

Chapter 7

What Matters in COMPASS Coaching with Teachers: Method or Amount?



Lindsey Ogle and Lisa A. Ruble

Overview Providing teachers opportunities to obtain feedback on their teaching practices is critical for effective coaching. This chapter compares and contrasts different types (electronic or face-to-face feedback) and dosages (amount) of performance feedback and coaching in COMPASS and lessons learned.

We know from previous research on evidence-based practices (EBPs) that teachers need support not only in developing intervention plans targeted to student's individualized goals but in implementing them with fidelity (Sam et al., 2021). In the research and practice literature, the terms consultation and coaching are sometimes used interchangeably, but in COMPASS we define the initial meeting in which intervention plans are developed as the "initial consultation" and follow-up implementation support with performance feedback as "coaching." Coaching is an evidence-based method for improving teachers' implementation of high-quality intervention plans and EBPs (Beidas et al., 2012; Dunst et al., 2015; Kraft et al., 2018; Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010; Ogle et al., 2023). However, many questions remain in terms of best practices in teacher coaching, such as how much coaching is necessary and does coaching have to occur in-person or can coaching delivered over the internet work equally well? The purpose of the chapter is to answer some of these questions.

Coaching is a complex intervention that requires training and practice to do well. In education, coaching is highly individualized to the specific needs of the teacher and usually focuses on discreet skills related to teaching quality and student progress over time (Beidas et al., 2012; Kraft et al., 2018; Kretlow & Bartholomew, 2010). An essential element that defines coaching is performance feedback and progress monitoring both on the quality of teaching and the students' responsiveness to that instruction in terms of engagement and goal attainment. Performance feedback encompasses quantitative data (e.g., adherence to the intervention plan and student goal attainment progress) and qualitative observations (e.g., engagement, enthusiasm, and tone). Research has shown that performance feedback that is

L. Ogle · L. A. Ruble (✉)

Department of Special Education, Ball State University, Muncie, IN, USA
e-mail: lnogle@bsu.edu; lisa.ruble@bsu.edu

mostly positive is associated with the largest impact on behavior (Sleiman et al., 2020), so knowing how to deliver constructive criticism in such a way that empowers and encourages is a critical skill for coaches as it builds rapport and alliance (see Chap. 6 for more about alliance and its importance).

Autism-focused teacher coaching builds upon these foundational coaching skills and combines it with specialized knowledge of the characteristics of autism, evidence-based practice, and high-leverage practices that are critical to the development of effective educational programming for students with autism. However, developing intervention plans that best meet the specific learning needs of a student with autism is a process that requires refinement and adjustment overtime. Starting off with a high-quality intervention plan that incorporates evidence-based practices is an important first step, but even the most carefully designed plans will need to be adjusted to meet the changing needs and interests of the student. Coaching with performance feedback and progress monitoring can support this process by providing a structured way to evaluate change over time and creatively problem-solve personal and environmental challenges that may be limiting the student's potential.

Coaching with performance feedback and progress monitoring has long been accepted as an evidence-based professional development intervention as teachers who receive support in implementing high-quality intervention plans have improved adherence to the teaching plans and improved student outcomes (Brock et al., 2020; Hamrick et al., 2021; Ogle et al., 2023; Ruble et al., 2010, 2012, 2013, 2018). However, many questions remain regarding the relative effectiveness of specific frequencies (i.e., dosage) and modalities (i.e., type) of coaching in terms of teacher adherence and acceptability and student goal attainment outcomes. The purpose of this chapter is to present what we learned about the training (see Chap. 2 for more information about our training package) and feedback required for school consultants to implement COMPASS coaching sessions. We begin by reviewing coaching and how it is applied in COMPASS.

COMPASS Coaching

COMPASS is unique in that it is a comprehensive intervention that not only provides teachers and caregivers support in identifying individualized goals and developing high-quality intervention plans adapted to the personal needs of the student but also because it includes a system of supporting teachers in the implementation of those plans through coaching. COMPASS was originally developed to include four face-to-face coaching sessions to support teachers in implementing the intervention plans. We know that the initial meeting identifying goals and developing intervention plans is an essential element of COMPASS, but we have been focused in recent years on understanding the nature of support teachers need in implementing plans with high fidelity following the initial consultation session.

