****

**Alternative Education Evaluation Rubric**

**Program Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Date of Visit: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**District (LEA): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Sending Schools: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Total Points: \_\_\_ out of 123 points**

**Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

*(Noncompliant: 0-12 points, Minimally Complaint: 13-36 points, Effective: 37-84 points, Highly Effective: 85-123 points)*

**Criteria Rated as Met or Not Met Rating is 2 points for yes or zero points for no.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **All Classes are Conducted by Certified Teachers** | YES | NO |
| **Courses Meet Curricular Standards** | YES | NO |
| **Clear and Measurable Goals and Objectives** | YES | NO |
| **Effective Student/Teacher Ratio** | YES | NO |
| **Budget** | YES | NO |
| **Student Participation** | YES | NO |

**Appropriate Program Design to Serve At-Risk Students Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| The program failed to meet the required minimum daily instructional time of 4 hours 12 minutes/5 days a week or 756 hours in a 180 day school calendar. | The program served relatively low-risk students even though the district dropout rate continued to be high. | The intervention was appropriately designed to serve the students who were at greatest risk of not completing high school for reasons other than a disability. | Students at high-risk of dropping out and whose needs were not met by other district services were served (overage/underserved students). |
| Alternative education students were not provided with standard services (ex. library access, school nutrition, transportation). | Too many or too few students were served. | The program served an appropriate number of students. | Students, including re-engaged students (former dropouts), were actively recruited for participation in the program. |
| The program was used in place of special education. | The program was limited to credit recovery or remediation. | The duration of the intervention was typically one or more semesters for the majority of students served. | Facilities, instructional materials, and staffing levels supported program quality and demonstrated a reasonable contribution of local funds beyond the state allocation. |
| The program design did not meet the needs of those most highly at-risk, as evidenced by high program dropout rate or a high district dropout rate. | Special education students were over-represented or excluded in the program. | The program was designed to provide differentiated services to students with a variety of needs and relates to the vision and mission of the program. | Student success is central to the vision and mission of the program, which includes the development of effective and affective skills, social competencies, and career readiness skills. |
| Fits the description of a virtual education program rather than an alternative education program. | The program design did not meet the needs of those most highly at-risk, as evidenced by a high program dropout rate or a high district dropout rate | The program was designed to ensure substantial daily, personal interaction with teacher(s). | Program promotes a safe and secure environment while developing the emotional and physical wellness of all students. |
|  | Program resources were inadequate to implement the program as designed. |  |  |

 *(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-6 points, Effective: 7-10 points, Highly Effective: 11-15 points)*

**Notes:**

**Faculty Selection Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| Faculty were assigned to the program because of availability or administrative convenience. | Teachers were selected based on curriculum certification rather than on proven success with students at-risk of school failure. | Faculty were selected on the basis of a record of successful work with at-risk students or personal and education factors that qualify them for work with at-risk students. | Meets all criteria for Effective; in addition, staff worked to improve their understanding of the philosophy of alternative education programming, required criteria, and instructional approaches. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1 point, Effective: 2 points, Highly Effective: 3 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Intake and Screening Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| There was no clearly targeted population identified for services. | The targeted population is at little risk of dropping out or school failure. | The targeted population is at significant risk of dropping out or school failure. | The program recruited students at very high-risk of dropping out or school failure. |
| No formal intake and screening process is in place. | An appropriate intake and screening process is written, but it is often circumvented. | Both traditional and alternative educators are included in the intake and screening process. | Committee and individual intake and screenings were conducted. |
| Students were placed on short-term basis for disciplinary reasons. | Student intake is permitted only at the beginning of grading periods. | Students may be asked to demonstrate responsibility as a part of the intake and screening process (responsibility steps, contracting, etc.). | All students demonstrate responsibility as a part of the intake and screening process (responsibility steps, contracting, etc.). |
| Most students have no real choice about attending the program. | All referrals automatically accepted. | A review of the students’ records is part of the intake and screening process. | The program ensures that all records are complete prior to enrollment in the program. |
| Students screened out because they are not likely to be a success in the program. | The high proportion of special education students placed in the program requires review. | Most students voluntarily enrolled in the program (legal assignments excluded). | The program is accurately described as a “school of choice”. |
| A change of placement meeting was not conducted for those special education students referred to the program. |  | Students are screened out only when the program is not the best fit for the student. |  |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-5 points, Effective: 6-12 points, Highly Effective: 13-15 points)*

