

SERC's IEP Rubric: A Summary



The Overview

Connecticut's State Education Resource Center (SERC) has developed an Individualized Education Program (IEP) Rubric that measures the quality of IEP development for students with disabilities. The IEP Rubric defines fourteen indicators needed for quality IEP development. The rubric is designed to be analyzed holistically as well as in the four categories and their individual indicators. The rubric is constructed on the premise that all students are entitled to the general education curriculum within the least restrictive environment, and therefore the design of an IEP is focused on student outcomes based in the general education curriculum. Supports operate on a continuum specifically targeted to meet the unique needs of a student. The purpose of the rubric is provide educators and families a means to assess the quality of an IEP by shifting the IEP from a mere list of legal or compliance tasks to an instructional tool that can be used to guide teams of people in how to support a student in achieving the same general education standards as nondisabled peers.

The Training of Scorers

Using this tool with fidelity requires scorers to be trained. The training provides scorers with a working knowledge of the content of the rubric and the technical knowledge to use the instrument with reliability. One and a half days of training are required to support the fidelity and reliability of the use of the rubric. The training sessions include a process for calibration of scorers that estimates their inter-rater reliability as a means to check for fidelity.

The Estimated Reliability and Validity of the Rubric

In 2012-2013, SERC conducted a study to estimate the reliability and validity of the rubric. Twenty-three SERC Consultants, trained scorers of the rubric, used the rubric to score two different IEPs. Using interclass correlation, the results indicated a reasonable inter-rater reliability with average measures of .859 and .934. Further analysis was conducted to determine any differences in scoring between those who had experience writing IEPs and those who did not have experience. The results seem to indicate no significant difference using an independent two-tailed t-test.

The rubric was examined for concurrent and content validity. During the concurrent validity, the scores using the SERC IEP Rubric were compared to scores using an IEP rubric developed by Hunt, Goetz, and Anderson (1986). The results demonstrated moderate correlation between the two rubrics. The content validity was examined using a method called the Table of Specifications from the work of Lawshe (1975) and Newman (2013). Scorers were asked to assess each of the indicators for the connections with the major content themes that supported the development of the rubric. The estimated validity was above the acceptable range using the Content Validity Ratio (Lawshe, 1975).

Limitations within the study prevent the results from being generalized at this time. There was a limited amount and scope of the data collected, using only the scores from trained SERC Consultants. Further study would be needed in the area of both inter-rater reliability and content validity before these results can be generalized to other settings or use.

For further information on the rubric, training for scorers, or the study on the estimated reliability and validity, please feel free to contact Kimberly Mearman, Ph.D., Assistant Director for Program Development & Research/Program Evaluation, SERC, (860) 632-1485, ext. 289 or at mearman@ctserc.org, or visit www.ctserc.org.

Major Resources

- Connecticut State Department of Education: Bureau of Special Education. (2010). *IEP manual and forms: State of Connecticut*. Hartford, CT: Retrieved from <http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/cwp/view.asp?a=2626&q=322680>.
- Connecticut State Department of Education. (2006). *Least restrictive environment (LRE) procedural checklist*. Hartford, CT.
- Connecticut State Department of Education. (2008). *Using scientific research-based interventions: Improving education for all students*. Hartford, CT.
- Donnellan, A. M. (1984). The criterion of the least dangerous assumption. *Behavioral Disorders*, 9(2), 141-150.
- Giangreco, M. F. (2001). Guidelines for making decisions about IEP services. Montpelier, VT: Vermont Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.uvm.edu/~mgiangre>.
- Hunt, P., Goetz, L., & Anderson, J. (1986). The quality of IEP objectives associated with placement on integrated versus segregated school sites. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 11(2), 125-130.
- Individuals with disabilities education improvement act of 2004, 118, Pub. L. No. 108-446, 118 Stat 2647 (2004).
- Lawshe, C. H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 563-575.
- Lignugaris-Kraft, B., Marchand-Martella, N., & Martella, R. C. (2001). Writing better goals and short-term objectives or benchmarks. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 34(1), 52-58.
- Moll, A. M. (2003). *Differentiated instruction guide for inclusive teaching*. New York: Dude Publishing.
- Newman, I., Lim, J., & Pineda, F. (2013). Content validity using a mixed methods approach: Its application and development through the use of a table of specifications methodology. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(3), 243-260. doi: 10.1177/1558689813476922
- Nolet, V., & McLaughlin, M. J. (2005). *Accessing the general curriculum: Including students with disabilities in standards-based reform* (second ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- U.S. Department of Education: Office of Special Education Programs. (2006). *Federal Register: Part II 34 CFR Sections 300 and 301*. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.