In standard COMPASS, four follow-up coaching sessions are generally scheduled roughly 4–6 weeks apart following the initial consultation, which should

ideally occur in the first 2 months of the academic year. The goal is to provide consistent, reliable, and helpful implementation support to the teacher and caregiver. To that end, each session follows a consistent format that involves the teacher, coach, and caregiver, if present, watching teacher-made videos of the implementation of each intervention plan together and using those videos as the basis for (1) rating the student's goal attainment progress for each skill on a five-point, goal attainment scale (e.g., -2 = present level, -1 progress, 0 = goal, +1 exceed goal, and +2 greatly exceed goal); (2) problem-solving any issues with implementing the intervention plans; and (3) adapting the plans as needed to the changing needs of the student. Viewing the videos together allows the teacher and coach to problem-solve more effectively. Often teachers will comment how they did not realize they were doing something in a certain way or with a certain frequency (e.g., excessively prompting the student without giving time to respond) which can aid in problem solving. This process is repeated for each of the student's goals and concludes with a coaching summary that outlines the student's goal attainment progress and what was changed in the intervention plans. To support the fidelity of implementation of the process, a COMPASS Coaching Guide (Appendix A) was developed for consultants outlining the steps of the coaching session in addition to a template COMPASS Coaching Report that summarizes what was observed on the videos, a summary of what was discussed regarding the intervention plans, and the student's goal attainment progress. A short one page Coaching Caregiver and Teacher Survey was also developed for consultant feedback. When in training, consultants received a summary of their fidelity of implementation of coaching (Appendix B) that evaluates adherence to the coaching protocol, GAS progress determined as rated by the consultees, teacher adherence to the teaching plan, consultant adherence to the coaching components, consultant coaching process skills, feedback from teachers and caregivers, and intervention plan feedback from the teacher.

COMPASS seeks to involve caregivers as much as possible in the implementation process and views caregivers as essential to the ultimate goal attainment success of the student. When parents and caregivers are involved in the education of their children, teachers often put out more effort to support students. To that end, caregivers are invited to attend all coaching sessions including by phone or through video calls. However, we recognize that this may not be possible for many caregivers, so regardless of whether the caregiver chooses to attend or not, they are still provided with a report of their child's goal attainment progress and a summary of what was discussed at the coaching session, including any changes that were made to the intervention plan. It is important to keep caregivers updated on what strategies are being implemented in the school setting so that caregivers are kept informed about their child's goal progress and changes to the intervention plan and are able to provide feedback on home and community progress and changes. This involvement improves teacher-caregiver alliance and ultimately student goal attainment outcomes (Ruble et al., 2022).

Research and Approach Behind COMPASS Coaching

COMPASS coaching incorporates the research-supported elements of performance feedback (Brock et al., 2020; Hamrick et al., 2021) and video self-reflection (Morin et al., 2019; Nagro & Cornelius, 2013) that together promote teachers in improving their instruction. However, the approach COMPASS takes to coaching is what sets it apart from other coaching methods. The goal in COMPASS coaching is to support teachers' self-efficacy and skill development through guided self-reflection and problem-solving. Focusing on improving teachers' self-efficacy in teaching students with autism is especially important research has demonstrated that increased self-efficacy is (a) positively correlated with student outcomes and teachers' successful engagement of students during lessons and (b) negatively correlated with stress (Love et al., 2020). Approaching coaching with the attitude of being an "expert" giving advice without regard for the teacher's point of view is generally poorly received by teachers, and this can inadvertently undermine the relationship between the coach and teacher (Ogle et al., 2023). In focus groups conducted prior to the development of the COMPASS training package, teachers and caregivers both discussed challenging experiences with consultants who disregarded their point of view (see Chap. 2). Simply put, no one responds well to having their knowledge and expertise minimized or ignored, and that is especially true of teachers and caregivers who have the most direct knowledge of and experience with the student. It is essential for coaches to approach the coaching session with empathy by demonstrating strong active listening skills, avoiding interrupting, asking relevant questions, and reinforcing the teachers efforts. This builds therapeutic alliance (Bordin, 1979; see Chap. 6 about therapeutic alliance) between the teacher and coach which then provides the foundation for work toward the shared goal of enhancing the student's goal attainment progress through improved teacher instruction.

