

Update on Performance Measures for the OSEP Parent Program

Carmen Sanchez

Office of Special Education Programs


January 20, 2012



Webinar Objectives

OSEP

- Increased understanding of
 - ◆ performance measures for the OSEP Parent Program
 - ◆ the results of the performance measure work
 - ◆ what is expected of grantees in relation to performance measures
- Awareness of the requirements for the 2012 performance measure collection




Evolution of Performance Measures Process

O
S
E
P

- 2008
 - ◆ Only PTACs' PTI projects sent in samples of products and services
 - ◆ Data was considered exploratory and used to establish benchmarks for future years.
 - ◆ Benchmarks for long-term measures developed using NPTAC survey

3



Evolution of Performance Measures Process

O
S
E
P

- 2009-2011
 - ◆ Random sample of all PTIs and CPRCs sent in product and service samples, along with descriptions
 - ◆ PTACs' PTI projects sent in samples of products and services in 2009 and 2010
 - ◆ Random sample of PTIs and CPRCs surveyed parents to collect data on long-term measures in 2009
 - ◆ PTACs provided specific TA on performance measures
 - ◆ Data considered final

4



Federal Performance Measurement

OSEP

- The Federal Government wants programs to work, and it assesses all programs to make sure they are working well for the American people
- The Office of Management and Budget, together with the Federal agencies, determines how programs will be assessed
- Programs are rated as Effective, Moderately Effective, Adequate, Inadequate, or Results Not Demonstrated
- www.performance.gov gives more information on current administration's initiatives

5



OSEP Performance Measurement

OSEP

- All Federal agencies must report the results of their performance measure to the Office of Management and Budget
- All OSEP programs have long- and short-term performance measures
 - ◆ Long-term performance measures are collected and reported every two years
 - ◆ Short-term performance measures are collected and reported every year

6



O
S
E
P

Short-Term Performance Measures

- Objective 1 of 3: Improve the quality of parent training and information projects
 - ◆ Measure 1.1 of 4: The percentage of materials used by Parent Training and Information Centers projects deemed to be of **high quality** by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products or services
 - ◆ Measure 1.2 of 4: The percentage of Parent Training and Information Centers products and services deemed to be of **high relevance** to educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products or services

7



O
S
E
P

Short-Term Performance Measures

- Objective 1 of 3: Improve the quality of parent training and information projects
 - ◆ Measure 1.3 of 4: The percentage of Parent Training Information Centers' products and services deemed to be **useful** to improve educational and early intervention policy or practice by an independent review panel of experts qualified to review the substantive content of the products or services
 - ◆ Measure 1.4 of 4: The Federal **cost per unit** of output provided by the Parent Training and Information Centers, by category

8



Long-Term Performance Measures

O
S
E
P

- Objective 2 of 3: Parents served by the Parent Training and Information Centers will be more knowledgeable about their IDEA rights and responsibilities
- Objective 3 of 3: Parents served by the Parent Training and Information Centers will be able to advocate for scientifically or evidence-based practices for their children

9



Performance Measurement and Results

O
S
E
P

- Measure 1.1 (Quality) : A panel of experts reviews products and descriptions provided by selected projects. The panel of experts reviews evidence-based products across OSEP projects in Technology, TA&D and Parent Training & Info.
 - ◆ 2007 – 69.6% (exploratory measure)
 - ◆ 2008 – 57.9% (baseline set at 60% for 2009)
 - ◆ 2009 – 83.5% (target of 60% exceeded)
 - ◆ 2010 – 76.3% (target of 63% exceeded)
- In 2011, stakeholder panel reviewed policy-based materials

10



O
S
E
P

Performance Measurement and Results

- Measure 1.1 (Quality) : A score of at least 6 out of 9 possible points across two dimensions—substance and communication—is considered high quality
 - ◆ **Substance criteria** is “Does the product reflect the best of current research and theory or policy guidance, as demonstrated by a scientifically or evidence-based approach, a solid conceptual framework, appropriate citations, and other evidence of conceptual soundness?”
 - ◆ **Communication criteria** is “Does the product have clarity in its presentation, as evidenced by being well-organized, free of editorial errors and appropriately formatted?”

11



O
S
E
P

Performance Measurement and Results

- Measure 1.2 and 1.3 (Relevance and Usefulness): A panel of stakeholders unique to the Parent Program reviews products, services, and descriptions provided by selected projects
 - ◆ 2007 – 95.8 (both - exploratory measure)
 - ◆ 2008 – 95.2 (both - baseline set at 95% for 2009)
 - ◆ 2009 – 89 (Relevance – target of 95% not met);
86.3 (Usefulness – target of 95% not met);
 - ◆ 2010 - 97.5 (Relevance – target of 96% met)
95% (Usefulness – target of 96% not met)

12



Performance Measurement and Results

O
S
E
P

- Measure 1.2 (Relevance): A score of at least 6 out of 9 possible points across three dimensions—need, pertinence, and reach—is considered high relevance
 - ◆ **Need** criteria is “Does the product or service attempt to solve an important problem or critical issue for infants, toddlers, or youth with disabilities?”
 - ◆ **Pertinence** criteria is “Does the product or service address a problem or issue facing the target group(s)?”
 - ◆ **Reach** criteria is “Is the product or service applicable to diverse populations within the target group?”

