



INTENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE QUALITY RUBRIC GUIDANCE DOCUMENT V2.0

This document provides guidance for using the Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Rubric to assess the quality of IDEA Data Center (IDC) intensive technical assistance (TA) efforts. It presents the Guiding Principles for IDC TA and four components associated with effective intensive TA efforts along with general guidelines and rating instructions.

Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Rubric

The IDC evaluation team developed the Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Rubric to reflect characteristics of effective intensive TA efforts. The evaluation team uses the Annual Scoring Sheet (see Appendix 1), the Summative Scoring Sheet (see Appendix 2), and this Guidance Document to rate the quality of the IDC intensive TA services being provided to states. This is the second version of the tools, which have been revised based on the experiences of the evaluation team using the tools in the field. It is expected that these tools will continue to evolve.

The Intensive TA Quality Rubric presents the Guiding Principles for IDC TA and four components of effective intensive TA. The Guiding Principles for IDC TA are new to this version of the Rubric and include: (1) Build relationships with states to foster trust and open and ongoing communication; (2) Engage the state as a partner in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of technical assistance; (3) Apply a systems thinking approach to technical assistance to build capacity at all levels of the system; and (4) Provide TA that is flexible, efficient, and builds the knowledge and skills capacity of state staff to promote self-sufficiency and sustainability within the state. The Principles were developed in collaboration with the IDC Part B and C leads for TA.

The four components of effective intensive TA are: (1) Clarity: the extent to which a state demonstrates commitment to the intensive TA effort, IDC staff conduct a comprehensive discovery process for identifying a state's priority need areas, and IDC and state staff develop a comprehensive TA plan for implementing and evaluating the intensive TA effort; (2) Integrity: the extent to which the TA plan is implemented as intended and the TA effort is effectively managed; (3) Intensity: the extent to which the frequency, methods of delivery, and duration of the TA is sufficient; and (4) Accountability: the extent to which the outputs and outcomes of the TA plan are achieved. The components and quality indicators for the Rubric are based on the State Implementation and Scaling-up of Evidence-based Practices (SISEP) core features of effective intensive TA,¹ TA and implementation research literature,² and the TA experiences of the IDC TA team leaders as well as evaluation team members.

¹ Fixsen, D. L., Blase, K. A., Horner, R., & Sugai, G. (2009, February). *Intensive technical assistance. Scaling Up Brief #2*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina, FPG, SISEP.

² Beale, B. & Luster, J. N. (2009, June). *A framework for collaborative partnership in providing intensive technical assistance*. Downloaded from [http://www.hdc.isuhsc.edu/tiers/docs/Framewor%20for%20CollaborativePartnership%20paper%20\(7%2028%2009%20FINAL\).doc](http://www.hdc.isuhsc.edu/tiers/docs/Framewor%20for%20CollaborativePartnership%20paper%20(7%2028%2009%20FINAL).doc) on 2/20/2014.

Data Sources

The primary data source for completing the Rubric is the IDC TA Tracker, which includes attachments (e.g., Service Agreement, State Selection Description, logic model, meeting notes), the TA plan, and entries describing actions taken related to TA. Other sources of data include state documents (e.g., SPP/APR, State Determination letters), the IDC State Data Quality Markers, IDC staff profiles, observations of TA events, state leadership and staff TA recipients, and IDC TA providers. Data from TA recipients and providers will be collected via surveys, interviews, or monthly calls (TA staff only). Information about the quality and impact of intensive TA services will be collected annually as appropriate from state TA recipients. Surveys or interview protocols may also include items to clarify or obtain information needed to complete the rubric when this information is not available through other secondary sources.

Rating Scales

Each rating will use a 2-point, 3-point scale, or 4-point scale. The 2-point scale (YES/NO) applies to quality indicators designed to rate the presence or absence of an intensive TA characteristic. A “YES” rating affirms that the characteristic is evident in the intensive TA effort. A “NO” rating indicates that the characteristic is not evidenced. For scoring purposes, a “YES” rating is 2 points and a “NO” rating is 0 points.

The 3-point scale (0, 1, or 2) applies to quality indicators designed to rate a characteristic on a continuum. A rating of “2” signifies that a high level of the characteristic is evident. A rating of “1” indicates that an adequate level of the characteristic is evident. A rating of “0” indicates that a low level of the characteristic is evident or that the characteristic is not evidenced.

The 4-point scale (0, 2, 4, or 6) applies to the Guiding Principles as well as to quality indicators designed to rate a principle/characteristic on a continuum. A rating of “6” signifies that a high level of the principle/characteristic is evident. A rating of “4” indicates that an adequate or moderate level of the principle/characteristic is evident. A rating of “2” indicates a low level of the principle/characteristic is evident. A rating of “0” indicates that a very low level of the principle/characteristic is evident or that the characteristic is not evidenced. Only the Guiding Principles and a few of the quality indicators deemed to be of high importance have a 4-point scale.

Because some subcomponents and quality indicators are time sensitive, a quality indicator may not be applicable to the intensive TA effort in a given year. For these situations, a rating of “NA” (not applicable) is appropriate. You should only use “NA” if it is presented as an option for that quality indicator. For example, quality indicators associated with Discovery subcomponent will almost always be applicable during the first year of an intensive TA effort only. Therefore, in subsequent years, these quality indicators should be rated “NA.”

Blase, K. (2009). *Technical assistance to promote service and system change. Roadmap to effective intervention practices #4*. Tampa, Florida: University of South Florida, Technical Assistance Center on Social Emotional Intervention for Young Children.

Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network (FMHI Publication #231).

Kahn, L., Hurth, J., Kasprzak, C. M., Diefendorf, M. J., Goode, S. E., & Ringwalt, S. S. (2009, April). The national early childhood technical assistance center model for long-term systems change. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education* 29(1): 24-39.

Regional Resource Center Program (2011, August). *RRC program technical assistance guidance*. Downloaded from <http://www.rrcprogram.org/cms2/images/rrcpdata/documents/RRCPTAGuidanceDoc12Aug2011.pdf> on 4/9/2014.

Scoring

The Rubric is completed annually to evaluate the quality of intensive TA efforts that have been underway for at least 3 months. Depending on the subcomponent/component and total scores achieved, the quality of an intensive TA effort will be categorized as being “high quality,” “adequate quality,” or “low quality.” “High quality” will be ascribed when 75% or higher of the maximum possible score is achieved, “adequate quality” will be ascribed when 50% - 74% of the maximum possible score is achieved, and “low quality” will be ascribed when less than 50% of the maximum possible score is achieved.