 **Notes:**

**State and Local Collaboration Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| No collaboration with community agencies. | Due to the location and/or time of the program, limited community partnerships were formed. | Coordinates services across multiple organizations to meet student needs. | Community services were considered integral to the success of the alternative program. |
| No outreach to local or regional organizations. | Limited effort to actively engage the students with community agencies, organizations, or individuals. | Students engage in activities that provide benefit to the community. | An active, community-based advisory group participates in the development, implementation and improvement of the program. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-2 points, Effective: 3-4 points, Highly Effective: 5-6 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Graduation Plan Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| There was no evidence that individual graduation plans were written. | Graduation plans were limited to graduation checklists. | Upon admission to the program, a graduation plan was designed with each student. | Options for career tech, jobs, and/or concurrent enrollment were included in students’ graduation plans. |
| Graduation plans were not regularly updated. | The graduation rate of seniors is low, indicating that plan implementation was ineffective. | Plan was updated throughout the year and reviewed with the student when each course was completed. | Goals for behavior factors that impeded students’ success (ex. absences, drug issues, suspensions) were included in the plans or separate documents. |
| Too few students make adequate progress toward graduation. | A graduation plan was completed, then reviewed quarterly; however, it was limited to little more than a required graduation checklist. | Students and teachers were engaged in the development, review, and revision of graduation plans and were cognizant of student status and progress toward graduation. | Graduation plans extended beyond high school graduation and assisted students with successful transitions. |
|  | The program did not afford students the opportunity to earn credits at an appropriate rate. | Students made adequate progress toward graduation. | Students made exceptional progress toward graduation. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-4 points, Effective: 5-8 points, Highly Effective: 9-12 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Individualized Instruction Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| There was no differentiation in the instructional approaches of the alternative program and those used in the traditional school or computerized learning programs. | There was little differentiation in the instructional approaches of the alternative program and those used in the traditional school or computerized learning programs. | Instruction is differentiated utilizing a variety of methods. | Individualized instruction includes learning activities and techniques that actively engage students. Approaches may include textbooks, packaged courses, computer-assisted instruction, teacher-designed curriculum, hands-on activities, and project-based learning. |
|  | No provisions were made for students who were able to earn credits at an accelerated rate. | Students actively engaged in learning and making adequate progress toward graduation. | Extends approaches to encompass a broad range of instructional options (experiential learning, extended technology, fine arts). |
|  | Progress inadequately monitored and/or teacher rarely intervenes to increase productivity. | Interactive (cooperative) learning opportunities are incorporated in the program. | The program demonstrates an understanding and sensitivity to academic, behavioral, cultural, developmental, gender, and societal needs of the students. |
|  | Opportunities for interactive (cooperative) learning among the students was limited. | The program shows an understanding to academic, behavioral, cultural, developmental, gender, and societal needs of the students.  | The program actively promotes student engagement and affords students with the opportunity to have a role in shaping the learning environment to facilitate feelings of connectedness. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-4 points, Effective: 5-8 points, Highly Effective: 9-12 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Effective Instruction Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| The pace of credit acquisition at such a level as to bring the curricular rigor into question. | The program lacks adequate rigor; this may be indicated by student scores on state assessments. | The curriculum has the appropriate rigor and is matched to the needs of learners. | Students demonstrated exceptional academic progress and/or exceptional improvement on key variables (GPA, attendance, suspensions, test scores, courses completed). |
| Students demonstrated inadequate academic progress and/or improvement on key variables. | Students demonstrated marginal academic progress and/or improvement on key variables. | Students demonstrated satisfactory academic progress and/or exceptional improvement on key variables. | Teachers and other program staff made exceptional efforts to maximize academic success. |
| No teacher available during a significant portion of instructional time. | Although teacher(s) were available to answer questions, students were expected to learn on their own. | Teachers and other program staff worked to ensure academic success. | Increasing teacher and staff capacity through training to ensure the use of research-based strategies that align with the needs of the program student population is used strategically in the program. |
