be implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide explicit details about the conditions under which the goal and objectives will be taught and implemented. • IEP goals and objectives provide explicit details on how the student will perform or demonstrate the skills, concepts, or strategies. • IEP goals and objectives have clearly defined definition of mastery of learning based on baseline assessment and targeted, well-defined, specific benchmarks that encompasses a robust, relevant, and achievable scope of growth over the course of one year.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 3

IEP goals and objectives use specially designed instruction to directly support access to, participation in, and progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• IEP goals and objectives do not use the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum.	• IEP goals and objectives are loosely aligned with the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum.	• IEP goals and objectives are aligned with the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum.	• IEP goals and objectives are driven by the age-appropriate grade-level general education curriculum.
• The IEP goals and objectives do not connect the specially designed instruction with the gap analysis.	• The IEP goals and objectives loosely connect the specially designed instruction with the gap analysis.	• The IEP goals and objectives connect the specially designed instruction with the gap analysis and connect with the barriers, missing skills, concepts, and strategies.	• The IEP goals and objectives directly connect the specially designed instruction with the gap analysis by isolating the barriers, missing skills, concepts, and strategies that need to be taught in order for the student to make progress in the general education curriculum.
• IEP goals and objectives do not capture any clear or specific supplemental instruction.	• The supplemental instruction is broadly described in the IEP goals and objectives.	• The supplemental instruction is described in the IEP goals and objectives.	• The supplemental instruction is explicitly described in the condition for learning and/or the student's demonstration of learning.
• IEP goals and objectives do not capture any clear or specific accommodations.	• Accommodations loosely connect with IEP goals and objectives.	• Accommodations are located in IEP goals and objectives.	• Accommodations are specifically embedded in IEP goals and objectives as conditions for learning and/or the student's demonstration of learning.
☐ *The next one is marked as **Not Applicable** if there are no modifications used*			
• IEP goals and objectives do not capture any clear or specific modifications.	• Modifications, if needed, are loosely described in the IEP goals and objectives.	• Modifications, if needed, are described in the IEP goals and objectives.	• Modifications, if needed, are explicitly described in the conditions for learning and/or the criteria for measurement of learning.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

☐ **/9 Total Score for IEP Goals & Objectives**

Quality Level	Score	Interpretation
Promising Practice	8-9	The goals and objectives are written in specific, measurable, and observable language. There are clear and specific details as to the design and delivery of the instruction in terms of what, when, and how. There are clear, specific, and observable details of how the student will demonstrate his or her learning. There are clear measures to track growth from a baseline to a specific target. These measures use methods and tools that can track growth daily, weekly, or at least monthly using a progress monitoring graph. The goals and objectives are driven by the general education curriculum. Supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications, if used, are embedded within goals and provide explicit details of when and how they are used.
Progressing	5-7	The goals and objectives are written in specific, measurable, and observable language. There are general details as to the design and delivery of the instruction in terms of what, when, and how. There are general details of how the student will demonstrate his or her learning. There are measures to track growth to a specific target. These measures use methods and tools that can track growth at least monthly. The goals and objectives are aligned with the general education curriculum. Supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications, if used, are embedded within goals.
Emerging	2-4	The goals and objectives are written in measurable and observable language. There are vague details as to the design and delivery of the instruction in terms of what, when, and how. There are vague details on how the student will demonstrate his or her learning. There are measures that could track growth. These measures use methods and tools that can note growth at least quarterly. The goals and objectives are loosely aligned with the general education curriculum. Supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications, if used, are connected to goals.
Unacceptable	0-1	There is one or more of the following concerns with the goals and objectives: they are not written in measurable and observable language; they are vague; and/or there are no real measures that could track growth. The goals and objectives are not aligned with the general education curriculum. Supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications, if used, are not connected to goals.