As discussed in the section above, some indicators may be rated “NA.” When this occurs, the Maximum and Actual cells for the indicator should be left blank on the Annual Scoring Sheet and the score for the indicator will not be counted toward the maximum possible score for the subcomponent or component. For example, if indicator A2.a under Discovery is rated “NA,” nothing would be entered into the Maximum or Actual score cells for that indicator. Once all of the Maximum and Actual scores are recorded, add the numbers in the Maximum and Actual columns for each subcomponent and component and enter them into the corresponding Maximum and Actual columns on the Annual Summary Sheet. The Annual total scores can then be divided by the Maximum total scores to obtain the threshold percentages and, based on those percentages, the appropriate quality ratings ascribed.

At the conclusion of every intensive TA effort, summative scores for subcomponents, components, and the total will be determined to evaluate the overall quality of an intensive TA effort. Summative scores are determined in the following ways:

- If there is only one annual score, which should be the case for all of the Discovery and Planning indicators, then the summative score is equal to the annual score.
- If there are multiple annual scores, then the summative score is calculated by:
 - summing the annual scores. Annual scores are summed for the Guiding Principles and the quality indicators identified as high importance (i.e., B1.b, D1.c, and D1.d).
 - averaging the annual scores. Annual scores are averaged for indicators that are rated on a continuum (e.g., 0/1/2).
 - assigning a new score based on the annual scores. This occurs for annual scores that are not rated on a continuum (i.e., YES/NO which translates to scores of 2/0). For example, the summative score for indicator A1.b under State Commitment would be a “2” if all annual scores are “2,” a “1” if some annual scores are “2,” and a “0” if no annual scores are “2.”

All Guiding Principles and quality indicators should have a summative score. The method for determining the summative scores for the Guiding Principles and quality indicators are provided on the Summative Scoring Sheet (see Appendix 2). Once the Maximum and Actual summative scores are determined, add the numbers in the Maximum and Actual columns for each subcomponent and component and enter them into the corresponding Maximum and Actual columns on the Summative Summary Sheet. The Summative total scores can then be divided by the Maximum total scores to obtain the threshold percentages and, based on those percentages, the appropriate quality ratings ascribed.

Guiding Principles of IDC Technical Assistance

The Guiding Principles component was added to the second version of the quality rubric in order to better capture IDC's overarching philosophy and approach to TA. This section further operationalizes the Principles and provides instructions for rating the extent to which the Principles are evidenced in an IDC Intensive TA effort. All Guiding Principles are rated on a scale of: 0=no evidence of Guiding Principle, 2=little to some evidence of Guiding Principle, 4=moderate evidence of Guiding Principle, and 6=substantial evidence of Guiding Principle. A Guiding Principle may be rated "NA" in the first year of an intensive TA effort if the effort has no TA plan or implementation has not yet started. Sources of evidence for ratings may include written documentation, observations made by evaluation team members, or verbal evidence obtained from state staff members or IDC TA providers.

1. Build relationships with states to foster trust and open and ongoing communication. [0/2/4/6]
 - State Liaison should understand and stay current on:
 - state contexts (e.g., strengths, needs, priorities, initiatives), organizational structures, and systems
 - OSEP's structure, guidelines, processes, and staff
 - IDEA and other disability-related laws and regulations
 - State Liaison should maintain confidentiality; use good judgment when sharing state information

Quality indicators related to this Principle include the Discovery indicators (A2), the use of state context to inform planning (A3.d), the implementation of the continuous improvement process (B1.c), the frequency of communication (C1.a), and the quality of TA services (first two bullets of D1.b). Sources of evidence might include the State Selection Description (evidence as to knowledge of state contexts), IDC staff profiles (evidence as to knowledge of OSEP and IDEA), IDC TA Tracker entries (evidence of ongoing communication), conversations with the State Liaison related to how they have tried to build their relationship with state staff, conversations with state staff about their relationship with the IDC TA staff, and evaluation team member observations of interactions between state and IDC TA staff.

2. Engage the state as a partner in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of technical assistance. [0/2/4/6]
 - State Liaison should keep a state-centered focus in TA work
 - State Liaison should model use of data driven decision-making in all aspects of state work

Quality indicators related to this Principle include the State Commitment indicators (A1.b, A1.c, A1.d, A1.e), the involvement of state staff in Discovery (A2.c), the involvement of state staff in Planning (A3.c), and the implementation of the continuous improvement process (B1.c). Sources of evidence might include the TA plan (evidence of planned involvement), IDC TA Tracker entries (evidence of actual involvement), conversations with the state staff about their involvement in the TA effort, conversations with State Liaison about how they have engaged state staff, and evaluation team member observations of TA meetings and activities.

3. Apply a systems thinking approach to technical assistance to build capacity at all levels of the system. [0/2/4/6]
 - State Liaison should know how various elements within state systems interacts and affects other systems
 - State Liaison should encourage clear communication and use of feedback loops across

organizational levels and stakeholders impacted by change

- State Liaison should assist state in building internal and external relationships to support their work

Quality indicators related to this Principle include the use of state context to inform planning (A3.d), the focus on systems change (A2.d, A3.g), the involvement of state staff from all levels of the system and multiple state infrastructures (A1.d, A1.e), the implementation of the continuous improvement process (B1.c), and the changes in the state system resulting from TA (D1.d). Sources of evidence might include the State Selection Description (evidence as to knowledge of state systems), TA plan and logic model (evidence of systems thinking and focus of TA on systems), IDC TA Tracker (evidence of communication, use of feedback loops, achievement of outcomes), conversations with the State Liaison about activities and communications across levels of the system, conversations with state staff about how different levels of the system are addressed and impacted by TA, and evaluation team member observations.

4. Provide TA that is flexible, efficient, and builds the knowledge and skills capacity of state staff to promote self-sufficiency and sustainability within the state. [0/2/4/6]

- State Liaison should be responsive to changes in state context and timing while working toward agreed upon outcomes
- State Liaison should leverage existing state strengths and resources; maximize benefit of TA by building upon the state's foundation
- State Liaison or other IDC provider should provide training and coaching to build staff capacity to perform critical functions of their role

Quality indicators related to this Principle include the implementation of the TA plan (B1.a, B1.b), the implementation of the continuous improvement process (B1.c), coaching of individual state staff members (bullet under C1.b), and building the knowledge and skills of state staff (D1.c). Sources of evidence might include the State Selection Description (evidence of leveraging state strengths and resources); TA plan (evidence of changes in the TA plan in response to state needs or contexts, activities designed to build staff capacity); IDC TA Tracker (evidence of shifts in TA, achievement of outcomes); conversations with the State Liaison and state staff about how TA has evolved, existing state strengths and resources have been leveraged, and state staff capacity has been built; and evaluation team member observations.

Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Components and Indicators

This section is organized by the four components of effective intensive TA. For each component, General Guidelines for ratings and instructions for rating each quality indicator are provided.

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 intensive TA Service Agreement and assigns staff to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]

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, via email) and interviews or written documentation must indicate that state staff was assigned to participate in the TA effort. The rating is "NA" in subsequent years of the TA effort as the service agreement and initial staff assignments should occur during the first year.

