### Eval Tool: Candidate Domain

**Offsite and Onsite Evidence Rating Scale**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rating | Evidence Label | Evidence Description |
| 4 | Compelling | Irrefutable evidence that criterion is being met consistently; or, sufficient evidence that while criterion is being met throughout the organization, one or more areas (i.e., programs) presents evidence above and beyond criteria. Would serve as a model to others. |
| 3 | Sufficient | Clear, convincing evidence demonstrating criterion is being met |
| 2 | Limited | Evidence inconsistently supports criterion; gaps within evidence exist; evidence is weakly linked to criterion |
| 1 | Insufficient | Inadequate evidence was found in support of the criterion |

**Output Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Evidence Description |
| + | Data supports the criterion |
| ? | Inconclusive data |
| - | Data contrasts with the criterion |

**Output Data Labels**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Label | Where to Find Data | Data Types |
| \* | Sent by specialist with offsite materials | Partner Survey; Candidate, Completer, Supervising Practitioner, and Hiring Principal Surveys; |
| \*\* | Available on public profiles | Demographic data, Employment data, Ed Eval data |
| \*\*\* | Compiled by Specialist | MTEL, CAP/PAL data, SGP data |
| Italics | Not yet available for use in reviews | Persistence data, GPA |

**Finding Output Data on Public Profiles**

1. Go to doe.mass.edu
2. Hover over “Data & Accountability” in the menu bar
3. Hover down to “Data Tools”
4. Select “School and District Profiles”
5. Under Directories, choose “Educator Preparation Program Providers”
6. Select organization from list of providers
7. For most output data, select “Ed Prep Students” tab; for annual goals, select “General” tab
8. Select data type in menu bar on the left side of the page
9. Navigate between years in the upper left hand corner

|  | OFFSITE | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Offsite Submission from SO | | | | State-collected Outputs | | | | |
| CAN Criterion 1:  Systems to recruit and admit candidates result in increased racial and ethnic diversity of completers in the workforce | Candidate Worksheet Prompt 1a & 1b | | | | Demographic Data\*\* | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | 2  Limited | 3  Sufficient | 4  Compelling | -  Contrasts | | ?  Inconclusive | | +  Supports |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | Evidence:  Rationale: | | | | |
| ONSITE | | | | | | | | |
| As applicable (e.g., Welcome Meeting) | | | | | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | | 2  Limited | | 3  Sufficient | | | 4  Compelling | |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion Overall Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Criteria Overall Rating Statement: | | | |  | Commendation | | | |
|  | Criteria Met | | | |
|  | Finding | | | |
| Professional Suggestion: | | | | | | | | |

|  | OFFSITE | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Offsite Submission from SO | | | | State-collected Outputs | | | | |
| CAN Criterion 2:  Admission criteria and processes are rigorous such that those admitted demonstrate success in the program and during employment in the licensure role. | Candidate Worksheet Prompt 2a, 2b & 2c  Admission Policy | | | | Candidate Survey\*  Completer Survey\*  Educator Evaluation Data\*\*  MTEL Data\*\*\* | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | 2  Limited | 3  Sufficient | 4  Compelling | -  Contrasts | | ?  Inconclusive | | +  Supports |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | Evidence:  Rationale: | | | | |
| ONSITE | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Artifacts  Faculty – Arts & Sciences Focus Group  Faculty – Full and Part-time Program Faculty Focus Group(s)  Program Supervisor Focus Group  Supervising Practitioner Focus Group | | | | | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | | 2  Limited | | 3  Sufficient | | | 4  Compelling | |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion Overall Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Criteria Overall Rating Statement: | | | |  | Commendation | | | |
|  | Criteria Met | | | |
|  | Finding | | | |
| Professional Suggestion: | | | | | | | | |