Together, these research-supported components and approaches have been highly impactful in improving teacher and student outcomes in COMPASS (Ruble et al., 2010, 2013, 2018). Ruble et al. (2013, 2018) found that teacher's adherence significantly increases over four coaching sessions, and that adherence is associated with improved student goal attainment outcomes. This finding has been consistent regardless of the experience level of the teacher and the support needs of the student, suggesting that coaching in COMPASS is highly adaptable to the specific needs of the teachers and students (Ruble et al., 2010, 2013, 2018; Ogle et al., 2023). However, multiple face-to-face coaching sessions is a resource-intensive intervention, so we have been systematically investigating alternative approaches to reduce burden related to time and scheduling and increase efficiency. Specifically, we have compared and contrasted several methods of providing implementation support to teachers that include the essential components of video self-review and performance feedback on adherence to the intervention plans and student goal attainment outcomes.

Coaching Modality

Virtual Coaching

To begin to address the need for less resource-intensive coaching, we looked to web-based or virtual coaching. The advantage of virtual coaching was that it did not require the consultant to travel to the teacher. Also, it allowed other participants to attend who may not be at the school. For consultants who work in large rural districts or urban schools, time for traveling could be costly. Thus, to answer the question about modality, we designed and conducted two studies. For the first study, we compared face-to-face and virtual coaching versus a control group (Ruble et al., 2013). For the second study, we expanded our questions to include not only the modality of coaching but also the amount of coaching (Ogle et al., 2023). We review the findings in the following section.

The first study comparing virtual coaching to traditional face-to-face coaching and a control was done using a video conference software (Adobe Connect, Zoom, Skype, etc.) The virtual, web-based coaching implemented in the study consisted of the same activities completed in the face-to-face modality. The same overall structure of reviewing video of the instruction with the child, scoring goal attainment progress, and problem-solving occurred. Much to our surprise, no differences in teacher satisfaction, teacher adherence to the intervention plans, or child goal attainment outcomes were observed between the two different coaching modalities (Ruble et al., 2013). *These findings point to virtual coaching as a viable and effective approach for supporting teachers.*

Emailed Performance Feedback

Another option that has been explored in our research is how performance feedback is provided. We developed an electronic report that was emailed to teachers and compared outcomes to traditional face-to-face or virtual coaching. The feedback form (see Appendix C) that was completed by the coach after viewing the video included each goal and the corresponding goal attainment scale, a description of the intervention plans, a place to note what rough percentage of the intervention plan elements were observed in the video (e.g., 0%, 25%, 50%, 75%, or 100%), and a place for comments and suggestions. Nine community-based consultants were trained to implement COMPASS and help test the effectiveness of electronic feedback. Together, the nine consultants worked with 28 sets of teachers, caregivers, and students with autism of which nine received one coaching session or one performance feedback report, nine received two or four sessions/reports, and ten received no follow-up after the initial consultation. Results indicated that similar to virtual coaching, performance feedback delivered via an emailed report was shown to be equally as effective as face-to-face coaching in improving student goal attainment

outcomes (when compared to those who only received the initial consultation with no follow-up) (Ogle et al., 2023). This finding is preliminary and needs to be researched further, but it does have some important implications for practice as delivering electronic feedback through a report rather than having a meeting, whether face-to-face or virtual, takes considerably less time for both the coach and teacher and requires even fewer resources.

