

**OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

University of South Florida St. Petersburg
July 17, 2014

Offsite Team Members

Dr. Philip S. Roberson, Chair
Dr. RoSusan D. Bartee, Member
Mr. Orman G. Feres III, Member
Dr. David K. Pugalee, Member
Ms. Terri R. Vest, Member

Offsite Team Observers

Ms. Kay A. Caster, State Consultant
Ms. Wendy Wiggins, CAEP Staff Consultant

BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT: CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY

The Purpose the of BOE Offsite Report

One of the key features of the Continuous Improvement (CI) Pathway is the combination of formative and summative processes. *The BOE Offsite Report provides formative feedback from the offsite review meeting. The BOE Onsite Report provides a summative evaluation of the findings from the onsite visit.*

The following BOE Offsite Report indicates areas of concern on which the Onsite BOE Team will focus during the upcoming visit. In addition, the last section for each standard is a list of evidence that the team plans to validate during the visit to ensure that the standards continue to be met. This validation will occur as the team interviews faculty, administrators, school-based partners, and other members of the professional community. Validation could also occur in the visits to schools and observations on campus. The validation list also includes some specific documentation that the team would like to review during the onsite visit. In some cases, the Offsite Team members could not locate a document or open a link and have requested that the Onsite Team review those documents.

The BOE Offsite Team has conducted a thorough review of the Institutional Report and exhibits to produce this report; however, the BOE Onsite Team is not limited to these findings. If the team is unable to validate information, or if further or contradictory information is found, the Onsite BOE Team may request additional evidence and/or cite new concerns as areas for improvement.

**BOARD OF EXAMINERS OFFSITE REPORT:
CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT PATHWAY**

I. Movement Toward Target

Please indicate the standard(s) on which the unit selected to demonstrate movement toward target:

Initial	Advanced	Standards
		Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions
		Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
		Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
X	X	Standard 4: Diversity
		Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
		Standard 6: Governance and Resources

II. Unit Standards

Standard 1. Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions

Candidates preparing to work in schools as teachers or other school professionals know and demonstrate the content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, pedagogical and professional knowledge and skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

1.1 Preliminary Findings

1.1.a What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit offers a Bachelors of Science in Education (BXE) leading to certification in both general and special education as well as an endorsement in English as a Second Language and Reading (ESOL). Initial certification programs also include a Master of Arts in Elementary Education and ESOL, Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) in Exceptional Student Education (program scheduled for termination in fall 2014), and the Professional Training Option (PTO) (for adding endorsements) as a minor in the BXE. Advanced licensure programs include the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership Development, Educational Leadership Track to Certification-only, and the MA in Reading Education (K-12). Beginning in summer 2014 a certificate in Early Childhood and Family Studies will be offered. The BXE and the Master's in Educational Leadership are also offered at the Pasco-Hernando State College (PHSC). The Elementary Education bachelors program and the Educational Leadership programs are also offered at New Port Richey.

The unit has developed assessments aligned to the three organizing themes of its conceptual framework (CF): Knowledgeable Professionalism, Reflective Teaching, and Collaborative Leadership. Candidates in initial teacher certification programs are evaluated at four transition points (described below) with assessments aligned with these CF themes. However, alignment with these themes is not evident for advanced programs.

Although the institutional report mentions an assessment system and conceptual framework revision and realignment process (pages 6 and 11), the nature and basis of the process is unclear; which stakeholders participated is also unclear.

Initial teacher certification candidates are evaluated at four transition points: 1. admission to the program; 2. entry to the unit assessment system; 3. admission to the final internship; 4. exit and graduation. The second transition point includes three tiers: admission and first course; before the final internship; and pre-graduation with candidates completing all requirements. Exhibit 1.4.d summarizes the number of candidates that pass or fail the transition points. Data are reported for summer/fall/spring for 2009-2010 and 2011-2012 for elementary education, ESE, ESOL, Reading, ESOL, and the MAT. For Tier 2, which includes the FEAP Portfolio, the FTCE Exams, and grade point average/course completion, there are large numbers of candidates who do not pass the tier. In spring 2011, for example, the pass:fail numbers are 55:53. In addition, there are discrepancies in the data, such as the Tier 3 data for spring 2010 which shows a total of