| There is little difference in the instructional approaches used in the alternative and traditional programs. | Teacher(s) lack the content knowledge to provide effective instruction in one or more areas. | A variety of professional development approaches, including technology, to accomplish the goals of improving instruction and increasing student achievement are used in the program. | Community partners are utilized when integrating life skills, soft skills, college and career readiness, and service learning into the program. |
|  | The instructional approach is different than that used in the traditional school, but students do not respond to it positively. |  |  |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-5 points, Effective: 6-8 points, Highly Effective: 9-12 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Counseling and Social Services Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| No counseling services provided. | Counseling services not available to all students equally. | Group and/or individual counseling sessions were readily available to all students every 2 weeks and include discussion on possible next steps after graduation. | A broad range of weekly group and individual counseling services were provided that encompass academic, career, and social/emotional well-being. |
| Counseling services provided on an “as needed” basis. | Counseling services too infrequent to be effective. | Certified/licensed counselors routinely scheduled sessions that encompass academic, career, and social/emotional well-being. | Additional counseling and social services features were evident (ex. home visits, parental trainings, wide range of topics addressed). |
|  | The program lacked resources to provide counseling services, but regular guidance sessions were provided to students. | Social services were arranged to meet students’ academic, mental, health, and/or family needs. | Students understand the relationship between success in school and transition to their next steps. |
|  | The program had contracted for counseling service but contract was not fulfilled. | Referral to other service agencies was made when deemed appropriate. | An environment for academic preparation that promotes a wide range of post-secondary options including career tech, the armed services, and college is created at the program. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-4 points, Effective: 5-8 points, Highly Effective: 9-12 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Life Skills Instruction Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| No life skills instruction was provided. | Life skills instruction was limited in time allotted for instruction and/or scope. | A comprehensive life skills curriculum was implemented that was age appropriate and aligned to student interest. | Opportunities outside the classroom which put relevant life skills into practice were evident. |
|  | A life skills curriculum was implemented but it was not appropriate for the ages or interests of the students in the program. | Life skills instruction was used to make the learning of core content more relevant for at-risk youth. | The instructor incorporated life skills instruction and activities into regular course content. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-2 points, Effective: 3-4 points, Highly Effective: 5-6 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Arts Education Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| No art or music instruction was offered as a part of the program. | The program staff ensured that students met the arts graduation requirements. | Fine arts education was infused into the curriculum. | Arts education incorporated artists or musicians (ex. artists-in-residences, local artists or crafters). |
|  |  | Arts education included activity-based approaches through a broad spectrum of offerings (fine, performing, and literary arts). | Arts-related instructional strategies were used throughout the year to expand and to enrich the curriculum. |
|  |  |  | Students were provided with opportunities to publish or perform (ex. displays, art shows, performances, or publications on the internet). |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1 point, Effective: 2-4 points, Highly Effective: 5-9 points)*

 **Notes:**

**Self-Evaluation Rating: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Noncompliant – 0 points each** | **Minimally Compliant – 1 point each** | **Effective – 2 points each** | **Highly Effective – 3 points each** |
| Inadequate student records are maintained. | Adequate student records are maintained but are not used to inform instruction, programming, and updated vision/mission. | The program keeps up-to-date records indicating whether each student is making sufficient progress toward graduation. | The program prepares its own routine, annual evaluation report to determine program success and plans for continued program improvement. |
| The program has a high dropout rate. | The program rarely makes changes in response to feedback, especially feedback related to student outcomes. | Student progress is monitored weekly (or more often). | The program routinely reports its progress to stakeholders (advisory board, local board of education, parents, students). |
| The program lost a high number of students shortly after enrollment (within 1st 3 weeks). |  | Student data summaries are provided as requested by SDE. | Program staff use evaluative feedback, including student outcome data, for program improvement. |

*(Rating - Noncompliant: 0 points, Minimally Compliant: 1-2 points, Effective: 3-6 points, Highly Effective: 7-9 points)*

 **Notes:**