Choosing a Modality of Feedback

Given that our research shows face-to-face coaching, virtual coaching, and emailed performance feedback produce similar outcomes (Ruble et al., 2013; Ogle et al., 2023), the choice between them is up to the coach and teacher. Some may have a strong preference to meet face-to-face, while others would prefer the convenience of meeting virtually due to scheduling or travel challenges. Virtual coaching is a great alternative to face-to-face coaching as it follows the same format and still allows for the development of a close coach-teacher relationship and active problem-solving. Coaching is also an effective way to support teachers who may have less experience or be less confident in designing and implementing educational programming for students with autism. An experienced coach can use the time in coaching to train the teacher in EBPs and model a problem-solving approach that can be used for other students in the future. It may also be helpful for students with complex or more severe needs where it is anticipated that the intervention plans initially developed may need to be tailored over time to best meet the needs of the student.

However, teachers who are more independent and confident in their ability to problem-solve may prefer to receive an emailed report rather than have a meeting. A report is far less time-consuming for teachers and coaches and is a viable alternative to coaching while maintaining the essential elements of accountability through performance feedback that supports improved adherence to the intervention plans and student outcomes. It could also potentially be equally effective to use a mix of different approaches depending on what the teacher needs over time. For example, a teacher may want to start with coaching to get the problem-solving support in tailoring the intervention plan to the student's needs but then transitions to receiving a performance feedback report once an effective plan is developed that the teacher has higher self-efficacy in implementing. While our research confirms that it is essential that teachers receive implementation support following the development of the intervention plans during the consultation (Ruble et al., 2013; Ogle et al., 2023), ultimately the method used should be up to the coach and teacher as they appear to be equally effective. Thus, communicating the benefits and disadvantages of the different modalities when choosing a follow-up approach with the teacher is important.

Frequency and Dosage of Performance Feedback Matters in COMPASS

What has emerged in our research as impactful on both teacher adherence and student goal attainment outcomes is the number of opportunities (i.e., dosage) for performance feedback a teacher receives (Ogle et al., 2023). There is little agreement in the field at large about how much performance feedback and coaching a teacher needs to demonstrate high-quality instruction and positive student outcomes. In a meta-analysis investigating coaching efficacy, Kraft et al. (2018) found that 27% of studies reported 10 hours or less of one-to-one coaching, 23% reported 11–20 hours, and 23% reporting 21 or more hours. Despite this wide range, they found no consistent relationship between the amount of coaching received and the quality of teacher instruction or student achievement (Kraft et al., 2018). This lack of relationship was also found in a separate meta-analysis (Brock & Carter, 2017) which found no relationship between the duration of training and quality of teacher instruction. This is in contrast to Sleiman et al. (2020) meta-analysis across multiple settings (e.g., human service organizations, schools, retail stores, and restaurants) that did find a relationship between the frequency of coaching (daily or weekly) and improved outcomes ($d = 0.6$ for 81% of the studies; $Md = 0.78$; $n = 96$; large effect size). This finding of the importance of multiple coaching sessions was supported by yet another meta-analysis (Noell et al., 2014) that found that coaching that included performance feedback and self-monitoring was associated with improved student outcomes.

In our study, the highest outcomes were seen in those who received more than one opportunity for performance feedback in the form of an emailed report or face-to-face coaching session (Ogle et al., 2023). These students on average slightly exceeded their annual IEP goal set at the initial consultation (i.e., 0.23 mean GAS score). While having two or more opportunities for coaching was important, there was no significant difference found in those who received one opportunity for performance feedback and those who only received the initial consultation with no follow-up. This finding highlights the importance of receiving multiple opportunities for feedback over time; in our study, at least two coaching/feedback opportunities were critical. Students whose teachers received less than two opportunities for feedback on average did not achieve their IEP goal at the end of the school year. This same pattern was repeated for the teacher's adherence to the intervention plans. Thus, when making decisions about how much coaching or performance feedback to provide to teachers, it is important to provide at least two and ideally four opportunities that are no more than 4–6 weeks apart.