|  | OFFSITE | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Offsite Submission from SO | | | | State-collected Outputs | | | | |
| CAN Criterion 3:  Candidates receive effective advising throughout the program (including, but not limited to, being knowledgeable about licensure requirements and career development and placement services that contribute to employment upon completion). | Candidate Worksheet Prompt 3a, 3b & 3c  Advising Policy | | | | Candidate Survey\*  Completer Survey\* | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | 2  Limited | 3  Sufficient | 4  Compelling | -  Contrasts | | ?  Inconclusive | | +  Supports |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | Evidence:  Rationale: | | | | |
| ONSITE | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Artifacts  Candidate/Completer Focus Group(s)  Faculty – Arts & Sciences Focus Group  Faculty – Full and Part-time Program Faculty Focus Group(s) | | | | | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | | 2  Limited | | 3  Sufficient | | | 4  Compelling | |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion Overall Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Criteria Overall Rating Statement: | | | |  | Commendation | | | |
|  | Criteria Met | | | |
|  | Finding | | | |
| Professional Suggestion: | | | | | | | | |

|  | OFFSITE | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Offsite Submission from SO | | | | State-collected Outputs | | | | |
| CAN Criterion 4:  Candidates at-risk of not meeting standards are identified throughout the program (in pre-practicum, during coursework, and while in practicum) and receive necessary supports and guidance to improve or exit the program. | Candidate Worksheet Prompt 4a & 4b  Advising OR Admission policy | | | | Candidate Survey\*  Completer Survey\*  Educator Evaluation Data\*\*  MTEL Data\*\*\* | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | 2  Limited | 3  Sufficient | 4  Compelling | -  Contrasts | | ?  Inconclusive | | +  Supports |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | Evidence:  Rationale: | | | | |
| ONSITE | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Artifacts  Faculty – Arts & Sciences Focus Group  Faculty – Full and Part-time Program Faculty Focus Group(s)  FBE Staff Interview  Program Supervisor Focus Group  Supervising Practitioner Focus Group | | | | | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | | 2  Limited | | 3  Sufficient | | | 4  Compelling | |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion Overall Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Criteria Overall Rating Statement: | | | |  | Commendation | | | |
|  | Criteria Met | | | |
|  | Finding | | | |
| Professional Suggestion: | | | | | | | | |

|  | OFFSITE | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Offsite Submission from SO | | | | State-collected Outputs | | | | |
| CAN Criterion 5:  Waiver policy ensures that academic and professional standards of the licensure role are met. | Candidate Worksheet Prompt 5  Waiver Policy | | | |  | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | 2  Limited | 3  Sufficient | 4  Compelling | -  Contrasts | | ?  Inconclusive | | +  Supports |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | |
| ONSITE | | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Artifacts | | | | | | | | |
| 1  Insufficient | | 2  Limited | | 3  Sufficient | | | 4  Compelling | |
| Evidence:      Rationale: | | | | | | | | |
| Criterion Overall Rating | | | | | | | | |
| Criteria Overall Rating Statement: | | | |  | Commendation | | | |
|  | Criteria Met | | | |
|  | Finding | | | |
| Professional Suggestion: | | | | | | | | |

Overall Domain Summary

| Criterion | Offsite | Output | | Onsite | Commendation | | Criterion Met | Finding |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Systems to recruit and admit candidates result in increased racial and ethnic diversity of completers in the workforce |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Admission criteria and processes are rigorous such that those admitted demonstrate success in the program and during employment in the licensure role. |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Candidates receive effective advising throughout the program (including, but not limited to, being knowledgeable about licensure requirements and career development and placement services that contribute to employment upon completion). |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Candidates at-risk of not meeting standards are identified throughout the program (in pre-practicum, during coursework, and while in practicum) and receive necessary supports and guidance to improve or exit the program. |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |
| 1. Waiver policy ensures that academic and professional standards of the licensure role are met. |  |  | |  |  | |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| Domain Summary | | | Overall Domain Recommendation | | | | | |
|  | | |  | | | Exemplary | | |
|  | | | Proficient | | |
|  | | | Needs Improvement | | |
|  | | | Unsatisfactory | | |