- b. State leadership is involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]

For this rating to be "YES," interviews or written documentation must indicate that one or more state leaders participated in the TA effort during the year.

- c. Key stakeholders are engaged throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]

For this rating to be "YES," interviews or written documentation must indicate that one or more internal stakeholders (e.g., intra-agency personnel) or external stakeholders (e.g., inter-agency personnel, State Advisory Panel/Interagency Coordinating Council, institutes of higher education, providers/teachers, parents) participated in the TA effort during the year.

- d. Staff members from multiple levels of the system are involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]

Levels of the system include the state, regional (if applicable), and local/program level. For this rating to be "YES," interviews or written documentation must indicate that staff members from two or more levels of the system participated in the TA effort during the year. The rating can be "NA" in the first year if the focus of TA was on building the capacity of state staff.

- e. Staff members representing at least two state infrastructures are involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]

For this rating to be "YES," interviews or written documentation must indicate that staff members representing at least two state infrastructures (i.e., professional development,

data, finance, monitoring and accountability, governance, technical assistance) participated in the TA effort during the year.

A2. Discovery (12 Points)

IDC TA staff and state staff conduct an initial comprehensive exploration of the needs and issues of the state as they relate to IDEA data quality.

General Guidelines: This subcomponent addresses the comprehensiveness of the initial inquiry process used by the IDC TA staff to yield data and information for ascertaining the state's data quality issues and need for intensive TA. As delineated by the quality indicators, the intent is for this process to utilize multiple perspectives from both IDC (e.g., IDC TA team members, IDC Data Support Specialists, IDC Topic Specialists, IDC TA leads) and state staff. In addition to the opinions and insights garnered from state staff, IDC TA staff should analyze key Federal and state documents. Moreover, the discovery process and data sources used by IDC TA staff should provide for a comprehensive assessment of the state's system for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using IDEA data and not simply an examination of an isolated infrastructure component or level.

Interviews of 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 State Selection Description, meeting minutes, notes from the IDC TA Tracker, discovery process documents, or other similar documentation. The quality indicators for this subcomponent would only be evaluated during the first year of the TA effort.

- a. At least two IDC TA staff members are involved in the discovery process. [YES/NO/NA]

Involvement means having participated in discussions or interviews with key state staff about the state's data quality issues or reviewing relevant Federal and state documents. For this rating to be "YES," interviews or written documentation must indicate that at least two IDC staff members were involved in the discovery process. IDC TA staff can include IDC TA Team members, the IDC TA Part B/C leads, Data Support Specialists, or other relevant IDC staff. The rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the initial discovery process.

- b. IDC TA staff members review documents pertinent to identifying issues or matters associated with IDEA data quality. [0/1/2/NA]

Examples of documents include the state SPP/APR; the SSIP; state determination letters; local determination letters; and state documents related to the policies, procedures, and practices for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using IDEA data. The rating is "2" if more than three documents pertaining to IDEA data are reviewed; the rating is "1" if three documents are reviewed; the rating is "0" if fewer than three documents are reviewed; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the discovery process. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the number of documents reviewed.

- c. IDC TA staff members conduct discussions with state leadership or state staff members that are knowledgeable of the issues or matters associated with why the state was selected for intensive TA. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is "2" if more than two state staff members participate in discussions; the rating is "1" if two state staff members participate in discussions; the rating is "0" if one state staff member participates in discussions; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion

of the discovery process. The intent is for state staff members that are engaged in this process to be those that have knowledge and insight to the state's data system and specifically about areas of need that could be addressed through TA. Examples of such staff include the State Director of Special Education or their designee, State Data Manager, State APR Coordinator, and Part C Coordinator. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the involvement of state staff.

- d. The initial discovery process entailed a comprehensive examination of the state's system for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using IDEA data that included 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/2/4/6/NA]

Levels of the system include the state, regional (if applicable), and local/program level. Data system framework (DaSy or IDC framework) components include: Purpose and Vision, Data Governance and Management, Stakeholder Engagement, IT System Design and Development, Data Use, Sustainability, and Data Integration (Part B only). State infrastructures can include governance, finance, professional development, accountability and monitoring, and technical assistance. The data systems frameworks are the state data infrastructure operationalized. Therefore, data infrastructure should not be included as one of the state infrastructures examined. The rating is "6" if all three criteria are met; the rating is "4" if two of the criteria are met; the rating is "2" if one of the criteria are met; the rating is "0" if none of the criteria are met; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the discovery process. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which the criteria are met.

A3. Planning (22 Points)

IDC TA staff and state staff develop a comprehensive plan for implementing and evaluating the intensive TA effort.

General Guidelines: This subcomponent addresses the comprehensiveness of the initial plan developed to implement and evaluate the intensive TA effort. The intent is for planning to be a collaborative effort and for the focus of the plan to be on the areas identified through the discovery process and on systems change.

Interviews of state staff or IDC TA staff and written documentation can be used to inform the ratings of this subcomponent. Where noted, written documentation is required. Written documentation can take the form of the IDC TA Service Agreement, IDC TA plan, logic models, IDC staff profiles, meeting minutes, notes from the IDC TA Tracker, discovery process documents, or other similar documentation. The quality indicators for this subcomponent should only be evaluated once during the TA effort.

- a. The IDC State Liaison creates a written TA plan within the first six months of the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]

The intent of this indicator is to capture whether an initial TA plan was developed in a timely manner. The rating is "YES" if a TA plan was developed within the first six months of the intensive TA effort. The rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan.

- b. The IDC State Liaison involves IDC TA staff with the appropriate expertise in the development of the initial TA plan. [0/1/2/NA]

The areas of appropriate expertise include planning, content, process, implementation, and adult learning. The rating is "2" if ALL areas of expertise are represented; the rating is "1" if three or more areas of expertise are represented; the rating is "0" if fewer than three areas of expertise are represented; the rating is "NA" if there is no TA plan or in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. A team member may have expertise in more than one area. Interviews and written documentation (TA plan, IDC TA Tracker, IDC staff profiles on the IDC Management Site) can be used to determine involvement and areas of staff expertise.

- c. The IDC State Liaison involves state leadership or key state staff members in the development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]

Involvement means participating in planning meetings or discussions, writing sections of the plan, or reviewing and providing input on the plan. For this rating to be "Yes," interviews or written documentation must describe how state staff members were involved in the development of the TA plan. The rating is "NA" if there is no TA plan or in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan.

- d. The state context informs development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]

State context refers to aspects of the state that have implications for effectively implementing the intensive TA effort. Examples include staffing, related initiatives, state infrastructures and systems, and state policies and procedures. For the rating to be "Yes," interviews or written documentation describing the context of the state as it relates to understanding and implementing the work is required. The rating is "NA" if there is no TA plan or in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. The intent is for the IDC TA staff and state staff to understand how the state context may impact the work and to use that information to maximize the effectiveness of the TA plan. Specifically, the information might be used to capitalize on state strengths (e.g., leveraging the work from other initiatives), work around state weaknesses (e.g., limited staffing), or inform how the work in the TA plan is structured (e.g., based on state infrastructure or available resources).