Types of Support & Placement

Indicator 1

Special education service hours and site of service delivery are designed to assist the student in making progress in the general education curriculum.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The IEP does not provide evidence that the general education setting is considered. • The IEP goals and objectives are not appropriately aligned with the service delivery. • The IEP does not provide evidence that it examines the use of supports for the student in relation to the general education curriculum. • There is evidence of overreliance on non-certified staff or that special education staff are to provide instruction for the IEP.	• The IEP provides some evidence that the general education setting is considered. • The IEP goals and objectives are appropriately aligned with the service delivery. • The IEP provides some evidence that it will include supports for the student in relation to the general education curriculum. • There is evidence that certified educators are used to provide instruction for the general education standards and have shared responsibility in implementing the IEP.	• The IEP provides evidence that the general education setting is considered. • The IEP provides evidence that the IEP goals and objectives were used to make decisions about service delivery options. • The IEP provides general evidence that the focus for the IEP is to include supports for the student to be successful in the general education curriculum. • There is evidence that highly qualified certified educators are used to provide instruction for the general education standards and have shared responsibility in implementing the IEP.	• The IEP provides strong evidence that the general education setting is considered the first placement option. • The IEP provides strong evidence that the IEP goals and objectives drive the service delivery options. • The IEP provides strong evidence that the primary focus for the IEP is to provide supports for the student to achieve general education curriculum standards. • There is strong evidence that highly qualified content experts and certified educators are used to provide instruction for the general education standards and have active responsibility in implementing the IEP as part of that general education instruction.
☐ **Majority of the elements = 0**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 1**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 2**	☐ **Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 2

Supports and services are provided in a manner that focuses on authentic learning that occurs in the natural settings and under the natural conditions that are typical for any student of the same-age peer group.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The IEP provides evidence that the goals and objectives are written to meet the elements of a "special education program."	• The IEP provides evidence that the focus of services is to provide support to meet the student's IEP goals and objectives.	• The IEP provides evidence that the focus of services is to provide support in the student's general education setting and/or the natural settings or under natural conditions where the type of learning specified in the IEP typically occurs for nondisabled peers.	• The IEP provides strong evidence that the primary focus of services is to provide support in the student's general education setting and/or the natural settings or under natural conditions where the type of learning specified in the IEP typically occurs for nondisabled peers.
• The IEP provides evidence that the focus of implementation of the IEP goals and objectives uses contrived and tightly controlled elements of learning opportunities, materials, tasks, and supports for learning or relies heavily on a program script for learning.	• The IEP provides evidence that the implementation of the IEP goals and objectives have few elements of authentic learning opportunities, materials, tasks, and supports for learning.	• The IEP provides evidence that the instruction and implementation of the IEP goals and objectives use some elements of authentic learning opportunities, materials, tasks, and supports for learning.	• The IEP provides strong evidence that the instruction and implementation of the IEP goals and objectives actively use authentic learning opportunities, materials, tasks, and supports for learning.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements = 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Indicator 3

The IEP organizes all supports and services in a comprehensive, flexible, coherent manner that focuses on the student achieving general education standards.

Unacceptable	Emerging	Progressing	Promising Practice
• The IEP reflects that various types of supports and services are isolated and disjointed from one another. • IEP goals and objectives do not relate to one another. • There is evidence that the IEP provides services that support separate and isolated programs.	• The IEP reflects that various types of supports and services share common themes across IEP goals and objectives. • IEP goals and objectives relate to one another. • There is evidence that the IEP provides services that support the scope and sequence of the general education instruction, while supporting the student's unique needs.	• The IEP reflects that various types of supports and services share responsibility for implementing the same IEP goals and objectives. • IEP goals and objectives connect with one another to provide a comprehensive plan. • There is evidence that the IEP provides flexible services that mirrors the scope and sequence of the general education instruction, while providing effective responses to the student's unique needs.	• The IEP reflects that all of the determined supports and services share a sense of collective responsibility for implementing the IEP as one comprehensive plan. • IEP goals and objectives interconnect and are interdependent with one another to provide one comprehensive and coherent plan. • There is strong evidence that the IEP provides a flexible service plan that flows with the scope and sequence of the general education instruction, while providing real-time, effective responses to the student's unique needs as they could grow and change over the course of the year.
☐	☐	☐	☐
Majority of the elements= 0	**Majority of the elements = 1**	**Majority of the elements = 2**	**Majority of the elements = 3**

