2015-2016 Formal Review
Info Session
November 13, 2014
Overview

Today’s objectives:

⭐ Become familiar with the criteria used to evaluate programs during the review
  ⭐ Understand how they were derived from the standards
  ⭐ Learn how to link evidence to specific criteria

⭐ Understand the process: know what is going to happen, when and how it happens
  ⭐ General process and specific to the 2015-2016 review year

⭐ Learn what resources are available and how they support the process

⭐ Get questions answered
Goal: Be ready to begin preparing for the formal review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction &amp; Agenda Overview</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Overview</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Overview</td>
<td>45 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence-Based Decision Making - Activity</td>
<td>60 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Overview</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 Review Logistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Steps</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guarantee that preparation in MA results in *effective educators* ready to support the success of all students.
New Program Approval Standards

★ June 2012

★ Communicate a shift/Raised bar
  ★ Emphasis at organization level
  ★ Inclusion of outcomes
  ★ Looking closely at K-12 partnerships and systems of continuous improvement
2012 Program Approval Standards

★ Standard A: Continuous Improvement
★ Standard B: Collaboration & Program Impact
★ Standard C: Capacity
★ Standard D: Subject Matter Knowledge
★ Standard E & F: Professional Standards
★ Standard G: Educator Effectiveness
Criteria

- Derived/developed with feedback from the field
- Concrete, actionable
- Descriptive of expectations, not prescriptive of approach
- 40 individual criteria: Range within domains from 4 to 14
- Evidence collected and rated at criteria level
- Findings or commendations are at criteria level
Domain: The Organization

Is the organization setup to support and sustain effective preparation programs?

Things to Note:
★ Organization Domain speaks largely to the Educator Preparation unit, not necessarily the institution-at-large.
Domain: Partnerships

Is educator preparation from your organization meeting the needs of the PK-12 system?

Things to Note:

★ Focus of this domain is on PK-12 partners

★ If you are both a PK-12 provider (e.g. district, charter school, etc) as well as a prep provider your submission should speak to your ability to meet the needs of the district/school through your preparation work

★ ESE issues a partner survey based on the partner list you provide as part of the review
Domain: Continuous Improvement

Is your organization driven by continuous improvement efforts that result in better prepared educators?

Things to Note:
★ Share examples of changes that have been made and the resulting impact of those efforts
★ Cross-cutting evidence will be present in this domain
Domain: The Candidate

Is the candidate’s experience throughout the program contributing to effective preparation?

Things to Note:

- Process-oriented domain – plans and inputs should still be detailed and specific
- Speaks to organizations taking an active responsibility for candidate experience
Domain: Field-Based Experiences

Do candidates have the necessary experiences in the field to be ready for the licensure role?

Things to Note:

- Field-based experiences include pre-practicum and practicum
- Criteria emphasize organization’s role in placing, monitoring and designing high-quality experiences for the candidate
Domain: **Instruction**

Do candidates have the necessary knowledge and skills to be effective educators?

**Things to Note:**
- Evaluated for each program/group of programs within a Sponsoring Organization
- Do not review syllabi; unless new program
- Documents required for submission varies by program
Questions?
Building a Stronger Review Process

*Goal: implement a review process that provides a solid-evidence base for decision-making*

★ Effective

★ Efficient

★ Consistently rigorous
A Stronger Review Process

★ Defining explicit, concrete criteria on which judgments can be made (Evaluation Tool)

★ Creating standardized, easy to use resources and tools (Toolkits)

★ Recruiting, selecting and training an elite cohort of Reviewers

★ Streamlining logistic of the submission process (Web-based Review System)
A Stronger Review Process: Themes to look for

- Communication
- Transparency
- Calibration & Consistency
- Reliance on Timelines
- Responsibility...

- For the process = Joint
- For the evidence-base = Sponsoring Organization
- For the decision = ESE
Questions?
Evidence-based Decision Making

Goal: implement a review process that provides a solid-evidence base for decision-making

★ Decision-making for:
  ★ ESE
  ★ Sponsoring Organization
  ★ Understanding Best Practices
Agents:

• Sponsoring Organizations
• Reviewers
• ESE

Sources:

• Offsite → Worksheets, artifacts, data from SO
• Onsite → Interviews, observations, artifacts
• Outputs → State data

Types:

• Data
• Artifacts
• Examples
HIERARCHY OF EVIDENCE

- PLANS: Light
- INPUTS: Medium
- IMPACT: Heavy
## Evaluating Evidence, Not Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Descriptor of Evidence</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Compelling</td>
<td>Irrefutable evidence that criteria is being met consistently; OR, sufficient evidence that while criteria is being met throughout organization, one or more areas (i.e., programs) presents evidence above and beyond criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>Clear, convincing evidence demonstrating criteria is being met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Evidence inconsistently supports criteria; gaps within evidence exist; evidence is weakly linked to criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Insufficient</td>
<td>Inadequate evidence was found in support of the criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence-Based Decision Making

Offsite • Onsite • Output Measures

Criteria Ratings

Domain Ratings

Overall Approval

Approved

Approved with Conditions

Not Approved

Evidence Base

Findings & Commendations

Exemplary
Proficient
Needs Improvement
 Unsatisfactory
Questions?
Activity Overview

★ Objectives:

