

NDE RISK ASSESSMENT
SCORING RUBRICS FY19

CATEGORY 1 – AUDIT/MONITORING PERFORMANCE

Risk Indicators	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Medium Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
1. Outcomes of Federal and State Fiscal Audits (as available): DOUBLE POINTS – 6	None Performed	Fiscal Audit was performed. Subrecipient had 3 low risk findings or less or had no findings or only minor findings (i.e. the entity is too small to properly segregate internal controls).	Subrecipient had findings in internal controls or grants, but the entity had a corrective action plan to deal with these issues. Findings did not exceed 5 of a minor nature.	Subrecipient was un-auditable. Major deficiencies in internal controls were found in the audit. Entity had major findings relating to grants and internal controls.
2. Single Audit (OMB Super Circular) Results (as appropriate) a. Submittal b. Evaluation c. Findings DOUBLE POINTS – 6	None Performed/Entity Exempt	Subrecipient received an unmodified opinion on certified annual financial report. Audit contained no findings or less than 3 findings (minor in nature) that entity responded to with a corrective action plan.	Subrecipient received a modified opinion on their certified annual financial report. 3-5 minor findings in annual certified financial report. However, entity did have corrective action plan for findings.	Subrecipient audit contained an adverse opinion or a disclaimer of opinion on the complete financial statements (not just a certain component). Material findings were found, and the auditee did not have a corrective action plan for findings. Audit contained notes that the entity was a “going concern.”
3. Title I Comparability Audits DOUBLE POINTS – 6	None Performed/Entity Exempt	Entity was in compliance with Title I Comparability requirements	Entity eventually was in compliance, but required several formal letters from the Department to become compliant.	Entity was not in compliance with Title I Comparability requirements.

Category 2 – Academic Achievement

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
4. CSI/TSI/ATSI Schools - LEA Percentage and number/ percentage of students.	There is no Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI), Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) or Additional Targeted Support and Improvement (ATSI) designated schools identified in the District.	1% to 25% of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI	25.01% to 49.99% of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI	50% or more of schools in the district are designated CSI/TSI/or ATSI
5. English Language Assessment, World Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) and Adequate Growth Potential (AGP).	At or greater than 13%.	11% to 12.99%	9% to 10.99%	Less than 9%
6. Index Scores - Percent of Schools within an LEA with Index Scores below 50. DOUBLE Points – 6	The subrecipient’s average index score was 67 or higher	The subrecipient’s average index score was between 51 and 66.99	The subrecipient’s average index score was between 34 and 50.99	The subrecipient’s index score was lower than 34
7. College and Career Readiness (CCR)	The subrecipient’s rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is less than 2% below or above the statewide average	The subrecipient’s rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is between 2.01% to 5% below the statewide average	The subrecipient’s rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is between 5.01% to 9.99% below the statewide average	The subrecipient’s rate of students obtaining their Advanced or CCR Diploma is greater than 10% below the statewide average.

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
8. Chronic Absenteeism - Percent of schools that are at chronic absenteeism rate or significant level DOUBLE POINTS – 6	The subrecipient’s chronic absenteeism rate is below 4.99%	The subrecipient’s chronic absenteeism rate is 5% to 8%	The subrecipient’s absenteeism rate is 8.01% to 9.99%	The subrecipient’s chronic absenteeism rate is 10% or greater. Note – If greater than 20% - double score.
9. Graduation Rates	The subrecipient’s graduation rate is 2% below or at the statewide average	The subrecipient’s graduation rate is 2.01% to 5% below the statewide average	The subrecipient’s graduation rate is 5.01% to 9.99% below the statewide average	The subrecipient’s graduation rate is 10% or more below the statewide average.
10. Equitable Service/ Consultation Process	The subrecipient had no carryover of their equitable services set-aside, no filed complaints, and signed annual affirmations of consultation were submitted on time.	The subrecipient had 15% or less carryover of their equitable services funds, no filed complaints, and signed annual affirmations of consultation were on time.	The subrecipient had greater than 15.01% but less than 25% carryover of their equitable services set-aside, or 1 – 2 filed complaints, or signed annual affirmations of consultation were late by two weeks or less.	The subrecipient had greater than 25.01% carryover of their equitable services set-aside, or three or more filed complaints, or signed annual affirmations of consultation were late by three or more weeks.

Category 3 – Reporting Timeliness and Accuracy

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
11. Grant Closeout Reports	ALL financial, performance, and other subrecipient reports required under the grant pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance §200.343 were completed and accurately submitted by the due date identified.	ONE financial, performance or other subrecipient reports, required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance §200.343), was EITHER incomplete or inaccurate AND/OR submitted after the due date identified.	TWO-THREE financial, performance or other subrecipient reports required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance §200.343) were INCOMPLETE or inaccurate AND/OR SUBMITTED after the due date identified.	FOUR OR MORE financial, performance or other subrecipient required reports required under the grant (pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance §200.343) were INCOMPLETE or inaccurate, AND/OR submitted after the due date identified.
12. Grant Funding Application Submissions	ALL financial, performance, and other sub-recipient reports required under the grant pursuant to the OMB Uniform Grants Guidance §200.343 were completed and accurately submitted by the due date identified.	ALL Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions are received by the due date, AND 95% to 99% of application components were completed correctly in the first submission of R0 for review and approval.	ALL Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions were received by the due date, AND 85% to 94.99% of application components were completed correctly in the first submission of R0 for review and approval.	Federal Grant Funding Application Submissions were NOT received by the due date, AND/OR Less than 85% of application components were completed correctly in the first submission of R0 for review and approval.
13. General Statement of Assurance (GSA)	ALL provisions established by the NDE (which governs the funds and program) are accepted by the sub-grantee through certification and acknowledgement of the federal General Statement of Assurances	N/A	N/A	The subrecipient did NOT accept the sub-grantee certification and acknowledgement of the federal General Statement of Assurances.