Scoring for Types of Support & Placement

☐ **/9 Total Score for Supports & Services**

Quality Level	Scores	Interpretation
Promising Practice	8-9	The focus of the IEP is general education, even if more restrictive settings are needed. The services and supports are driven by the IEP goals. For each goal area, highly qualified certified staff are used to provide the instruction, with a strong presence of general education-certified content experts being actively involved in the implementation of the IEP. There is a sense of collective partnership among a team of educators. The tone of the IEP is the use of authentic learning occurring in the natural environments for that learning. The IEP reflects a comprehensive, flexible plan that is driven by the student's needs and promoting progress in the general education curriculum.
Progressing	5-7	General education is referenced throughout the IEP, even if more restrictive settings are needed. The services and supports are connected to the IEP goals. For each goal area, highly qualified certified staff are used to provide the instruction, which include a presence of general education certified content experts. There is evidence of a team approach to the implementation of the IEP. The IEP includes the use of authentic learning occurring in the natural environments for that learning. The IEP reflects a comprehensive plan that is driven by the student's needs.
Emerging	2-4	General education is loosely referred to in the IEP. The services and supports are aligned to the IEP goals. For each goal area, certified staff are used to provide the instruction, although there is overreliance on special education teachers and student support services professionals. The IEP uses a focus of special education programming and controlled tasks and settings for learning. The IEP reflects a plan that feels disjointed in the scope of the goals and services.
Unacceptable	0-1	The IEP is focused on segregated programming, services, and/or settings. The services and supports are not aligned to the IEP goals, and it appears that the services and special education programming are driving how the goals were written. There is overreliance on paraprofessionals, special education teachers, and student support services professionals to implement the IEP with very little if any mention of general education teachers. The IEP uses contrived tasks for learning. IEP goals and services appear isolated from one another and there is evidence they are not related or connected to one another.

☐ /42 Total Score

Quality Level	Scores	Interpretation
Promising Practice	37-42	The IEP is driven by the general education curriculum and provides only necessary specially designed instruction or services. There is a clear use of the continuum of supports and services that moves from general education to more restrictive special education. The gap analysis explicitly identifies the environmental and instructional strengths, barriers, and gaps. The flow of the IEP explicitly links the gap analysis to targeted supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications. The IEP goals and objectives are written in language that allows for clear instruction. The assessments used throughout the IEP can be used to easily track student progress at least monthly from a specific baseline to a specific set of targets. The supports and services are designed to implement the IEP with fidelity and the intentions of closing gaps and addressing barriers. The IEP is written in very clear and precise language that allows for any educator or family member to fully understand what needs to occur on a daily basis without the need for any further clarification.
Progressing	22-36	The IEP is closely aligned with the general education curriculum. There is a continuum of supports and services that moves from general education to more restrictive special education. The gap analysis identifies the environmental and instructional gaps. The flow of the IEP links the gap analysis to supplemental instruction, accommodations/assistive technology, and modifications. The IEP goals and objectives are written in language that leads instruction. The assessments used throughout the IEP can be used to track student progress at least quarterly. The supports and services are designed to implement the IEP with fidelity. The IEP is written in language that is clear enough for an educator or family member to understand what needs to occur.
Emerging	8-21	The IEP is loosely connected with the general education curriculum. It is unclear if a continuum of supports and services is used, or the IEP seems to flow from special education to general education. The gap analysis is vague and provides only broad understanding of the gaps. The flow of the IEP is disjointed and choppy from gap analysis to goals to services. The IEP goals and objectives are vague and broad. The IEP is not always clear for educators or family members.
Unacceptable	0-7	The IEP has no or very little connection with the general education curriculum. The IEP seems to focus on special education programming and services and may over-support the student. The IEP appears isolated and unconnected between gap analysis, goals, and services. Goals and objectives seem to have been written for specific special education programs versus addressing unique needs. The determination of service seems to be set for implementation of programs versus individualized supports. The IEP is written in vague and unclear language that makes it difficult to understand what needs to occur to implement the IEP.