- e. The discovery process informs development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]

For this rating to be "Yes," interviews or written documentation must show that the outcomes included in the TA plan are consistent with or address the findings from the initial discovery process. The rating is "NA" if there is no TA plan or in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. Assuming the discovery process was comprehensive, the intent is to ensure that the discovery process findings align with the focus of the TA plan.

- f. The initial TA plan is complete and coherent. [0/1/2/NA]

The initial TA plan is considered complete if all fields in the TA plan have been addressed and is considered coherent if the plan is clear and makes sense given the year of the intensive TA effort and the state's issues. The rating is "2" if the initial TA plan is complete and coherent; the rating is "1" if the initial TA plan is either complete or coherent; the rating is "0" if the TA plan is neither complete nor coherent; the rating is "NA" if there is no TA plan or in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. The State Selection Description, TA plan, and logic model should be used to determine if the criteria are met.

- g. The initial TA plan focuses on systems change as evidenced by a focus on 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/1/2/NA]

Levels of the system include the state, regional (if applicable), and local/program level. Data system framework components include Purpose and Vision, Data Governance and Management, Stakeholder Engagement, IT System Design and Development, Data Use, Sustainability, and Data Integration (Part B only). State infrastructures can include governance, finance, professional development, accountability and monitoring, and technical assistance. The data system framework is the state data infrastructure operationalized. Therefore, data infrastructure should not be included as one of the state infrastructures of focus. The rating is "2" if all three criteria are met; the rating is "1" if one or two of the criteria are met; the rating is "0" if none of the criteria are met; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. The TA plan and logic model must be used to determine if the criteria are met.

- h. The initial TA plan indicates how the intensive TA effort will work by linking data system framework components to expected outcomes, state improvement activities, TA service activities, and outputs as delineated below:

- 1) The TA plan shows all data system framework components are linked to one or more expected outcomes.
 - 2) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes focus on improved systems, policies, procedures, practices, or performance.
 - 3) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes are adequately addressed by one or more TA plan activity. *The intent is to provide some assessment related to the quality or feasibility of the activities identified to achieve the expected outcomes.*
 - 4) The TA plan shows that staff members are identified to implement each TA plan activity.
 - 5) The TA plan shows that a timeline is specified for implementing each TA plan activity.
 - 6) The TA plan shows that outputs are specified for each TA plan activity. *Outputs are defined as the actual services or deliverables resulting from TA plan activities.*
- [0/2/4/6/NA]

The rating is "6" if all six of the criteria are met; the rating is "4" if four or five of the criteria are met; the rating is "2" if two or three of the criteria are met; the rating is "0" if one or none of the criteria are met; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. The TA plan is the sole source of evidence for this indicator.

- i. A continuous improvement process is described in the TA plan.

The rating is "2" if the processes for monitoring implementation of activities and assessing progress toward achieving outcomes are both sufficiently described in the TA plan; the rating is "1" if either the process for monitoring implementation of activities or the process for assessing progress toward achieving outcomes is sufficiently described in the TA plan; the rating is "0" if neither the process for monitoring implementation of activities nor the process for assessing progress toward achieving outcomes is sufficiently described in the TA plan; the rating is "NA" in the years following the completion of the initial TA plan. The term sufficiently described means the description is clear and logical. The TA plan is the sole source of evidence for this indicator.

B. INTEGRITY**B1. Faithfulness of Implementation (12 Points)**

IDC State TA team and state staff members carry out the intensive TA activities as specified in the TA plan.

General Guidelines: This subcomponent addresses the extent to which state improvement AND TA service activities are conducted as delineated in the TA plan. Additionally, this subcomponent examines the extent to which data are collected and used to guide improvements of TA plan activities.

The reference point for this assessment is the IDC TA plan and its related provisions. Interviews of core TA recipients, other state staff, and IDC TA staff; written documentation; and data collected through continuous improvement activities can be used to inform the ratings of this subcomponent. Written documentation can take the form of the IDC TA plan revision history, meeting minutes, notes from the IDC TA Tracker, or other similar documentation.

- a. The TA plan is used to guide the implementation of the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is "2" if there is evidence that IDC or state staff members use the TA plan at least monthly to guide implementation of TA and state improvement activities; the rating is "1" if there is evidence that the TA plan is used every 2-3 months to guide implementation of TA or state improvement activities; the rating is "0" if there is evidence that the TA plan is used annually or less frequently to guide implementation of TA or state improvement; the rating is "NA" if implementation has not yet started. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which the plan guides implementation. For example, attendance during calls or meetings, meeting minutes, or the IDC TA Tracker may indicate use of or changes to the TA plan.

- b. TA Plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan. [0/2/4/6/NA]

The rating is "6" if 75% or more of the TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan; the rating is "4" if 50%-74% of TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan; the rating is "2" if 25%-49% of TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan; the rating is "0" if less than 25% of TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan; the rating is "NA" if implementation has not yet started. If TA plan activities have been modified, the evaluator should review modifications to determine if they were informed by the continuous improvement process (informal or formal). Modifications to TA plan activities that do not appear to be informed by the continuous improvement process should not be counted as being implemented as specified in the TA plan. Interviews and written documentation can be used to assess level of implementation and determine reasons for modifications.

- c. The continuous improvement process is conducted as specified in the TA plan.

- The processes for monitoring implementation of TA plan activities and assessing progress towards outcomes are conducted as specified in the TA Plan. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is "2" if both monitoring implementation of activities and assessing progress towards outcomes are conducted as specified in the TA plan; the rating is "1" if either monitoring implementation of activities or assessing progress towards outcomes is

conducted as specified in the TA plan; the rating is “0” if neither monitoring implementation of activities nor assessing progress towards outcomes is conducted as specified in the TA plan; the rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. Interviews or written documentation can be used to assess whether the process for monitoring implementation of activities has been conducted as specified in the TA plan. Written documentation could include meeting minutes, IDC TA Tracker entries, TA progress or status reports, and actual data that have been collected.

- Data and information generated through the continuous improvement process are discussed collectively by IDC TA staff and state staff members. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is “2” if data and information from the continuous improvement process are discussed collectively on a regular basis (i.e., monthly or quarterly); the rating is “1” if data and information from the continuous improvement process are sometimes discussed collectively; the rating is “0” if data and information from the continuous improvement process are not discussed collectively; the rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. Interviews or written documentation can be used demonstrate that data and information yielded through the continuous improvement process about TA plan implementation and progress toward outcomes are discussed jointly by IDC TA staff and state staff, and used to inform changes to TA plan activities. Written documentation could include meeting minutes, IDC TA Tracker entries, TA progress or status reports, and TA plan modifications. The intent is that IDC TA staff and state staff should regularly discuss the data and information generated through the continuous improvement process so that these data can be used to inform improvements to the intensive TA effort.

