****

**Product Evaluation**

**Metasynthesis Pre-Service Briefs**

State team members from four states who receive intenstive TA from ECPC were asked to evaluate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of the Metasynthesis Pre-Service Briefs. The state team members rated the briefs during their attendance at an ECPC Institute focused on facilitating the state teams work towards building a Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD). There are six briefs that derive from the Metasynthesis, with each brief describing an aspect of high imipact teaching related practices. These are; Purpose of the Briefs, Faculy Coaching, Cooperative Learning, Web Based Instruction, Course Based Instruction, Teaching Methods, and Student Field Experiences. The quality, relevance, and usefulness of the briefs was rated on a five-point Likert scale; strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree. Twenty-five (25) participants completed the evaluations, below is a summary of the results.

*Table 1. Quality: Substance and Communication (n=25)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality** | **SD** | **D** | **N** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| **Substance:** The product’s content reflects evidence of conceptual soundness and quality, grounded in recent scientific evidence, legislation, policy, or accepted professional practice. | -- | -- | 1 | 14 | 10 | -- | 4.36 | 0.57 |
| **Communication:** The product’s content is presented in such a way so as to be clearly understood, as evidenced by being well-organized, free of editorial errors, and appropriately formatted. | -- | 3 | 4 | 13 | 5 | -- | 3.80 | 0.91 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N= Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

**Additional comments related to the quality of the product:**

* Clarify graphs to indicate measures with meeting for those without statistical backgrounds.
* Many need to define inquiry-based learning (not of terms may be helpful as a handout. Faculty coaching + instructional… has a typo on the back page embedded.
* I think there is value in raising the importance of degree completion + how degree completion supports strengthens individuals' capacity in the 7 practices identified as "very high" or "high" impact. This plays into how we focus on what kinds of people are able to enter practice.
* Need to be backed by more evidence.
* Difficult to differentiate at a glance, perhaps title header in a different color for each. White on purple is difficult for visually impaired, not enough control text in white bold is better or no contrast is better.
* Product is good, sound, well-researched but is too dense. Less words more visuals. Not sure I would use this to share with others. Feels condescending.
* Wording. White on purple is hard to read.
* Core practices in pre-service teacher prep impact table is nice but may be helpful to have reference t examples of the very high and high impact so that IHE faculty have some examples of how to implement/ make it work. There are some typos and inconsistencies between documents in the overview section across all briefs.

Table 2. *Relevance: Needs, Pertinence & Reach (n =25)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Relevance** | **SD** | **D** | **N** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| **Need:** The product attempts to solve an important problem or deal with a critical issue. | -- | 1 | 2 | 16 | 6 | -- | 4.08 | 0.70 |
| **Pertinence:** The product addresses a problem or issue recognized as important by the target audience(s). | -- | 1 | 2 | 15 | 7 | -- | 4.12 | 0.73 |
| **Reach:** The product’s content is applicable to diverse segments of the target audience(s). | -- | 2 | 6 | 11 | 6 | -- | 3.84 | 0.90 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N= Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

**Additional comments related to the relevance of the product:**

* Highly technical.
* Yes, but if used across disciplines, you need to define terms related to practice.
* Rating from an equity perspective. Who is excluded? If degree completion os out of reach it is a very high impact indeed. In a bad way.
* Info sheets while trying to address multiple groups they seem a little too generic and not personalized at least on accuracy level.
* Feels like the target audience is doctoral students or other researchers. Feels too academic to be useful in real-world scenarios how a dean uses this to make decisions about programs.
* Diversity in higher ed audiences could be more clearly targeted- not sure how well it will reach different degree levels ad different degree/ disciplines (even gen d and spec-ed programs).
* Who is the target audience?

Table 3. *Usefulness: Ease & Suitability (n =25)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Usefulness** | **SD** | **D** | **N** | **A** | **SA** | **N/A** | **M** | **STD** |
| **Ease:** The product addresses a problem or issue in an easily understood way, with directions or guidance regarding how the content can be used to address the problem or issue. | -- | 1 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 4.25 | 0.79 |
| **Suitability:** The product provides the target audience(s) with information or resources that can be used again or in different ways to address the problem or issue. | -- | 1 | 2 | 9 | 10 | 1 | 4.33 | 0.82 |

***Note:*** *SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N= Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, N/A = Not Applicable, M = Mean, STD = Standard Deviation*

**Additional comments related to the usefulness of the product:**

* I like the consistent format throughout. Is there any breakout of this info for 0-3 only? I feel like this is even more of a challenge to feel prepared after school, it is not for everyone (meaning many people don't fully understand it + think it required less skills than the classroom, are also usually underprepared for children 0-3, coaching (true coaching). The challenge of providing services in a natural environment would be so helpful to see data for 0-3! :)
* Good doc. Nice visuals colors. Less words. Explain the statistical tech language.
* Information is laid out in a way that provides quick reading without missing important details. Provides what I could see as a good resource for personnel prep of an education program.
* Liked that products showed why the research was important and how findings could be useful to improve processes and procedures to support better student outcomes.
* Visuals on teaching methods were the most useful because it drew me to read it. Maybe because I am no an academic, it does not make sense to me, and because I am not sure it's useful, I probably would not share with my state's higher ed faculty who may find it helpful.
* Some graphs may not be understood by those outside of the education field. These briefs may be more helpful for others, such legislators rather than EPP.
* Good content, but very dense.
* The section on "how can we use this info" is very easy to understand and easy to make identified steps to take we have to start somewhere (teachers), but would love to see broadening this to additional disciplines- particularly in Part C, but also 619 prep.
* Beyond our CSPD, my specific work will benefit from using their briefs. I have an Americorps program with Corps members who we train (teach) to use specific interventions. We need members to implement the interventions correctly for impact on student growth — skills in reading. We need methods of teaching to the needs of members so they have the knowledge and skills for fidelity of implementation it starts with us.
* Need a good editor!