****

**Product Evaluation**

*Pre-Service Personnel Preparation Brief*

Fourteen individuals attending the three-day (September 12-14, 2019) ECPC Doctoral Student Institute at Avon Old Farms Hotel in Avon, Connecticut. The participants were asked to evaluate the quality, relevance, and usefulness of five products. This summary pertains to one of those documents, the *Pre-Service Personnel Preparation Brief*. Eleven (11) participants completed the product evaluation (78.6% response rate).

of the. Eleven (11) participants completed the evaluations, below is a summary of the results.

*Table 1. Quality: Substance and Communication (n = 11)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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.  | -- | -- | -- | 4 | 7 | -- | 4.64 | 0.50 |
| **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.  | -- | -- | 2 | 2 | 7 | -- | 4.45 | 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 quality of the product:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| * Front pages are cluttered. Check grammar and sentence structure and ease of reading.
 |
| * I like the current references!
 |
| * The 7 core practices are on point and clearly repeated as the foundation of the doc[ument].
 |
| * Too wordy but great tool for faculty to use to pitch practices/curriculum changes to dean/other faculty.
 |
| * Very informative and helpful to guide thinking.
 |

 |
|  |

Table 2. *Relevance: Needs, Pertinence & Reach (n = 11)*

| **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.  | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 9 | -- | 4.82 | 0.40 |
| **Pertinence:** The product addresses a problem or issue recognized as important by the target audience(s).  | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 9 | -- | 4.82 | 0.40 |
| **Reach:** The product’s content is applicable to diverse segments of the target audience(s).  | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 9 | -- | 4.82 | 0.40 |

***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:**

|  |
| --- |
| * Great for academic planning for IHE faculty.
 |
| * Not sure in what context this could be used - good info but not engaging - does not prompt action or interaction with info.
 |
| * Will be useful for those preparing these teachers. Is that the target?
 |

Table 3. *Usefulness: Ease & Suitability (n = 11)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 8 | -- | 4.64 | 0.67 |
| **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 | 8 | 0 | 4.64 | 0.67 |

***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:**

|  |
| --- |
| * Make the section on how to use information bigger/attractive/visual.
 |
| * This document is very well done. I really love the layout of those documents. I believe they are informative, clear, and useful for a variety of readers.
 |
| * This is great! Would have loved to have had this for my comps! I think this is a great resources for moving standards forward.
 |
| * Very text heavy - not sure how it could be used beyond as a research resource? \*Again, what makes

this info specific to EC? |

**Other comments:**

* Also I worry about early career teachers … the state mentoring program (in Ohio) isn't great … especially for ECE/ECSE.