B2. Management (10 Points)

The IDC State Liaison effectively leads and manages the intensive TA effort.

General Guidelines: This subcomponent addresses the extent to which the IDC State TA Liaison effectively leads and moves the TA work forward. Evaluation team member observations, interviews of state and/or IDC staff members, and written documentation may be used to inform the ratings of this subcomponent. Written documentation can take the form of the IDC TA plan, meeting agendas and minutes, IDC TA Tracker entries, IDC staff profiles, or other similar documentation.

- a. The IDC State Liaison effectively facilitates and leads IDC TA work. [YES/NO/NA]

For this to be “YES,” evaluation team member observations or written documentation (e.g., agendas, minutes, TA plan, IDC TA Tracker entries) must show that IDC TA work is progressing as intended. The rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. Facilitated means that IDC TA activities have a defined purpose and are effectively managed. Progressing means that the work in the TA plan is being completed in a timely and logical manner.

- b. The IDC State Liaison works to foster effective cross-center collaboration related to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]

This indicator applies to those intensive TA efforts for which one or more center staff members have been identified to collaborate on IDC TA work. For this rating to be “YES,” evaluation team member observations, interviews, or written documentation (e.g., TA plan,

agendas, minutes, IDC TA Tracker entries) must show that cross-center collaborators have defined roles in the intensive TA effort. The rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. The intent of this indicator is to determine whether cross-center collaborators have expertise that adds value to the intensive TA effort.

- c. IDC State TA team members meet internally to plan intensive TA work. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is “2” if TA staff members (including cross-center collaborators if applicable) meet prior to most or all key IDC events with the state; the rating is “1” if TA staff members meet prior to some key IDC events with the state; the rating is “0” if TA staff members do not meet prior to any key IDC TA events with the state; the rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. The term “meet” is defined as communication (e.g., email, phone, virtual, in-person) that occurs prior to the event to coordinate and plan. Interviews and written documentation (e.g., minutes, IDC TA Tracker entries) can be used to determine the extent to which TA staff members meet internally.

- d. The IDC State Liaison sufficiently documents the intensive TA work in the IDC TA Tracker. [0/1/2]

The rating is “2” if TA actions are entered into the IDC TA Tracker in a timely manner and there is sufficient explanation or evidence (e.g., minutes, documents) about what occurred; the rating is “1” if TA actions are entered but they are not entered in a timely manner or there is not sufficient explanation or evidence about what occurred; the rating is “0” if there are TA actions that have not been entered or the TA actions entered were not done so in a timely manner and do not have sufficient explanation or evidence. Evaluation team member observations and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which TA actions are entered and sufficient explanation or evidence provided.

- e. IDC TA staff members with the necessary expertise to effectively implement the intensive TA are involved as needed throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is “2” if IDC staff members representing all areas of expertise (i.e., content, process, implementation, and adult learning) participated in the TA effort during the year; the rating is “1” if IDC staff members representing three areas of expertise participated in the TA effort during the year; the rating is “0” if IDC staff members representing fewer than three areas of expertise participated in the TA effort during the year; the rating is “NA” if implementation has not yet started. A team member may have expertise in more than one area. Interviews and written documentation (e.g., TA plan, IDC TA Tracker, IDC staff profiles) can be used to determine involvement and areas of staff expertise.

C. INTENSITY

C1. Frequency, Type, and Duration (10 Points)

The IDC State TA team delivers TA to the state that is sufficient in its frequency, methods of delivery, and duration.

General Guidelines: This subcomponent addresses the extent to which IDC TA is delivered routinely, is delivered through a variety of methods, involves coaching, and is implemented over an extended period of time.

Interviews of state TA recipients, other 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 meeting minutes, documents from the IDC TA Tracker, activity records from the TA Tracker, or other similar documentation.

- a. The IDC State TA team members routinely contact the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2]

The intensive TA effort includes discovery, planning, as well as implementation. The rating is "2" if IDC TA team members contact the state at least monthly; the rating is "1" if IDC TA staff members contact the state every 5 - 8 weeks; the rating is "0" if IDC TA team members contact the state less frequently than every 8 weeks. The intent is for IDC TA team and state staff members to be in regular contact with each other in order to effectively implement the intensive TA effort. Written documentation, specifically, the activity records in the IDC TA Tracker, should be used to determine the extent to which IDC TA team members are in contact with the state.

- IDC State TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events with the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2]

The intensive TA effort includes discovery, planning, as well as implementation. Events are defined as meetings, trainings, or other activities. The rating is "2" if IDC TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events more than 6 times a year (minimum of two on-site); the rating is "1" if IDC TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events more than 3 - 6 times a year (minimum of one on-site); the rating is "0" if IDC TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events fewer than 3 times a year. The intent is for this type of contact to be of a more formal and personal nature. Written documentation, specifically, the activity records in the IDC TA Tracker, should be used to determine the extent to which IDC TA staff members conduct on-site or virtual events with the state.

- b. IDC State TA team members use three or more methods to deliver TA services to the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]

The intensive TA effort includes discovery, planning, as well as implementation. Examples of TA delivery methods include on-site visits, virtual visits, online learning communities, web-based and pre-packaged resources, information sharing/research, and cross-center collaboration. For this rating to be "Yes," interviews or written documentation must indicate that three or more methods were used to deliver TA services to the state.

- IDC TA services to the state include ongoing coaching. [YES/NO/NA]

Coaching is defined as building the knowledge and skills capacity of state staff to improve performance and effectiveness of practices, processes, policies and systems related to data quality, data use, and the SSIP. Ongoing is defined as coaching by IDC TA staff that occurs regularly over an extended period of time (monthly for at least 6 months). For this rating to be "Yes," interviews or written documentation must indicate that the state received ongoing coaching. The rating is "NA" if implementation has not yet started.

- c. The intensive TA effort occurs over multiple, consecutive years. [0/1/2/NA]

The intensive TA effort includes discovery, planning, as well as implementation. This indicator should not be assessed until the end of the intensive TA effort. The rating is "2" if the TA effort occurs over a period of 2 consecutive years or more; the rating is "1" if the TA effort occurs over a period of 1 - 2 consecutive years; the rating is "0" if the TA effort occurs over a period of less than 1 year; the rating is "NA" for all but the final year of the intensive TA effort. Written documentation, specifically, the activity records in the IDC TA Tracker, should be used to determine the duration of the intensive TA effort.

D. ACCOUNTABILITY

D1. Outputs and Outcomes (24 Points)

Outputs and outcomes of the intensive TA effort are achieved.

General Guidelines: The focus of this subcomponent is on ascertaining the extent to which the immediate measurable results that emanate from state improvement and TA service activities (outputs) are attained, as well as outcomes. The outputs and outcomes of interest are those defined in the TA Plan. TA performance for this subcomponent is to be assessed against those outputs and outcomes.

