**EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAM PROPOSAL EVALUATION INSTRUMENT**

**Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE)**

Connecticut Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) or other organizations seeking approval for new educator preparation programs must submit for evaluation to the Connecticut State Department of Education (CSDE) an application describing the program as well as program syllabi, key assessments, and faculty vita or resumes. This evaluation instrument: (1) provides explicit criteria that make clear basic expectations for new programs based on Connecticut certification regulations, and state and national content standards; (2) triangulates data and build an evidentiary base to inform evaluator decision-making; and (3) streamlines the proposal evaluation process. Using the rating scale below, evaluators first rate the sufficiency of proposal evidence using specific criteria for four evaluation categories: (1) Program Design, Scope and Sequence; (2) Candidate Assessment and Program Evaluation; (3) Faculty and Instructor Qualifications; and (4) Program Resources. If any rating for any evaluation category criterion is less than “4”, reviewers provide a brief summary of concerns, with specific examples:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Evidence Designation** | **Evidence Description** |
| 4 | Sufficient | Clear, convincing evidence demonstrating the criterion is met. |
| 3 | Sufficient w/Conditions | Evidence is mostly sufficient, but proposal requires some revision to fully meet the criterion. |
| 2 | Limited | Evidence inconsistently supports the criterion OR critical gaps exist within evidence for the criterion OR evidence is weakly linked to the criterion. |
| 1 | Insufficient | Inadequate evidence was found in support of the criterion. |

Evaluators next rate the proposal overall based on sufficiency of evidence using the same rating scale now aligned with options regarding whether or not the proposal moves to the next approval level (CSDE Review Committee):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Evidence Designation** | **Evidence Description** |
| 4 | Sufficient | Clear, convincing evidence demonstrating all criteria are met across the four evaluation categories. **Proposal moves forward to the Review Committee for consideration without any required revisions.** |
| 3 | Sufficient w/Conditions | Evidence is mostly sufficient, but proposal requires some revision to fully meet all criteria across the four evaluation categories. **Proposal moves forward to the Review Committee for consideration, with proposal revisions submitted to the CSDE for review prior to the Review Committee meeting.** |
| 2 | Limited | Across the four evaluation categories, evidence inconsistently supports criteria OR critical gaps within evidence exist OR evidence is weakly linked to criteria. **Proposal must be revised and resubmitted for team evaluation. Proposal does not move forward to CSDE Review Committee for consideration at this time.** |
| 1 | Insufficient | Inadequate evidence was found in support of most criteria across the four evaluation categories. **Proposal must be revised and resubmitted for team evaluation. Proposal does not move forward to the Review Committee for consideration at this time.** |

Please complete this evaluation instrument electronically and submit to [lauren.tafrate@ct.gov](mailto:lauren.tafrate@ct.gov).

1. **PROPOSAL EVALUATION BY CATEGORY**

Please rate the proposal based on sufficiency of evidence using specific criteria for four evaluation categories: (1) Program Design, Scope and Sequence; (2) Candidate Assessment and Program Evaluation; (3) Faculty and Instructor Qualifications; and (4) Program Resources. **Please highlight your ratings in yellow and provide a brief summary of concerns for ratings less than 4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION CATEGORY** | **RATING/EVIDENCE**  **(Please highlight your rating for each criterion in yellow)** |
| **1. Program Design, Scope and Sequence** |  |
| a. Program courses are coherently sequenced and cover the breadth and depth of content knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge and skills described by national content-specific standards. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| b. Program courses cover the breadth and depth of pedagogical knowledge and skills described by the Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) (if applicable—initial licensure programs only). | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| c. Program courses meet Connecticut regulatory and statutory requirements for educator preparation programs. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| d. Program fieldwork and clinical experiences are coherently sequenced and will provide candidates with sufficient opportunities to further develop and practice the application of pedagogical knowledge and skills described by national content-specific standards and the CCT (if applicable—initial licensure programs only). | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| e. Program fieldwork and clinical experiences will be closely supervised and formally evaluated by program faculty or qualified professionals. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| f. Proposed textbooks and other curriculum materials are current and reflect best practices. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| **2. Candidate Assessment and Program Evaluation** |  |
| a. Key assessment tasks, performance expectations and rubrics are aligned with course and/or program objectives and adequately represent performance requirements described by national content standards and the CCT (if applicable—initial licensure programs only). | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| b. Key assessments meet basic technical standards:   * Scoring guides/rubrics describe the quality and specifics of candidate performance (not just task completion). * If rubrics/scoring guides describe levels of candidate proficiency (e.g., “unacceptable”, “acceptable”, “target”), levels are clearly and evenly distinguishable from one another. * If rubrics/scoring guides describe levels of candidate proficiency (e.g., “unacceptable”, “acceptable”, “target”), performance levels and performance descriptions are congruent (e.g., language describing “acceptable” describes truly acceptable performance). * If rubrics/scoring guides are single point, target proficiency criteria are detailed, comprehensive, and truly describe target performance requirements. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| c. The EPP has a plan in place for the administration of key assessments, collection and analysis of assessment data, and the use of assessment data for candidate remediation and program evaluation. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| d. The EPP has a plan in place for training faculty and instructors to use key assessments, collect and analyze assessment data, and use assessment data for candidate remediation and program evaluation. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| **3. Program Faculty and Instructor Qualifications** |  |
| a. Program candidates will be instructed and/or evaluated by faculty/instructors withcontent-specific expertise (earned doctorates or exceptional expertise) and clinical supervisors who have professional P-12 experiences at the levels they will be supervising candidates. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| b. Program faculty/instructors have involvement in, or experience with, pre-k through 12 schools sometime during the last five years. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| c. Program faculty/instructors are of sufficient numbers to ensure that each candidate receives adequate training, mentoring, and remediation, if necessary. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| d. Program faculty/instructors who will provide oversight, supervision, and evaluation of program fieldwork and clinical experiences have been identified. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| **4. Program Resources** |  |
| a. The EPP has adequate faculty, campus and unit facilities to support program candidates in meeting standards, including resources to implement the program assessment plan and technology resources. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| b. Program faculty and candidates will have access to sufficient and current library and curricular resources, and electronic information. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |
| c. Resources for distance learning aspects of the program are sufficient to ensure that the delivery system will be reliable, speedy, and maintain candidate confidentiality. | 1 2 3 4  Insufficient Limited Sufficient w/Conditions Sufficient |
| Summary of concerns/examples if rating less than 4: |

1. **EVALUATION TEAM RECOMMENDATION**

Please rate the proposal overall based on sufficiency of evidence using the same rating scale now aligned with options regarding whether or not the proposal moves to the next approval level (CSDE Review Committee)**. Please highlight your final rating in yellow.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Evidence Designation** | **Evidence Description** |
| 4 | Sufficient | Clear, convincing evidence demonstrating all criteria are met. **Proposal moves forward to the Review Committee for consideration without any required revisions.** |
| 3 | Sufficient w/Conditions | Evidence is mostly sufficient, but proposal requires some revision to fully meet all criteria. **Proposal moves forward to the Review Committee for consideration, with proposal revisions submitted to the CSDE for review prior to the Review Committee meeting.** |
| 2 | Limited | Evidence inconsistently supports criteria OR critical gaps within evidence exist OR evidence is weakly linked to criteria. **Proposal must be revised and resubmitted for team evaluation. Proposal does not move forward to CSDE Review Committee for consideration at this time.** |
| 1 | Insufficient | Inadequate evidence was found in support of most criteria. **Proposal must be revised and resubmitted for team evaluation. Proposal does not move forward to the Review Committee for consideration at this time.** |