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
14. Stale Claims – Number of stale claims at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year (SFY) and percent of active awards with stale claims for each LEA: DOUBLE POINTS – 6 DEFERRED in FY19	No stale claims were submitted on behalf of the Subrecipient at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year.	N/A	One stale claim was submitted on behalf of the Subrecipient at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year due to circumstances that were preventable by the LEA.	Two or More Stale Claims were submitted on behalf of the Subrecipient at the end of the previous State Fiscal Year due to circumstances that were preventable by the LEA.
15. Grant Programmatic Desktop Monitoring Submissions. Percentage of non-compliance monitoring items DEFERRED in FY19	No late or out of compliance submissions	One submission late or out of compliance.	Two to three submissions late or out of compliance	Four or more submissions late or out of compliance

Category 4 – Grant Management

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
16. Carryover of Grant Funds DOUBLE POINTS – 6 DEFERRED in FY19	No carryover. \$0 Reversions to Fed or State.	Federal Funds carryover of .01% to 4.99% and \$0 Reversions back to Feds or State.	Federal funds carryover in range of 5% to 14.99% and \$0 Reversions back to Feds or State	Federal funds carryover in excess of 15% and/or any amount greater than \$0 reverted back to Feds or State.
17. Timeliness and Accuracy of Reimbursement Request Submissions (Per program). DEFERRED in FY19	No reimbursement request submissions that were late or inaccurate.	One reimbursement request submission late or inaccurate.	Two reimbursement request submissions late or inaccurate.	Three or more reimbursement request submissions late or inaccurate.
18. Amendment Requests	No amendment requests in past fiscal year.	One or two subrecipient initiated amendment requests in past fiscal year.	Three or four subrecipient initiated amendment requests in past fiscal year.	Five or more subrecipient initiated amendment requests in past fiscal year.
19. New Personnel and New or Substantially Changed Systems DEFERRED in FY19	The subrecipient had no turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored.	The subrecipient had greater than 0 and less than 20% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored	The subrecipient had greater than 20% but less than 50% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored	The subrecipient had greater than 50% turnover of Superintendent, or key fiscal or programmatic grant management personnel in the past three years prior to the federal grant award year being monitored

Category 5 – District and School Strategic Planning

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
<p>20. Subrecipient Performance Plan (DPP) Submission DOUBLE POINTS - 6</p>	<p>Subrecipient’s DPP submission MEETS ALL Federal requirements per ESSA §1112(a)(1)(A) and §1112(a)(3), §1112(6) Plan Provisions(6)(b)(A-D and 1111(g)(1)(B) (i.e. connecting applicable additional plans within the Subrecipient plan, such has the Subrecipients and associated practices). DPP was “Accepted” by the SEA for meeting all Federal compliance indicators</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Subrecipient’s DPP DOES NOT MEET ALL Federal requirements per ESSA §1112(a)(1)(A) and §1112(a)(3)) §1112(6) Plan Provisions(6)(b)(A-D and 1111(g)(1)(B) (i.e. connecting applicable additional plans within the Subrecipient’s plan, such has the Subrecipient’s Equitable Distribution Plan and associated practices). DPP was marked as “Does Not Meet Compliance” by the SEA for not meeting all Federal compliance indicators.</p>
<p>21. Subrecipient Approved School Performance Plan (SPP) Submissions Double POINTS -6</p>	<p>ALL APPROVED subrecipient SPP submissions MEETS ALL Federal and State requirements and all SPP submissions were accepted by the SEA in meeting the compliance indicators outlined in ESSA</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>ONE OR MORE APPROVED subrecipient SPP submissions DOES NOT MEET ALL Federal and State requirements and was not accepted by the SEA in meeting all compliance indicators, as outlined in ESSA §1114(b)(6)], 1114(b)(7)(A)(i), (iii)), NRS 385A.650 and Chapter 501 of</p>

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
	<p>§1114(b)(6)], 1114(b)(7)(A)(i), (iii), (IV), NRS 385A.650 and Chapter 501 of State regulation AB7.</p>			<p>State regulation AB7.</p>
<p>22. Evidence Based levels - DPP DEFERRED in FY19</p>	<p>For the subrecipient’s allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (90% or greater) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State</p>	<p>For the subrecipient’s allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (80% to 89.9%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes.</p>	<p>For the subrecipient’s allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (70% to 79.9%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes.</p>	<p>For the subrecipient’s allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (less than 70%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes.</p>

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
	outcomes.			
23. Evidence-Based Levels-SPP DEFERRED in FY19	For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (90% or greater) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes	For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (80% to 89.9%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low- performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes	For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (70% to 79.9%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes.	For the SPPs allocation of federal grant funds, specific, prioritized Level 1, 2 and 3 (less than 70%) evidence-based interventions were implemented in low-performing schools that resulted in outcomes with measurable effectiveness related directly to the targeted intervention and is aligned to Nevada’s Academic Content Standards (NACS) and/or other State outcomes.

Risk Indicator	Least Risk (0)	Low Risk (1)	Moderate Risk (2)	High Risk (3)
24. Equitable Distribution of Teachers (EDT): Plan to Address Equity Gaps	The Subrecipient submitted EDT plans that prioritized funds to build instructional excellence in schools and employed effective strategies to ensure students met NDE academic achievement standards.	N/A	N/A	No evidence was provided by the subrecipient to indicate that funds were prioritized to build instructional excellence in schools or strategies employed to ensure students meet NDE academic achievement standards.