thirteen candidates who failed the Before Graduation Full FEAP and ESOL requirements; but, there are only four candidates listed for Elementary Education/ESOL. The programs for the other nine candidates are not clear. The IR does not provide the data that are used to make those decisions at the three tiers. For example, there are no data related to grades or reports of candidate performance on state exams required for licensure. Data are not provided for the various assessments that are used as a basis for judging pass/fail for the three tiers reported in the Candidate Performance Data reports (Exhibit 1.4.d). Without these data, there is insufficient evidence for reviewers to make determinations about the candidates' successful progression through the three tiers.

In reference to candidate content knowledge, as reported in the IR, the new unit assessment system was implemented in the fall of 2013. Consequently, the unit "has limited data related to the new assessment system" (page 7) at the time of the report. Three years of data from FTCE exams, disaggregated by program, as well as evidence of an aggregate 80 percent pass rate on licensure exams in the content area, were not documented.

Consistent with the constraints noted above for documentation of candidate content knowledge, data that provide evidence of candidate attainment of pedagogical content knowledge and skills were not evident (e.g., knowledge and use of instructional strategies, presentation of content in clear and meaningful ways, use of instructional technology, etc). Nor was data evidence that support candidate attainment of proficiencies related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills (consideration of school and family contexts, knowledge and use of theories and research, reflective practice, etc.).

A teacher work sample (TWS) is required for all initial certification candidates. The TWS is based on a comprehensive two-week plan with accompanying assessments. In the final internship candidates implement their unit and assess the impact on the K-12 students' learning including the learning environment, learning goals aligned to the Sunshine State Standards and the Common Core, design of instruction and an assessment plan, delivery of instruction, and a reflection incorporating candidate and student performance. Data from the TWS show a 100 percent success rate on measures (see IR 1.4.g, Final Intern TWS Ratings). Data provided in the IR, however, are not disaggregated by program.

Candidates in the Exceptional Student Education (ESE) MAT and MA (program implemented in spring 2012) programs also complete an exit portfolio which includes an action research project and final paper. The portfolio is a major assessment for these programs. Data reported show 100 percent pass rates for three of five semesters, 67 percent for one semester, and 75 percent for one semester. The MAT in ESE is discontinued with the last candidate graduating in Fall 2014. The MA in ESE will continue to be offered.

The program assesses candidate dispositions in the BXE, Dual Track, Reading, Math/Science Masters, and ESE MAT programs. They are assessed as part of the final internship for initial teacher certification candidates. The IR reports data on the number of successful candidates in these programs. Exhibit 1.4.f provides aggregate data on the assessment of candidates' professional dispositions by program. In the MA in Reading candidates have a mid-program review and evaluation of dispositions based on the International Reading Association's

professional dispositions for reading educators. The IR reports that all candidates in 2011 were acceptable for six IRA standards and one candidate was unacceptable for IRA 6.2.1. In 2012 and 2013, 100 percent of candidates were acceptable. In Math/Science Masters programs all candidates received acceptable ratings (1 candidate in fall 2011 and 3 in summer 2013). Candidates in the Educational Leadership program complete a self-evaluation of their professional dispositions with scores for each disposition ranging from 0-3. Data for fall 2011 ranged from 2.71 to 3.00. However, data on dispositions are not reported for advanced programs.

For both initial and advanced programs, it is not clear what key assessments are required. The IR provides no clearly defined listing of key course assessments for the various programs. In addition there are no data reported for candidate performance on key assessments. Although the IR reports that key assessments are administered at the course level across the unit during both coursework and internship, data for such assessments were not provided.

The unit assesses the quality of program completers through Employer Satisfaction and Graduate surveys. Revision of these surveys, conducted by the FLDOE, is in progress to align them to the new Florida guiding standards.