Interviews or surveys of state TA recipients, other state staff, or IDC State TA team members; written documentation; and data generated through the continuous improvement process can be used to inform the ratings of this subcomponent. Written documentation can take the form of the IDC TA plan, notes or meeting minutes from data reviews conducted through the continuous improvement process, the IDC TA Tracker activity records, assessments of state improvement or TA service activities, or other similar documentation.

- a. Outputs in the TA plan are achieved. [0/1/2/NA]

The rating is "2" if 75% or more of the expected outputs listed in the TA Plan are achieved; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of the expected outputs are achieved; the rating is "0" if fewer than 50% of outputs are achieved; the rating is "NA" if no TA plan activities have been implemented. If no data are provided then the evaluator must assume the output has NOT been achieved. An output should not be included in the calculation if it is for a state improvement or TA service activity that was not conducted due to a legitimate modification to the TA Plan. The hope is modifications eliminating specific state improvement or TA activities, products, services, etc., would also be reflected in changes to associated outputs, but that may not always be the case so the evaluators should take this into consideration. Outputs to be achieved in a specific year should be included in the rating of this indicator for that year only. The exception would be if an output is expected to be achieved annually. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which outputs are achieved.

- b. The TA services provided are of high quality.

- State TA recipients are satisfied with the TA relationship. [0/1/2/NA]

Satisfaction is defined as a score of 3.0 or better (4-point scale) on identified items from an interview or survey of state TA recipients. The rating is "2" if 75% or more of respondents indicate satisfaction with the relationship they have with IDC State TA team

members; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the ratings is "0" if fewer than 50% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess satisfaction.

- State TA recipients are satisfied with TA communication. [0/1/2/NA]

Satisfaction is defined as a score of 3.0 or better (4-point scale) on identified items from an interview or survey of state TA recipients. The rating is "2" if 75% or more of respondents indicate satisfaction with the communication they have with the IDC State TA team members; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the rating is "0" if fewer than 50% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess satisfaction.

- State TA recipients are satisfied with the leadership of the TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]

Satisfaction is defined as a score of 3.0 or better (4-point scale) on identified items from an interview or survey of state TA recipients. The rating is "2" if 75% or more of respondents indicate satisfaction with the leadership of the intensive TA effort; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the rating is "0" if fewer than 50% of respondents indicate satisfaction; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess satisfaction.

- State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are of high quality. [0/1/2/NA]

High quality is defined as a score of 3.0 or better (4-point scale) on identified items from an interview or survey of state TA recipients. The rating is "2" if 75% or more of respondents indicate IDC TA services are of high quality; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of respondents indicate IDC TA services are of high quality; the rating is "0" if fewer than 50% of respondents indicate IDC TA services are of high quality; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess quality.

- State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are useful. [0/1/2/NA]

Useful is defined as a score of 3.0 or better (4-point scale) on identified items from an interview or survey of state TA recipients. The rating is "2" if 75% or more of respondents indicate IDC TA services are useful; the rating is "1" if 50% - 74% of respondents indicate IDC TA services are useful; the rating is "0" if fewer than 50% of respondents indicate IDC TA services are useful; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess usefulness.

- c. Short-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved knowledge, skills, policies, procedures, or practices are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]

The ratings is "6" if 75% or more of the expected short-term outcomes listed in the TA Plan are achieved; the rating is "4" if 50% - 74% of the expected short-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "2" if 25% - 49% of the expected short-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "0" if less than 25% of expected short-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess TA plan short-term outcomes. If no evidence is provided then the evaluator must assume the outcome has NOT been achieved. An outcome should not be included in the calculation if it is for a state improvement or TA service activity that was not conducted due to a legitimate modification to the TA Plan. The hope is modifications eliminating specific state improvement or TA activities, products,

services, etc., would also be reflected in changes to associated outcomes, but that may not always be the case so the evaluators should take this into consideration. Outcomes to be achieved in a specific year should be included in the rating of this indicator for that year only. The exception would be if an outcome is expected to be achieved annually. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which outcomes are achieved.

- d. Intermediate and long-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved systems, policies, procedures, practices, or performance are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]

The ratings is "6" if 75% or more of the expected intermediate and long-term outcomes listed in the TA Plan are achieved; the rating is "4" if 50% - 74% of the expected intermediate and long-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "2" if 25% - 49% of the expected intermediate and long-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "0" if less than 25% of expected intermediate and long-term outcomes are achieved; the rating is "NA" if it is too early in the intensive TA effort to assess TA plan intermediate and long-term outcomes. If no evidence is provided then the evaluator must assume the outcome has NOT been achieved. An outcome should not be included in the calculation if it is for a state improvement or TA service activity that was not conducted due to a legitimate modification to the TA Plan. The hope is modifications eliminating specific state improvement or TA activities, products, services, etc., would also be reflected in changes to associated outcomes, but that may not always be the case so the evaluators should take this into consideration. Outcomes to be achieved in a specific year should be included in the rating of this indicator for that year only. The exception would be if an outcome is expected to be achieved annually. Interviews and written documentation can be used to determine the extent to which outcomes are achieved.

DRAFT

INTENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE QUALITY RUBRIC: ANNUAL SCORING SHEET

Use this Scoring Sheet to document your ratings about the quality of IDEA Data Center (IDC) intensive technical assistance (TA) efforts. Please complete this scoring sheet annually (including in the final year) for TA efforts that have been underway for at least three months following the rating instructions provided in the Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Rubric: Guidance Document. In the Rating column, enter your rating using the rating scale shown by each indicator. In the Evidence/Comments column, document the evidence used to make your rating including the source of that evidence. In the Score column, enter the Maximum numerical score possible as well as the Actual numerical score associated with your rating (i.e., 6=6, 4=4, 2=2, 1=1, 0=0, Yes=2, No=0, NA=no score). Enter the Maximum and Actual total scores for each subcomponent in the designated rows. Once you have completed the Annual Scoring Sheet, use the Summary Sheet at the end of this document to report the subcomponent, component, and total scores for the intensive TA effort.

