# Evaluation Rubric: Edtech Technical Assistance Resources1

This rubric can help you determine the quality of guidance provided in a technical assistance resource. Use of the scoring is optional; do use it to reflect on the potential of the resource as you comment.

| **Criteria** | **Definition** | **0** | **1** | **2** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Content Quality | The content in the resource is relevant to adult education practitioners. |  |  |  |
|  | The content in the resource is written in plain language. |  |  |  |
|  | The content is accurate and/or current. |  |  |  |
|  | The content is based on some expert knowledge or evaluation results (i.e., there are easily accessed references to support the content). |  |  |  |
|  | The content is logically arranged and easy to follow. |  |  |  |
|  | The content conveys the information it purports to cover. |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |
| Ease of use; accessibility | The content is not behind a paywall and/or requires, at most, a login. |  |  |  |
|  | The content presents information in a format that supports usability (e.g., layout or navigation are easy to follow) and accessibility (e.g., may include alt text, closed captioning). |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |
| Provenance | The author or authoring organization is known and has made previous contributions to the field. |  |  |  |
| Comments |  |  |  |  |
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1This rubric is based on the protocol developed by the CREATE Adult Skills Network team to review technical assistance resources for inclusion in the CREATE [Edtech Technical Assistance Library](https://createadultskills.org/edtech-ta-library).
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