CE COMMITTEE RATING SYSTEM

The proposal process is extremely competitive and only sixteen proposals will be accepted. The Continuing Education Committee selects workshops based on a number of factors (seven categories) and demonstration of adherence to the standards is required.

Please review the explanation of the rating system used by the CEC in their appraisal of workshop proposals. The seven categories are listed with an explanation of the point values assigned and resultant weightings (the highest possible total for any workshop is 64 points). Each proposal is rated by at least three committee members. Final selections are made in mid-March.

Previous presentations:
5 = APA CE Workshops
4 = National/International meetings
3 = Regional CE
2 = Graduate Programs
1 = Local
0 = None

Instructor qualifications:
8 = Recent publications and/or teaching expertise (national recognition and much experience)
7
6
5
4 = Some publications and/or teaching, expertise (local/regional recognition and moderate experience)
3
2
1 = No publications and/or teaching expertise (local recognition/little experience)

Curriculum Content:
10 = Full description and solid theoretical and/or empirically-based content and instructional methodology used in your workshop.
9
8
7
6
5 = Partial description with some theoretical and/or empirically-based content and instructional methodology used in your workshop
4
3
2
1 = Weak description and little theoretical and/or empirically-based content and instructional methodology used in your workshop

Learning Objectives:

5 = Learning objective stated clearly and written in measurable terms, using active verbs; Content is congruent with objectives; Correct number of objectives (3)

4

3 = Learning objective stated but lack clarity, written in measurable terms (although vague), using active verbs (more ambiguous outcomes); Correct number of objectives (3)

2

1 = Incorrect number of objectives, poorly stated, cannot measure outcomes, poorly articulated, and content does not match objectives

Schedule/format/activities:

5 = Varied learning methods, format appropriate for topic/objectives, adequately paced, and encourages participant interaction

4

3 = Overemphasis on single modality, pacing not correctly gauged, and some/little interaction

2

1 = Single learning method, no pacing method, and little/no interaction

References:

5 = Updated reference list demonstrating knowledge of current literature 4

3 = Reference included - may need updating 2

1 = Little/no references, outdated

Need:

8 = "Hot" topic with high demand, emerging area of psychology, strong interest in topic and evidence supporting need for psychologists to have/want information

7

6

5

4 = Needed topic, appeal not as high 3

2

1 = Narrow appeal and routinely available

Disclosure: Is this section complete and questions fully answered? Yes/No

Ethics: Is this section complete and are questions fully answered? Yes/No

Comments: Please include comments below for all proposals you review. If you are accepting a workshop please be sure to note any suggestions or changes and if your acceptance is conditional upon these. For workshops that you do not accept, please provide narrative outlining your concerns with specific attention to correspondence with relevant sections of the CE Standards and Criteria as well as any comments on the topic area (e.g., topic of limited relevance/importance, rated other proposals covering same topic higher).

Scores are collected and weighted as follow:

Previous Presentation:	no weighting (Max=5)
Instructor Qualifications:	rating * 1.5 (Max=12)
Curriculum Content:	rating * 2 (Max=20)
Learning Objectives:	no weighting (Max=5)
Schedule/format:	no weighting (Max=5)
References:	no weighting (Max=5)
Need:	rating * 1.5 (Max=12)

Total possible score: 64