Conclusion

While high-quality goals and intervention plans are essential components of high-quality educational programming for students with autism, implementation support for teachers with performance feedback on their adherence to the intervention plans and student goal attainment progress is necessary to help students gain their full potential. On average, students whose teachers received two to four coaching sessions or electronic feedback not only attained their annual IEP goal but exceeded it. This was in stark contrast to those who did not receive any follow-up from the initial consultation or who received just one opportunity. On average, these students did not attain their annual IEP goal at the end of the school year. The method in which performance feedback is delivered by the coach (e.g., face-to-face, web-based, or electronic report) was not related to teachers' fidelity of implementation or students' goal attainment outcomes meaning that the decision between the modality for feedback be based on preferences of the coach and teacher. While these results are preliminary and more research is needed, the amount of support provided by the coach may matter more than the method.

Appendices

The COMPASS Coaching Guide (Appendix A), COMPASS Coaching Feedback Protocol (Appendix B), and COMPASS Emailed Feedback Form (Appendix C) are available to download and print for free on our website at:

<https://compassforautism.org/blank-forms/>



Appendix A: COMPASS Coaching Guide

Audio record coaching session – State names of those present and the date at the beginning of the recording

Check that the teacher and parent received the consultation or from the coaching report.

- Ask if there are any questions
- Ask if any changes have occurred, including any changes to the IEP

Ensure everyone present has a copy of the most up-to-date teaching plans and the GAS form

Repeat the following steps for all three goals

1. Watch the video of the implementation of the teaching plan with those present
2. Score the GAS form based on what was observed in the video. You can also provide a second rating if the teacher thinks that typical performance was not on the video.

3. Update the teaching plan:

- (a) Ask teacher to walk you through the teaching plan and explain what was done or not done/ what is working or not working and review Common Elements in the plan.
- (b) Problem-solve with the teacher any additional personal and environmental challenges and supports that may need to be addressed, modified, added, or maintained.

Common Elements:

1. Meaningful, goal-directed activity
2. Obtain and maintain attention
3. Initial request from teacher/peer/ environment is understood by child
4. Wait time of 3-5sec after initial request & between prompts
5. Clear reinforcement

4. Ask the following:

(a) Do you keep data on the skill?

☐ No (provide examples to teacher) ☐ Yes (review data)

(b) How many times a day/week is this goal worked on? _____

(c) Who usually instructs the skill? ☐ Teacher ☐ Teaching Assistant ☐ SLP ☐ Peers ☐ Other

Have you trained the other person instructing this skill on the teaching plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No

After three goals have been reviewed

1. Ask the teacher (and caregiver if present) to complete the Coaching Survey.
2. Complete your Coaching Consultant Survey.
3. Confirm the date and time for the next coaching session.
4. Send Coaching Summary & Updated Teaching Plans to Caregiver and Teacher with a reminder of the date of the next coaching session.

COMPASS Coaching Report

Student: _____Date: _____

Teacher: _____Consultant: _____

Others Present at Coaching Session: _____

Communication Goal:

Observation of Video:

Discussion (Updates and changes made to the Teaching Plan):

Goal Attainment Progress Score from Video and Teacher Ratings:

Social Goal:

Observation of Video:

Discussion (Updates and changes made to the Teaching Plan):

Goal Attainment Progress Score from Video and Teacher Ratings:

Learning Goal:

Observation of Video:

Discussion (Updates and changes made to the Teaching Plan):

Goal Attainment Progress Score from Video and Teacher Ratings:

Future Plans:

COMPASS Coaching Caregiver & Teacher Survey

Please rate today’s coaching session by circling a number on the line nearest to the description that best fits your experience.

I did not feel heard, understood, and respected	12345678910	I felt heard, understood, and respected
We did not work on or talk about what I wanted to work on and talk about.	12345678910	We worked on and talked about what I wanted to work on and talk about.
The consultant’s approach is not a good fit for me.	12345678910	The consultant’s approach is a good fit for me.
There was something missing in the consultation today.	12345678910	Overall, today’s consultation was right for me.

