This document is designed to support the development of an accurate and complete submission for an offsite review for program approval. The offsite review is a document review. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (ESE) has structured the organization and targeted the content for this review. In so doing, ESE ensures that documentation supplied by the Sponsoring Organization (SO) is directly linked to criteria on which the review is evaluated. This supports a more effective and efficient review process by:

* Requiring SOs to submit only what is absolutely necessary for the review, and
* Ensuring reviewers have everything they need to complete a thorough evidence-based evaluation.

Formal v. Informal Review

The information provided below is relevant to the offsite review for both formal and informal approval. See the [Guidelines for Program Approval](http://www.doe.mass.edu/edprep/ProgramApproval.pdf) for a complete description of formal and informal review and the processes that guides each.

For the formal review, the offsite review is one part of the review; additional evidence is reviewed and evaluated during the onsite review (site visit) and in conjunction with relevant output measures.

For the informal review, the offsite review is the primary evidence based upon which the decision regarding approval is made. Similar to formal review, informal review also uses output measures (where available) as a component in the overall review determination. Informal review occurs in two instances:

1. Existing Sponsoring Organization (already approved as an educator preparation provider in MA) wishes to put forth a new program(s) (New Program)
2. New organization would like to become an approved educator preparation provider in MA (New Organization)

The submission requirements vary depending on the type (formal v. informal) or instance (new program v. new organization) of the review. Any interested new organization should contact edprep@doe.mass.edu for full and complete guidance. Any currently approved educator preparation provider should contact edprep@doe.mass.edu to indicate your intent to put forth a new program(s).

Organization of Submission

Program Approval Standards, Domains and Criteria

All Sponsoring Organizations are accountable for the program approval standards set forth in [603 CMR 7.03](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=03). For the purposes of review, ESE has organized the Program Approval Standards into categories, called domains, and then further into criteria.
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Criteria in each domain are derived directly from the Program Approval Standards and are designed to distill high-level concepts into a set of concrete, actionable criteria. Organizing the submission this way minimizes duplicate efforts in terms of both preparing and evaluating evidence. With these domains, evidence that would otherwise be collected and considered in two standards (i.e., Standard A – Continuous Improvement and Standard G – Program Impact) are now required, and subsequently evaluated, only once. Program Approval Standards are divided into the following domains: The Organization, Partnerships, Continuous Improvement, The Candidate, Field-Based Experiences and Instruction. See pages 4-5 for a complete crosswalk of Standards to domains.

Worksheets

Worksheets are the primary component of the offsite submission. Worksheets outline all required documents and prompt SOs to craft narratives that directly respond to the criteria on which the organization is evaluated. The worksheets standardize the review process, creating consistency across organizations and allowing reviewers to improve evaluative judgments through increased calibration.

There is a worksheet for each domain. All domains, with the exception of the Instruction Domain, are evaluated at the organizational level. Sponsoring Organizations, as the educator preparation provider seeking approval, will submit one set of evidence for each of these domains. In the case of the Instruction Domain, however, SOs will submit one set of evidence per program. For example, each Sponsoring Organization will submit a single set of evidence in support of The Candidate Domain, whereas for the Instruction Domain both the elementary program and the math program will each submit their own set of evidence.

For informal reviews, Educator Preparation Specialists will work with individual SOs to determine which domain worksheets will be required for submission.

Completing the Worksheets

ESE recognizes that the worksheet structure is a new approach for many Sponsoring Organizations in the state. Below are some helpful hints in preparing an accurate and thorough submission.

Adhere to word limits.

For each narrative, ESE has imposed a word limit to encourage concise, clearly articulated answers to each prompt. The narrow margin of space for responses will focus efforts of the SO and ensure that reviewers get only the most crucial information.

Include only the strongest evidence.

Strong evidence is:

* **Outcomes-based**: Evidence should inform whether your plans/actions are/were successful.
* **Specific and, whenever possible, quantifiable**: Evidence should be numeric in measure or descriptive in nature.
* **Aligned with criteria**: Evidence should be directly linked to the criteria being evaluated.

