|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | 1. **Inadequate: Performance of expectations is consistently inadequate, failing to meet the minimum requirements. Aspiration to improve not consistently evident.** | 1. **Progressing: Performance of some expectations requires further development of skills. Demonstrates a willingness to improve skills.** | 1. **Satisfactory: Performance consistently meets and may occasionally exceed expectations.** | 1. **Highly Effective: Performance frequently exceeds expectations. Indicates agency, state, or national-level leadership.** |
| **Information Session**  **Observation** | 1. **Information session did not adequately describe the HS completion options offered by the agency.** | Information session describes the HS completion options offered by the agency with inconsistent adequacy- may include inaccuracies or incomplete information. | Information session adequately describes the HS completion options offered by the agency with accurate and complete information. | Information session accurately and completely describes NEDP and the other HS completion option(s) offered by the agency with particular clarity. |
| **Indicators:** | 1. **Information Session Date \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_** 2. **NOTES:** | | | |
| **Administrative Review of Competency Area/ Diagnostics**  (based on at least one D client and one GA or PR client when possible) | 1. **Assessment inconsistently aligned with evaluation criteria** 2. **Insufficient or inappropriate notes to client and/or staff** 3. **Diagnostic tab missing information** | * Assessment usually aligned to evaluation criteria * Most notes to client and/or staff are appropriate * Client progress may be encouraged by additional notes | * Assessment consistently aligned with evaluation criteria * Appropriate and useful notes to client and staff * Diagnostic tab shows all open and closed diagnostic instruments (including ND assessments) | As described in satisfactory rating, plus   * Calls for and/or participates in consensus and mediation, and/or * Makes item suggestions to CASAS/NEDP |
| **Indicators** | 1. **Area/Diag Reviewed \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Client Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Review Date \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_** 2. **Notes:** | | | |
| **Responsiveness**  (evaluation and release of assessment, portfolio review or WP assessment) | 1. **Unassessed or unreleased client work past the two-week window** | Client work generally assessed and released within two weeks | Client work consistently scored/released within two weeks | Client work consistently assessed and released before two week window has elapsed |
| **Indicators** | 1. **Client Status(es) reviewed for:** 2. **Notes:** | | | |
| **IOC/Feedback Session Observation**  IOC/Feedback Session conducted according to the procedures and philosophy of competency-based assessment | 1. **Session included frequent errors such as** 2. **Providing content instruction** 3. **Assessing work (or indicating assessment) during IOC** 4. **Paraphrasing questions or instructions** 5. **Using non-NEDP language such as failed** | Session was generally in line with NEDP procedures, but included one of the errors in the “inadequate” description | Session was fully in line with NEDP procedures and was free from the errors listed in the “inadequate” description | Session was in line with NEDP procedures, free from errors in the “inadequate” description; additionally, Assessor’s demeanor and style of communication was exemplary. |
| **Indicators** | 1. **IOC/Feedback Session Date \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_ Client Number \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** 2. **Notes:** | | | |
| **Professional Development** | 1. **Staff has not participated in NEDP professional development opportunities** 2. **Staff inconsistently attends NEDP staff meetings** | Staff has participated in fewer than half of the available professional development opportunities or staff meetings. | * Staff has participated in several professional development opportunities, and * Staff consistently attends NEDP staff meetings. | As described in the “satisfactory” rating, plus   * Provided professional development to peers and/or trainees * Contributed to PD presented by other trainers |
| **Indicators** | 1. **List Professional Development participation and dates here:** | | | |
| **Client Evaluations** | 1. **Score of 2 or below on client evaluation(s)** | Score of 3 - 5 on client evaluation(s) | Score of 6 – 8 on client evaluation(s) | Score of 9 – 10 on client evaluation(s) |
| **Indicators** | 1. **Attach client evaluation(s)** | | | |