|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)**
 |