Adapted from Johnson, Miller, & Duncan, 2000

Comments:

1. Are the teaching plans clear to you?
- ☐ Not at all clear ☐ Somewhat unclear ☐ Somewhat clear ☐ Very clear
2. Are the teaching plans relevant to the goals?
- ☐ Not at all relevant ☐ Somewhat irrelevant ☐ Somewhat relevant ☐ Very relevant
3. Are the teaching plans realistic to implement within the context of your classroom?
- ☐ Not at all realistic ☐ Somewhat unrealistic ☐ Somewhat realistic ☐ Very realistic
4. Are the teaching plans appealing to you? Do you like the teaching strategies in the plans?
- ☐ Not at all appealing ☐ Somewhat unappealing ☐ Somewhat appealing ☐ Very appealing
5. Are the teaching plans consistent with your values and teaching philosophy?
- ☐ Not at all consistent ☐ Somewhat inconsistent ☐ Somewhat clear ☐ Very clear
6. Are the teaching plans effective enough to help your student achieve the goals?
- ☐ Not at all clear ☐ Somewhat unclear ☐ Somewhat clear ☐ Very clear

Appendix B: COMPASS Coaching Feedback Protocol

A. Abridged Protocol Checklist

Instructions: Below are the steps that make up the abridged protocol for a COMPASS consultation. Check if the consultant:

1. Observe the student demonstrating each targeted skill/objective/goal with the teacher_____	☐
2. Review and rate the Goal Attainment Scale (GAS) form _____	☐
3. Complete the COMPASS Coaching Form for each objective _____	☐
4. Complete Post-Coaching Surveys _____	☐
5. Complete Coaching Summary & Send to Teacher and Parent _____	☐

B. Goals & GAS Scores

Instructions: Insert the text for the three goals identified during the consultation. GAS is rated on a -2 to +2 scale with 0 meaning that the student achieved the goal. Teaching Plan Adherence is rated on a 0-4 scale: 0 = No components implemented, 1 = 1-25% implemented, 2 = 26-50% implemented, 3 = 51-75% implemented, 4 = 76-100% implemented. Common Elements total score

	GAS scores			Teaching plan adherence	
	Teacher	Consultant	Supervisor	Consultant	Supervisor
Communication Goal:					
Social Goal:					
Independent Learning Goal:					

C. Fidelity Checklist (Coaching Adherence)

Instructions: Below are the components of the COMPASS coaching session. Mark with an “X” the following boxes for the elements that occurred during the coaching session.

	Consultant	Supervisor
1. We reviewed the consultation/coaching written summary report and answered questions.		
2. We reviewed the most current teaching plan and updated the written plan to reflect current teaching strategies for each objective.		
3. We evaluated the goal attainment of the child’s most current level of progress on the skills.		
4. After the observation of each skill, the consultant began the discussion by asking the teacher about thoughts on what was observed.		

	Consultant	Supervisor
5. We discussed at least one idea (what teaching methods to keep in place or what teaching methods to consider changing) for each objective.		
6. If the student was not making as much progress as desired on an objective, we discussed the student's personal challenges that might be impacting progress on skills.		
7. If the student was not making as much progress as desired on an objective, we also discussed the student's environmental challenges that might be impacting progress on skills.		
8. To counter the personal challenges related to an objective, we identified at least one personal support (e.g., a reinforcer, strength) to continue to use, add, or adapt in the teaching plan.		
9. To counter environmental challenges related to an objective, we identified at least one environmental support (e.g., instructional method, visual support) to continue to use, add, or adapt in the teaching plan.		
10. We discussed other environmental factors (student, teacher, or caregiver related) that might be helping or hindering the student progress either directly (health issues) or indirectly (home or classroom issues) on accomplishment of the objective.		
11. We reviewed and rated the GAS Form for each objective the teacher/student demonstrated.		
12. We obtained the rating of the student's most consistent and representative level of progress over the past two-week period.		
13. For each objective, we discussed how often the skill is taught, if data are being kept, and problem solved any data collection issues.		
14. We discussed generalization plans (e.g., who else is working on this skill with the student; where else does the student practice this skill; how is information being shared with other school personnel about this skill) for each objective.		
15. The overall tone set by the consultant during the session was collaborative (e.g., positive tone; positive feedback: "I think you're doing a good job in the classroom"; providing information; initiating joint activities: "Let's focus on social problems right now").		
16. The overall tone set by the consultant during the session was empowering (e.g., the consultant asked open-ended questions to encourage teacher problem solving and self-reflection; the consultant helped to develop teacher confidence in ability to impact change).		
Total score	/16 %	/16 %