CRITERION	RATING	EVIDENCE/COMMENTS	SCORE	
			Maximum	Actual
GUIDING PRINCIPLES				
1. Build relationships with states to foster trust and open and ongoing communication. [0/2/4/6]				
2. Engage the state as a partner in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of technical assistance. [0/2/4/6]				
3. Apply a systems thinking approach to technical assistance to build capacity at all levels of the system. [0/2/4/6]				
4. Provide TA that is flexible, efficient, and builds the knowledge and skills capacity of state staff to promote self-sufficiency and sustainability within the state. [0/2/4/6]				
Total Score for Guiding Principles				
A. CLARITY				
A1. State Commitment				
a. State leadership agrees to the intensive TA Service Agreement and assigns staff to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]				
b. State leadership is involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]				
c. Key stakeholders are engaged throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]				
d. Staff members from multiple levels of the system are involved				

CRITERION	RATING	EVIDENCE/COMMENTS	SCORE	
			Maximum	Actual
throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]				
e. Staff members representing at least two state infrastructures are involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]				
Total Score for State Commitment				
A2. Discovery				
a. At least two IDC TA staff members are involved in the discovery process. [YES/NO/NA]				
b. IDC TA staff members review documents pertinent to identifying issues or matters associated with IDEA data quality. [0/1/2/NA]				
c. IDC TA staff members conduct discussions with state leadership or state staff members that are knowledgeable of the issues or matters associated with why the state was selected for intensive TA. [0/1/2/NA]				
d. The initial discovery process entailed a comprehensive examination of the state's system for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using IDEA data that included 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/2/4/6/NA]				
Total Score for Discovery				
A3. Planning				
a. The IDC State Liaison creates a written TA plan within the first six months of the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]				
b. The IDC State Liaison involves IDC TA staff with the appropriate expertise in the development of the initial TA plan. [0/1/2/NA]				
c. The IDC State Liaison involves state leadership or key state staff members in the development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]				
d. The state context informs development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]				
e. The discovery process informs development of the TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]				
f. The initial TA plan is complete and coherent. [0/1/2/NA]				
g. The initial TA plan focuses on systems change as evidenced by a focus on 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/1/2/NA]				
h. The initial TA plan indicates how the TA effort will work by linking data system framework components to expected outcomes,				

CRITERION	RATING	EVIDENCE/COMMENTS	SCORE	
			Maximum	Actual
<p>state improvement activities, TA service activities, and outputs as delineated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The TA plan shows all data system framework components are linked to one or more expected outcomes. 2) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes focus on improved systems, policies, procedures, practices, or performance. 3) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes are adequately addressed by one or more TA plan activity. 4) The TA plan shows that staff members are identified to implement each TA plan activity. 5) The TA plan shows that a timeline is specified for implementing each TA plan activity. 6) The TA plan shows that outputs are specified for each TA plan activity. [0/2/4/6/NA] <p>i. A continuous improvement process is described in the TA plan. [0/1/2/NA]</p>				
Total Score for Planning				
B. INTEGRITY				
B1. Faithfulness of Implementation				
a. The TA plan is used to guide implementation of the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]				
b. TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan. [0/2/4/6/NA]				
c. The continuous improvement process is conducted as specified in the TA plan.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The processes for monitoring implementation of TA plan activities and assessing progress towards outcomes are conducted as specified in the TA plan. [0/1/2/NA] ▪ Data and information generated through the continuous improvement process are discussed collectively by IDC TA staff and state staff members. [0/1/2/NA] 				
B2. Management				
a. The IDC State Liaison effectively facilitates and leads the IDC TA work. [YES/NO/NA]				
b. The IDC State Liaison works to foster effective cross-center collaboration related to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]				
c. IDC State TA team members meet internally to plan intensive TA work. [0/1/2/NA]				

CRITERION	RATING	EVIDENCE/COMMENTS	SCORE	
			Maximum	Actual
d. The IDC State Liaison sufficiently documents the intensive TA work in the IDC TA Tracker. [0/1/2]				
e. IDC TA staff members with the necessary expertise to effectively implement the intensive TA are involved as needed throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]				
Total Score for Faithfulness of Implementation				
C. INTENSITY				
C1. Frequency, Type, and Duration				
a. IDC State TA team members routinely contact the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2]				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IDC State TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events with the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2] 				
b. IDC State TA team members use three or more methods to deliver TA services to the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IDC TA services to the state include ongoing coaching. [YES/NO/NA] 				
c. The intensive TA effort occurs over multiple, consecutive years. [0/1/2/NA]				
Total Score for Frequency, Type, and Duration				
D. ACCOUNTABILITY				
D1. Outputs and Outcomes				
a. Outputs in the TA plan are achieved. [0/1/2/NA]				
b. The TA services provided are of high quality.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with the TA relationship. [0/1/2/NA] ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with TA communication. [0/1/2/NA] ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with the leadership of the TA effort. [0/1/2/NA] ▪ State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are of high quality. [0/1/2/NA] ▪ State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are useful. [0/1/2/NA] 				
c. Short-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved knowledge, skills, policies, procedures, or practices are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]				

CRITERION	RATING	EVIDENCE/COMMENTS	SCORE	
			Maximum	Actual
d. Intermediate or long-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved system, policies, procedures, practices, or performance are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]				
Total Score for Outputs and Outcomes				

DRAFT

INTENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE QUALITY RUBRIC: ANNUAL SUMMARY SHEET

Use this Summary Sheet to document your total maximum possible and total actual scores, calculate the percentage of maximum possible points achieved (actual/maximum), and assign the annual quality rating (i.e., low quality, adequate quality, high quality) to each subcomponent/component and overall. Please refer to the Scoring section of the Guidance Document (page 3) for instructions on determining the quality for each subcomponent/component and overall.

COMPONENTS/SUBCOMPONENTS	ANNUAL TOTAL SCORES		ANNUAL QUALITY DESIGNATION	
	Maximum	Actual	Percent	Quality Rating
GUIDING PRINCIPLES				
Guiding Principles Total				
CLARITY				
State Commitment				
Discovery				
Planning				
Clarity Total				
INTEGRITY				
Faithfulness of Implementation				
Management				
Integrity Total				
INTENSITY				
Frequency, Type, and Duration/Intensity Total				
ACCOUNTABILITY				
Outputs and Outcomes/Accountability Total				
OVERALL TOTAL				

INTENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE QUALITY RUBRIC: SUMMATIVE SCORING SHEET

Use the Intensive Technical Assistance Quality Rubric: Guidance Document and this Scoring Sheet to evaluate the overall quality of an IDEA Data Center (IDC) intensive technical assistance (TA) effort upon its conclusion. In the Annual Scores columns, enter the scores from the Annual Scoring Sheets you completed for the intensive TA effort. If there are no scores for an indicator or year, leave the cell empty. Once you have transferred the annual scores, follow the Summative Scoring Instructions to determine the maximum and annual summative score for each indicator and enter those scores into the appropriate Summative Score column.

