



# One Rubric, Two Centers, and the Evaluation of Technical Assistance

2018 OSEP Project Directors' Conference—July 23-25, 2018

**Sarah Heinemeier**

Compass Evaluation & Research, Inc.  
Evaluator for the *IDEA* Data Center (IDC)

**Judy Lee**

Evergreen Evaluation & Consulting, Inc. (EEC)  
Evaluator for the Center for the Integration of  
*IDEA* Data (CIID)

# Developing the IDC Rubric

- Proposed in IDC grant application
- Intended to guide and define procedures for evaluating quality of intensive technical assistance (TA)
- Created based on:
  - State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices' (SISEP's) six core features of effective intensive TA
  - TA and implementation research literature
  - Experiences of IDC TA team leaders and evaluation team members

# Developing the IDC Rubric (cont.)

- Fourth iteration of the tool
- Guidance document and scoring sheet
- Quality of intensive TA evaluated on
  - Guiding principles of TA
  - Components of effective intensive TA
    - Clarity
    - Integrity
    - Intensity
    - Accountability

# Developing the IDC Rubric: Sample of Guidance Document

## A. CLARITY

### A1. State Commitment (10 Points)

State leadership and state staff demonstrate commitment to the intensive TA effort.

*General Guideline: This subcomponent addresses the extent to which the state is committed and involved throughout the TA effort. Interviews of state leaders, state staff, or IDC TA staff and written documentation can be used to inform the ratings of this subcomponent. Written documentation can take the form of the IDC TA Service Agreement, meeting minutes, notes from the IDC TA Tracker, or other similar documentation.*

- a State leadership agrees to the written intensive TA Service Agreement. [YES/NO]  
*State leadership is defined as the State Director of Special Education for Part B and the Part C Coordinator for Part C. For this rating to be “YES,” there must be a written IDC TA Service Agreement that the state has agreed to in writing (e.g., signed service agreement, agrees via email) during the first year of TA services. In subsequent years, for this rating to be “YES,” there must be evidence that the TA Service Agreement was reviewed and updated if needed.*

# Adapting the IDC Rubric for CIID: Process and Content



\*CIID terminology, service methodology/delivery

# Implementing the IDC Rubric: Methodology

1. Two evaluators independently rate each intensive TA effort
  - Data sources
  - Evaluator processes
2. Discuss ratings jointly (30-60 minutes per state)
3. Come to consensus
4. Evaluate indicators on rubric

# Implementing the IDC Rubric: Use of Findings

- Report on a project measure for Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Annual Performance Report (APR)
- Feedback process
  1. Meet with TA leads to identify areas for improvement
  2. Develop feedback forms highlighting strengths and areas for improvement as well as improvement strategies
  3. Conduct calls that include evaluators, TA lead, and intensive TA provider

# Reflecting on the IDC Rubric

- Perceived validity
  - Consistent across raters
  - Consistent with other impressions and data
  - Consistent experiences across centers

# Reflecting on the IDC Rubric (cont.)

- Benefits for evaluators
  - Adapting tool for specific center deepens understanding of its service model
  - Reliable, consistent tool for assessing quality TA at point in time and across time allows for comparison
  - Tool provides structured platform for assessing TA and developing credible recommendations for center leaders and staff

# Reflecting on the IDC Rubric (cont.)

- Benefits for TA centers
  - Serves as a model for high-quality TA
    - source of implementation data
  - Reflects *and* drives expectations: staff have input into development, know what they are being evaluated on
  - Generates concrete, comprehensive feedback on
    - Documentation, service delivery processes, quality
    - Actionable strategies based on data

# Reflecting on the IDC Rubric (cont.)

- Limitations/Challenges
  - TA services evolve; so too must rubric (not static)
  - Maintain integrity of principles of quality TA (and overall rubric structure), while adapting to each center's TA
- Next steps
  - Expand to other centers: opportunity to continue to test validity of rubric across centers with different TA models

# Interactive Discussion

1. In what ways might this rubric be useful in evaluating TA services provided by your project?
2. Have others used a rating rubric or other standardized tool to evaluate TA services?
3. What other approaches or methods have you used to evaluate the quality of TA services? Have the approaches or methods varied by type of TA service (e.g., universal, targeted, intensive)?

# Presenter Contact Information

Sarah Heinemeier, Compass  
[sarahhei@compasseval.com](mailto:sarahhei@compasseval.com)

Judy Lee, EEC  
[judymlee@msn.com](mailto:judymlee@msn.com)

For more information about IDC's Intensive  
TA Quality Rubric, contact

Bethany Howell, Compass  
[bahowell@compasseval.com](mailto:bahowell@compasseval.com)

The contents of this presentation were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, #H373Y130002. However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the federal government.

Project Officers: Richelle Davis and Meredith Miceli