D. Coaching Process Skills Checklist

Instructions: Teachers, consultants, and supervisors have rated the following items on a scale of: 0: Not present, 1: Attempted, 2: Competent, 3: Superior

The consultant...	Consultant	Supervisor
1. Shared feedback, information, and resources only after the teacher shared her/his thoughts and ideas		
2. Acknowledged the teacher's point of view		

The consultant...	Consultant	Supervisor
3. Identified important points regarding the teacher's needs and directions		
4. Summarized, paraphrased, and clarified		
5. Pursued issues assertively		
6. Reinforced the teacher's efforts		
7. Actively listened (e.g., maintained eye contact, nodded head, uses "uh huh" and non-verbal types of communication)		
8. Was empathetic, accepting, and broad-minded		
9. Asked relevant questions (clear, concise, open)		
10. Avoided interrupting, asking misdirected questions, and wandering off topic		
11. Demonstrated accurate knowledge of the teacher and student (e.g., student need and progress, classroom curriculum and routines)		
12. Demonstrated accurate knowledge of assessment and intervention techniques		
Total score		

E. Session Rating Scale

Instructions: Teachers rated the session on a 1–10 scale (10 being the most positive). Adapted from Johnson et al., 2000

		Parent	Teacher
Relationship:	I felt heard, understood, and respected.		
Goals or Topic:	We worked on and talked about what I wanted to work on and talk about.		
Approach or Method:	The consultant's approach is a good fit for me.		
Overall:	Overall, today's session was right for me.		
Comments:			

F. Intervention Plan Feedback Scale

Instructions: The teacher rated the three teaching plans developed on a scale of 1 = Not at all to 4 = Very much.

	Teacher
1. Are the intervention plans clear to you?	
2. Are the intervention plans relevant to the goals?	
3. Are the intervention plans realistic to implement within the context of your classroom?	
4. Are the intervention plans appealing to you? Do you like the teaching strategies in the plans?	
5. Are the intervention plans consistent with your values and teaching philosophy?	
6. Are the intervention plans effective enough to help your student achieve the goals?	
Total score	

G. Summarized Supervisor Feedback

Areas of Strength:

Areas for Growth:

Appendix C: COMPASS Emailed Feedback Form

GOAL ATTAINMENT					
-2 Present level of performance	-1 Progress	0 Expected level of outcome (GOAL)	+1 Somewhat more than expected	+2 Much more than expected	Rating
Comments:					
INTERVENTION PLAN					
Who/ Where/ When: Materials: Data System:					
Teaching Plans			Describe what was observed/ not observed	Adherence Rating	
Pre-Teaching Activities:				_____	
Teaching Sequence:				_____ % of intervention plan components implemented.	
Plans for Maintenance, Self-Direction, & Generalization:					
Comments:					

Note: Teaching Plan Adherence Rating: 0 = No components implemented, 1 = 1–25% of components, 2 = 26–50% of components, 3 = 51–75% of components, 4 = 76–100% of the components