★ Increase fluency with the criteria used in the evaluation
★ See examples of the types of evidence evaluated during the review

Note: **NOT** rating quality of evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Breakdown</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity

- Read each evidence example
  - Reflective of actual evidence generated during a review
  - Simply examples of evidence – NOT examples of “sufficient” evidence

- Discuss together which criteria the evidence example is best linked to
  - Discuss possible linkages and WHY – NOT whether evidence is good/bad

- Match each evidence example with the Criteria
  - Quite possible that evidence examples will overlap criteria – looking for strongest link
  - FYI: not all criteria listed – wanted to provide focused activity

Extension: Choose one criteria in each Domain – generate another evidence example and post it
Debrief & Questions
http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/toolkit

Toolkits

★ Everything you need in one place
★ Accessible at any point in the process
★ Available to the public and other stakeholders
★ Various resources, worksheets, instructions, overviews

★ Be sure to click into the 2015-2016 Toolkit
**Continuous Improvement Worksheet**

**Sponsoring Organization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the primary person responsible for leading or overseeing your organization’s annual evaluation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Document**

- Strategic plan

**Prompt 1:** Describe the system of ongoing continuous improvement (including the annual evaluation) within the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prompt 1: Describe the system of ongoing continuous improvement (including the annual evaluation) within the organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Prompt 2:** Provide 3-4 examples of how your organization has used data (including surveys and other feedback) to make program improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Rationale including description of data</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Key faculty/staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Optional:** Provide additional context pertaining to continuous improvement work at your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optional: Provide additional context pertaining to continuous improvement work at your organization.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>250 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Optional:** List up to 3 supplemental documents below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemental Document</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Components on all Worksheets**

- **Required Documents**
- **Prompts**
- **Optional Context**
- **Optional Additional Documents**
Prompts Linked to Criteria

The Candidate: Recruitment, Admission, Advising
Worksheet

Required Documents
- Admission Policy
- Advising Policy
- Waiver Policy

Criteria: Waiver policy ensures that academic and professional standards of the licensure role are met.

Prompt 1: How are recruitment efforts designed to yield a diverse candidate pool?

Criteria: Recruitment efforts yield a diverse candidate pool.
## Triangulating Evidence for EACH Criteria

### Domain: The Candidate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: Structures and processes ensure that candidates receive effective advising throughout the program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OFFSITE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onsite Submission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Completer Survey Persistence Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Worksheet Prompt 3a Advising Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Rationale:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas for follow-up onsite:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **ONSITE** |
| **Onsite Visit** |
| Candidate Interview Completer Interview Faculty Interview Candidate Files |
| Candidate Interview Completer Interview Faculty Interview Candidate Files |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria Overall Rating Statement:

Professional Suggestion:
Shifts & Tips for Completing Worksheets

★ Shift: Focused, targeted narratives
  ★ Tip: Adhere to Word Limits
  ★ Tip: Craft concise, cogent narratives

★ Shift: Criteria is assessed based on quality of evidence
  ★ Tip: Choose the BEST evidence.
    ★ Best Evidence is:
      ★ Representative of the larger body of evidence
      ★ Illustrative of a system or structure at an organization, not an anomaly
  ★ Tip: Use the Eval Tools as a reference

★ Shift: Looking for evidence of impact
  ★ Tip: Use narratives and supplemental docs to provide evidence of impact in addition to describing inputs and plans
Logistics for **2015-2016** Formal Reviews

- **Electronic Submission**
  - Cloud-based (Dropbox, Google Drive, etc.)
  - Flash Drive

- **Prepare for Cost**
  - Reviewer Accommodations
  - Review Team meals during the visit

- **Allocate time and resources – engage the organization**
  - Begin reviewing criteria and worksheets now

- **Work with Ed Prep Specialist – able to provide technical assistance, not feedback or early judgments.**
Differentiation of Reviews in 2015-2016

Instruction Domain Submission Requirements

★ All Teacher Programs- Only Instruction Worksheet
  ★ No Program of Study, Matrices, or Syllabi required
  ★ Narrative in worksheet will provide evidence of effective programs, outputs and onsite evidence may still warrant findings/ commendations
  ★ All approval designations (approved, approved w/ conditions, not approved)

★ Administrative Leadership Programs
  ★ Full submission required

★ Professional Support Programs
  ★ Full submission required
  ★ School Psychologist (NASP approval)
Questions?
Next Steps: Early & Important Decisions

⭐ Decide what programs (continuing or new) to put forth for review
  ⭐ Dormant Programs (zero completer/low completers)
  ⭐ 2 Year Moratorium on new programs following formal review

⭐ Decide how you will group programs for purposes of review
  ⭐ Common Program of Study
  ⭐ Be aware of Variety of Fields
  ⭐ Designate program “variations”

⭐ Confirm Timeline for review with Specialist
Next Steps

For the Review:

- Participate in initiation phone call
- Activate key stakeholders within organizations
- Begin working on Needs Assessments
- Begin working on Worksheets (Offsite submission)
- Disseminate Reviewer Recruitment materials

For today’s session:

- Right now: Working Session (debrief, review, plan, ask questions, etc.)
- Before you leave: Complete the feedback form
Thank you!

Please take a few minutes to complete the feedback form before you leave.

http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/toolkit