Resources

Bates, M. W. (1996). *The meaning of 'educational benefit' following Rowley: A statistical analysis of case law* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Bowen, S. K., & Rude, H. A. (2006). Assessment and students with disabilities: Issues and challenges with educational reform. *Rural Special Education Quarterly, 25*(3), 24-30.

Browder, D. M., Wakeman, S. Y., & Flowers, C. (2006). Assessment of progress in the general curriculum for students. *Theory into Practice, 45*(3), 249-259.

Clark, S. G. (2000). The IEP process as a tool for collaboration. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 33*(2), 56-66.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2006). *Least restrictive environment (LRE) procedural checklist*. Hartford, CT.

Connecticut State Department of Education. (2008). *Using scientific research-based interventions: Improving education for all students*. Hartford, CT.

Connecticut State Department of Education: Bureau of Special Education. (2010). *IEP manual and forms: State of Connecticut*. Hartford, CT: Retrieved from http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2626&q=322680.

Connecticut State Department of Education: Bureau of Special Education. (2012). *Connecticut part B state performance plan*. Hartford, CT: Retrieved from http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2626&q=322094.

Donnellan, A. M. (1984). The criterion of the least dangerous assumption. *Behavioral Disorders, 9*(2), 141-150.

Giangreco, M. F. (2001). Guidelines for making decisions about IEP services. Montpelier, VT: Vermont Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.uvm.edu/~mgiangre.

Hunt, P., & Farron-Davis, F. (1992). A preliminary investigation of IEP quality and content associated with placement in general education versus special education classes. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 17*(4), 247-253.

Hunt, P., Goetz, L., & Anderson, J. (1986). The quality of IEP objectives associated with placement on integrated versus segregated school sites. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 11*(2), 125-130.

Individuals with disabilities education improvement act of 2004, 118, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 118 Stat 2647 (2004).

Lignugaris-Kraft, B., Marchand-Martella, N., & Martella, R. C. (2001). Writing better goals and short-term objectives or benchmarks. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 34*(1), 52-58.

Lynch, E. C., & Beare, P. L. (1990). The quality of IEP objectives and their relevance to instruction for students with mental retardation and behavioral disorders. *Remedial and Special Education, 11*(2), 48-55.

McLaughlin, M. J. (2010). Evolving interpretations of educational equity and students with disabilities. *Council for Exceptional Children, 76*(3), 265-278.

Moll, A. M. (2003). *Differentiated instruction guide for inclusive teaching*. New York: Dude Publishing.

Nolet, V., & McLaughlin, M. J. (2005). *Accessing the general curriculum: Including students with disabilities in standards-based reform* (second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Pretti-Frontczak, K., & Bricker, D. (2000). Enhancing the quality of individualized education plan (IEP) goals and objectives. *Journal of Early Intervention, 23*(2), 92-105.

Stetson, F. (2002). *Step by step training for inclusive schools.* Paper presented at the State Education Resource Center, CT.

Thompson, S. J., Thurlow, M. L., Quenemoen, R. F., Esler, A. E., & Whetstone, P. (2001). Addressing standards and assessments on state IEP forms (Synthesis report 38). Retrieved from http://cehd.umn.edu/nceo/OnlinePubs/Synthesis38.html.

U.S. Department of Education: Office of Special Education Programs. (2006). *Federal Register: Part II 34 CFR Sections 300 and 301*. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

Zinkil, S. S. (2004). *Differential effects of assessment report type on special educators' recommendations regarding identification of goals and choice of intervention.* Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Fla. Retrieved from http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=813772191&sid=1&Fmt=2&clientId=1898&RQT=309&VName=PQD.