It is in the best interest of SOs to be selective in their choice of evidence; we don’t need every example, we want your most compelling. An abundance of documentation and data can prevent the reviewer from seeing the most critical information to and undercut the effectiveness of the review. SOs have the opportunity to provide evidence in two ways:

**In narratives**: Narratives are generated in response to prompts. Prompts vary in structure, some ask for examples, others for impact data, and some are process-oriented. Regardless of the prompt, ESE would always prefer to see evidence that speaks to impact or data related to effectiveness. Strong evidence is representative of the work done by the SO during the time period of the review. Strong evidence is not an anomaly, but rather emblematic of a system or structure that is in place to yield similar results.

**With supplemental documents**: These are documents chosen by the SO in support of narratives. If included (they are optional), they should be referenced within the narrative. Supplemental documents must be artifacts of practice or data-related, extended narratives will not be accepted as supplemental documentation. Portions of long artifacts, such as a page out of a student handbook, further focus the reviewer’s eye on the strongest evidence. SOs should refer to the list of required documents and use the “potential” list as a guide post for what or what not to include.

Refer to required or supplemental documents in the narrative responses.

With only limited space, SOs should not repeat or duplicate information that is available elsewhere in the submission. Supplemental documents should be referenced so that reviewers understand why they were included in the submission. SOs should consider any state collected output measure (i.e., employment data, survey data, etc.) as another evidence source reviewers will consider. SOs are welcome to reference this data in narratives as well.

Remember that the offsite is a starting point for the review.

Especially in the case of formal reviews but also true of informal reviews, the offsite is the beginning of evidence collection and evaluation. ESE intends to work with SOs as reviewers triangulate evidence from the offsite, the onsite, and available output measures. The process is designed to be comprehensive and support complex decision making.

*Toolkit resources, including worksheets, may be updated or revised. SOs should work with their Educator Preparation Specialist to determine the correct version for the period of review.*

Program Approval Standards and Domain Crosswalk

| **Domain** | **Program Approval Standards (603 CMR 7.04)** |
| --- | --- |
| **Organization**  | Standard (C) Capacity: Create, deliver and sustain effective preparation programs.  |
| **Partnerships**  | Standard (B) Collaboration and Program Impact: Collaborate with school districts to ensure positive impact in meeting the needs of the districts. |
| **Continuous Improvement** | Standard (A) Continuous ImprovementConduct an annual evaluation to assess program compliance, effectiveness, and impact using a data driven system to ensure continuous improvement. |
| Standard (G) Educator Effectiveness Analyze and use: aggregate evaluation rating data of program completers, employment data on program completers employed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, results of survey data, and other available data to improve program effectiveness. |
| **Candidate**  | Standard (c) Capacity: Create, deliver and sustain effective preparation programs.  |
| Standard (d) Subject Matter Knowledge**Initial License** - Subject Matter Knowledge (SMK): Ensure that program completers have content mastery based on the subject matter knowledge requirements; [603 CMR 7.06, 7.07, 7.09, and 7.11](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=06), at the level of an initially licensed educator. |
| **Field-Based Experiences** | Standard (C) Capacity: Create, deliver and sustain effective preparation programs.  |
| **Instruction** | Standard (C) Capacity: Create, deliver and sustain effective preparation programs.  |
| Standard (D) Subject Matter Knowledge**Initial License** - Subject Matter Knowledge (SMK): Ensure that program completers have content mastery based on the subject matter knowledge requirements; [603 CMR 7.06, 7.07, 7.09, and 7.11](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=06), at the level of an initially licensed educator**Professional License** – Advanced Subject Matter Knowledge: Ensure that program completers have advanced content mastery based on the subject matter knowledge requirements; [603 CMR 7.06 and 7.07](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=07) at the level of a professionally licensed educator. |
|
| Standard (E) Professional Standards for Teachers**Initial License** – Professional Standards for Teachers: Ensure that program completers have been assessed and mastered the Professional Standards for Teachers, [603 CMR 7.08](http://www.doe.mass.edu/lawsregs/603cmr7.html?section=08) at the level of an initially licensed teacher.**Professional License** – Advanced Professional Standards for Teachers: Ensure that program completers have been assessed and mastered the Professional Standards for Teachers at the level of a professionally licensed teacher. |
|
| Standard (F) Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership: Ensure that program completers have been assessed and mastered the Professional Standards for Administrative Leadership at the level of an initially licensed administrator. |
| Standard (G) Educator Effectiveness: Analyze and use: aggregate evaluation rating data of program completers, employment data on program completers employed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, results of survey data, and other available data to improve program effectiveness. |