13



Performance Measurement and Results

O
S
E
P

- Measure 1.3 (Usefulness): A score of at least 6 out of 9 possible points across three dimensions—ease, replicability, and sustainability—is considered useful
 - ◆ **Ease** criteria is “Does the product or service description address a problem or issue in an easily-understood way, with directions or guidance when appropriate? “
 - ◆ **Replicability** criteria is “Is it likely that the information derived from the product or service will eventually be used by the target group to achieve the benefit intended?”
 - ◆ **Sustainability** is “Is it likely that the product or service will be used successfully in more than one setting, over and over again to achieve the intended benefit?”

14



O
S
E
P

Performance Measurement and Results

- Measure 1.4 (Cost): Per unit cost is calculated by taking the services delivered in the prior year (according to the National PTAC data collection and weighted by intensity) and divided by total Federal cost of the program
 - ◆ Four categories of services: 1) Web site visits and newsletters sent; 2) attendance at presentations and conference, and individual responses to letters, e-mails, and calls; 3) attendance at workshops, trainings, and home visits; and 4) extended services (e.g. IEP meeting attendance by staff)
 - ◆ 2007 - \$2.24 (baseline); 2008 - \$1.10.; 2009 - \$1.06

15



O
S
E
P

Performance Measurement and Results

- Measure 2.1 (Rights) is calculated by averaging weighted responses to selected National PTAC impact survey questions
 - ◆ Three questions are used as proxies to the direct question of enhanced knowledge of IDEA
 - ◆ The numerator is the total number of “yes” responses to each question times the question’s weight divided by the number of responses to each question times the question’s weight
 - ◆ A baseline of 85% was established in 2007 based on prior responses to National PTAC survey
 - ◆ 2009 – 90.6 (Target of 85% exceeded);

16



Performance Measurement and Results

O
S
E
P

- Measure 3.1 (Evidence-Based Practices) is calculated by averaging weighted responses to selected National PTAC impact survey questions
 - ◆ Four questions are used as proxies to the direct question of the promotion of evidence-based practices
 - ◆ The numerator is the total number of “yes” responses to each question times the question’s weight divided by the number of responses to each question times the question’s weight
 - ◆ A baseline of 74% was established in 2007 based on prior responses to National PTAC survey
 - ◆ 2009 – 79% (Target of 74% exceeded);

17



Collection Methodology 2009-11

O
S
E
P

- Quality, Relevance, and Usefulness Short-Term Measures
 - ◆ A random sample of CPRCs and PTIs (stratified by center size) submitted products and services for review by the quality and stakeholder panels
 - ◆ In 2010 and 2011, centers submitted 1 product and 1 service and descriptions of those products and services as defined in required documentation, including noting if the service or product is policy or evidence based
- Cost Short-Term Measure
 - ◆ Calculated directly from the National PTAC impact survey data from prior year

18



Collection Methodology 20011

■ Long Term Measures

- ◆ One calculation for each measure was based on the established methodology using the 2010 National PTAC impact survey data
- ◆ The validation study conducted in 2009, in which 24 randomly selected centers (4 from each region) resurveyed 15 randomly selected families served in the same period as the families served in the 2008 National PTAC impact survey data, showed that the established methodology using proxy questions yields comparable results

O
S
E
P

19



Performance Measure Results 2011

Measure	Target	Actual
1.1 Quality	65%	89.4%
1.2 Relevance	95.2%	98.5%
1.3 Usefulness	95%	92.4%
1.4 Cost	\$2.24	\$1.13
2.1 Rights	87%	84.5%
3.1 Evidence-Based Practices	75%	77%

O
S
E
P

20



Collection Methodology 2012

O
S
E
P

- 35 Centers (10 CPRCs and 25 PTIs) will be randomly selected to send in product and service descriptions for the quality, relevance and usefulness short-term measures
 - ◆ Centers will send a list of 5 products and services (at least two of each) , and identify the most requested
 - ◆ Centers will be told which product and service in each of their lists they will submit to the contractor, along with the corresponding descriptions

21



Collection Timeline

O
S
E
P

- January 23 – Centers notified of Selection
- January 30 – Centers send Study Group List of Top 5 Products and Services
- February 6 – Study Group notifies Centers of which Product and Service to submit
- February 27 – Centers submit Products and Services and Descriptions

22



OSEP

Collection Methodology 2012

- Cost measure will be calculated according to the established methodology, using the National PTAC data collection
- The Study Group will be responsible for data collection and analysis, with Mike Norman and Larry Law as primary contacts

23



OSEP

Technical Assistance

- Exemplary product and service descriptions will be shared with the centers chosen
 - ◆ OSEP will share with PTACs exemplary descriptions from the 2011 collection
- Conference calls will be held with chosen centers

24



O
S
E
P

Questions?



Carmen Sanchez



Mike Norman

Thank You for All You Do!!