References

- Beidas, R. S., Edmunds, J. M., Marcus, S. C., & Kendall, P. C. (2012). Training and consultation to promote implementation of an empirically supported treatment: A randomized trial. *Psychiatric Services*, 63, 660–665. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps.201100401>
- Bordin, E. S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice*, 16(3), 252.
- Brock, M. E., & Carter, E. W. (2017). A meta-analysis of educator training to improve implementation of interventions for students with disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 38, 131–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741932516653477>
- Brock, M. E., Barczak, M. A., & Dueker, S. A. (2020). A randomized evaluation of group training for paraprofessionals to implement systematic instruction strategies with students with severe disabilities. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 44, 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406420923769>
- Dunst, C. J., Bruder, M. B., & Hamby, D. W. (2015). Meta-synthesis of in-service professional development research: Features associated with positive educator and student outcomes. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 10, 1731–1744. <https://doi.org/10.5897/err2015.2306>
- Hamrick, J., Cerda, M., O'Toole, C., & Hagen-Collins, K. (2021). Educator knowledge and preparedness for educating students with autism in public schools. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 36, 213–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357621989310>
- Kraft, M. A., Blazar, D., & Hogan, D. (2018). The effect of teacher coaching on instruction and achievement: A meta-analysis of the causal evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 88, 547–588. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654318759268>
- Kretlow, A. G., & Bartholomew, C. C. (2010). Using coaching to improve the fidelity of evidence-based practices: A review of studies. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 33, 279–299. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406410371643>
- Love, A. M., Findley, J. A., Ruble, L. A., & McGrew, J. H. (2020). Teacher self-efficacy for teaching students with autism spectrum disorder: Associations with stress, teacher engagement, and student IEP outcomes following COMPASS consultation. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 35, 47–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088357619836767>
- Morin, J. F. G., Afzali, M. H., Bourque, J., Stewart, S. H., Séguin, J. R., O'Leary-Barrett, M., & Conrod, P. J. (2019). A population-based analysis of the relationship between substance use and adolescent cognitive development. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 176, 98–106. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ajp.2018.18020202>
- Nagro, S. A., & Cornelius, K. E. (2013). Evaluating the evidence base of video analysis. *Teacher Education and Special Education: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Council for Exceptional Children*, 36, 312–329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888406413501090>
- Noell, G. H., Gansle, K. A., Mevers, J. L., Knox, R. M., Mintz, J. C., & Dahir, A. (2014). Improving treatment plan implementation in schools: A meta-analysis of single subject design studies. *Journal of Behavioral Education*, 23, 168–191. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10864-013-9177-1>
- Ogle, L., Ruble, L., & McGrew, J. H. (2023). Type and dosage of performance feedback following COMPASS consultation on teacher and student outcomes. *Remedial and Special Education*. In Press.
- Ruble, L. A., Dalrymple, N. J., & McGrew, J. H. (2010). The effects of consultation on individualized education program outcomes for young children with autism: The collaborative model for promoting competence and success. *Journal of Early Intervention*, 32, 286–301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053815110382973>
- Ruble, L. A., Dalrymple, N. J., & McGrew, J. H. (2012). *Collaborative model for promoting competence and success for students with ASD*. Springer.

- Ruble, L. A., McGrew, J. H., Toland, M. D., Dalrymple, N. J., & Jung, L. A. (2013). A randomized controlled trial of COMPASS web-based and face-to-face teacher coaching in autism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 81*, 566–572. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032003>
- Ruble, L. A., McGrew, J. H., Toland, M., Dalrymple, N., Adams, M., & Snell-Rood, C. (2018). Randomized control trial of COMPASS for improving transition outcomes of students with autism spectrum disorder. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 48*, 3586–3595. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-018-3623-9>
- Ruble, L., Ogle, L., & McGrew, J. H. (2022). Practice makes proficient: Evaluation of implementation fidelity following COMPASS consultation training. *Psychology in the Schools, 60*, 743. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22800>
- Sam, A. M., Odom, S. L., Tomaszewski, B., Perkins, Y., & Cox, A. W. (2021). Employing evidence-based practices for children with autism in elementary schools. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders, 51*, 2308–2323. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-020-04706-x>
- Sleiman, A. A., Sigurjonsdottir, S., Elnes, A., Gage, N. A., & Gravina, N. E. (2020). A quantitative review of performance feedback in organizational settings (1998–2018). *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management, 40*, 303–332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01608061.2020.1823300>