CRITERION	ANNUAL SCORES				SUMMATIVE SCORING INSTRUCTIONS	SUMMATIVE SCORE	
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4		Maximum	Actual
Guiding Principles							
a. Build relationships with states to foster trust and open and ongoing communication. [0/2/4/6]					The summative score is the sum of the annual scores.		
b. Engage the state as a partner in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of technical assistance. [0/2/4/6]					The summative score is the sum of the annual scores.		
c. Apply a systems thinking approach to technical assistance to build capacity at all levels of the system. [0/2/4/6]					The summative score is the sum of the annual scores.		
d. Provide TA that is flexible, efficient, and builds the knowledge and skills capacity of state staff to promote self-sufficiency and sustainability within the state. [0/2/4/6]					The summative score is the sum of the annual scores.		
Total Score for Guiding Principles							
A. CLARITY							
A1. State Commitment							
a. State leadership agrees to the intensive TA Service Agreement and assigns staff to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
b. State leadership is involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]					For indicators A1.b – A1.e, the summative score is:		
c. Key stakeholders are engaged throughout the							

CRITERION	ANNUAL SCORES				SUMMATIVE SCORING INSTRUCTIONS	SUMMATIVE SCORE	
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4		Maximum	Actual
intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 if all the annual scores are 2 • 1 if some of the annual scores are 2 • 0 if no annual scores are 2 		
d. Staff members from multiple levels of the system are involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]							
e. Staff members representing at least two state infrastructures are involved throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]							
Total Score for State Commitment							
A2. Discovery							
a. At least two IDC TA staff members are involved in the discovery process. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
b. IDC TA staff members review documents pertinent to identifying issues or matters associated with IDEA data quality. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
c. IDC TA staff members conduct discussions with state leadership or state staff members that are knowledgeable of the issues or matters associated with why the state was selected for intensive TA. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
d. The initial discovery process entailed a comprehensive examination of the state's system for collecting, analyzing, reporting, and using IDEA data that included 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/2/4/6/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
Total Score for Discovery							
A3. Planning							
a. The IDC State Liaison creates a written TA plan within the first six months of the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
b. The IDC State Liaison involves IDC TA staff with the appropriate expertise in the development of the initial TA plan. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
c. The IDC State Liaison involves state leadership or key state staff members in the development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		

CRITERION	ANNUAL SCORES				SUMMATIVE SCORING INSTRUCTIONS	SUMMATIVE SCORE	
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4		Maximum	Actual
d. The state context informs development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
e. The discovery process informs development of the initial TA plan. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
f. The initial TA plan is complete and coherent. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
g. The initial TA plan focuses on systems change as evidenced by a focus on 1) all levels of the system, 2) at least two data system framework components, and 3) at least two state infrastructures (excluding data infrastructure). [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
h. The initial TA plan indicates how the TA effort will work by linking data framework components to expected outcomes, state improvement activities, TA service activities, and outputs as delineated below: 1) The TA plan shows all data system framework components are linked to one or more expected outcomes. 2) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes focus on improved systems, policies, procedures, practices, or performance. 3) The TA plan shows that all expected outcomes are adequately addressed by one or more TA plan activity. 4) The TA plan shows that staff members are identified to implement each TA plan activity. 5) The TA plan shows that a timeline is specified for implementing each TA plan activity. 6) The TA plan shows that outputs are specified for each TA plan activity. [0/2/4/6/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
i. A continuous improvement process is described in the TA plan. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
Total Score for Planning							
B. INTEGRITY							
B1. Faithfulness of Implementation							

CRITERION	ANNUAL SCORES				SUMMATIVE SCORING INSTRUCTIONS	SUMMATIVE SCORE	
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4		Maximum	Actual
a. The TA plan is used to guide implementation of the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
b. TA plan activities are implemented as specified in the TA plan. [0/2/4/6/NA]					The summative score is the sum of the annual scores.		
c. The continuous improvement process is conducted as specified in the TA plan.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The processes for monitoring implementation of TA plan activities and assessing progress towards outcomes are conducted as specified in the TA plan. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data and information generated through the continuous improvement process are discussed collectively by IDC TA staff and state staff members. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
B2. Management							
a. The IDC State Liaison effectively facilitates and leads the IDC TA work. [YES/NO/NA]					The summative score is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 if all the annual scores are 2 1 if some of the annual scores are 2 0 if no annual scores are 2 		
b. The IDC State Liaison works to foster effective cross-center collaboration related to the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO/NA]							
c. IDC State TA team members meet internally to plan intensive TA work. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
d. The IDC State Liaison sufficiently documents the intensive TA work in the IDC TA Tracker. [0/1/2]					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
e. IDC TA staff members with the necessary expertise to effectively implement the intensive TA are involved as needed throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
Total Score for Faithfulness of Implementation							
C. INTENSITY							
C1. Frequency, Type, and Duration							
a. IDC State TA team members routinely contact the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2]					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IDC State TA team members conduct on-site or virtual events with the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [0/1/2] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
b. IDC State TA team members use three or more					The summative score is:		

CRITERION	ANNUAL SCORES				SUMMATIVE SCORING INSTRUCTIONS	SUMMATIVE SCORE	
	Yr 1	Yr 2	Yr 3	Yr 4		Maximum	Actual
methods to deliver TA services to the state throughout the intensive TA effort. [YES/NO]					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 if all the annual scores are 2 • 1 if some of the annual scores are 2 • 0 if no annual scores are 2 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IDC TA services to the state include ongoing coaching. [YES/NO/NA] 							
c. The intensive TA effort occurs over multiple, consecutive years. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score.		
Total Score for Frequency, Type, and Duration							
D. ACCOUNTABILITY							
D1. Outputs and Outcomes							
a. Outputs in the TA plan are achieved. [0/1/2/NA]					The summative score is the annual score OR the average of the annual scores.		
b. The TA services provided are of high quality.							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with the TA relationship. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with TA communication. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients are satisfied with the leadership of the TA effort. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are of high quality. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ State TA recipients report IDC intensive TA services are useful. [0/1/2/NA] 					The summative score is the average of the annual scores.		
c. Short-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved knowledge, skills, policies, procedures, or practices are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]					The summative score is the annual score OR the sum of the annual scores.		
d. Intermediate or long-term outcomes in the TA plan focused on improved system, policies, procedures, practices, or performance are achieved. [0/2/4/6/NA]					The summative score is the annual score OR the sum of the annual scores.		
Total Score for Outputs and Outcomes							

INTENSIVE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE QUALITY RUBRIC: SUMMATIVE SUMMARY SHEET

Use this Summary Sheet to document your total maximum possible and actual scores, calculate the percentage of maximum possible points achieved (actual/maximum), and assign the summative quality categories (i.e., low quality, adequate quality, high quality) to each subcomponent/component and overall. Please refer to the Scoring section of the Guidance Document (page 3) for instructions on determining the quality for each subcomponent/component and overall.

COMPONENTS/SUBCOMPONENTS	SUMMATIVE TOTAL SCORE		SUMMATIVE QUALITY DESIGNATION	
	Maximum	Actual	Percent	Quality Category
GUIDING PRINCIPLES				
Guiding Principles Total				
CLARITY				
State Commitment				
Discovery				
Planning				
Clarity Total				
INTEGRITY				
Faithfulness of Implementation				
Management				
Integrity Total				
INTENSITY				
Frequency, Type, and Duration/Intensity Total				
ACCOUNTABILITY				
Outputs and Outcomes/Accountability Total				
OVERALL TOTAL				