The employer survey results for 2011-2012 (Exhibit 1.4.j) provide ratings of teacher performance on instructional design and lesson planning, the learning environment, instructional delivery and facilitation, assessment, continuous professional improvement and professional responsibility and ethical conduct. Ratings support that graduates are highly effective or effective in these areas except for “Developing” ratings for Learning Environment (14%), Instructional Delivery and Facilitation (21%), and Assessment (7%). Data for USF Saint Petersburg were included with the USF Tampa data until the 2008-2009 cohort; therefore, the unit does not have employer data prior to 2009-2010. Completer Survey Results (Exhibit 1.4.i) available for 2011-2012 provide responses on multiple components related to the quality of the teacher education program using HE (Highly Effective), E (Effective), and NI (Needs Improvement). For the majority of areas, completers rated the program as HE or E. The unit identified several areas as priorities based on the survey data: develop a climate that fosters inquiry (15% NI); teach literacy strategies across the curriculum through explicit instruction (25% NI); employ higher-order questioning techniques (33% NI); differentiate instruction based on an assessment of differing needs and diversity of students (25% NI).

The unit distributes surveys to program completers in the Educational Leadership program. For 2010-2011 no surveys were completed and returned. Program faculty are attempting to address this issue. An employer survey is also sent to employers of program completers to gather information on district employers’ satisfaction with the level of preparedness of program completers during their first year in their positions. For the one year for which data are reported in the IR, 100 percent of employers rated candidates as Highly Effective in adhering to ethical standards expected of an educator in an administrative position and in the school community, adhering to the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession in Florida, recognizing diversity as an asset, and organizing time, tasks, and projects effectively with clear objectives and coherent plans. From the IR it is not clear when these data were collected or the number of responses.

1.1.b How were unit programs reviewed by the BOE? What trends emerged? What do these trends reveal about the unit's programs?

All programs leading to certification require state level approval, which is current for all appropriate programs through 2015. None of the programs submitted, or were required to submit, reports for review by the Specialty Professional Associations. The BXE and the Master's in Educational Leadership are also offered at the Pasco-Hernando State College (PHSC). State program approval documents did not provide additional information to clearly establish the quality of programs, candidates or assessments.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

1.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

As reported in the IR, changes in the unit since the last NCATE visit (2009) suggest a pattern of continuous improvement. As examples,

- an ESA MA (special education) degree was re-introduced in the fall of 2012;
- an MA in Middle Grades STEM was implemented in the summer of 2012;
- many online and face-to-face courses developed and/or re-designed;
- a Reading Masters course was modified;
- the Unit assessment system and conceptual framework were modified, as were accompanying rubrics; and
- advising and assessment practices were modified.

However, the extent to which these changes were data-informed is not consistently established in evidence provided.

1.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement

AFIs continued from last visit:

AFI Number & Text	Apply to	AFI Rationale
1. The unit does not ensure that all candidates, faculty, and P-12 partners are familiar with the conceptual framework and how it relates to the unit's programs.	ITP, ADV	Although the conceptual framework is consistently referenced and embedded in program information including assessments and course syllabi, more evidence will be needed to support that candidates, faculty and P-12 partners are familiar with the conceptual framework.

1.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

Data are not disaggregated by program or by criteria, making it difficult to determine whether candidates meet the specific proficiencies identified by Standard 1.

Rationale: The unit has not clearly identified its key assessments or systematically provided data by program or for key assessments. While the unit presents quite a bit of data, these data do not clearly support that candidates are meeting all of the proficiencies delineated in the elements of Standard 1.

1.5 Evidence for the Onsite BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Candidate performance data are aggregated for multiple criteria as pass/fail with number of candidates in each category. Are disaggregated data available for the individual criteria, i.e. specific proficiencies that are measured by assessments?
- (2) The unit should provide data, aggregated and disaggregated by program type, instead of summary data reflected in candidate counts. Data should be presented for all assessments. Are there candidate data on which the pass/fail numbers were derived for the tiers in the transition points?
- (3) Were there key assessments prior to the 2012 revision and realignment? Where are the data for key assessments by program?
- (4) The data presentation is difficult to follow. Multiple documents have the same exhibit number and appropriate documents are not systematically referenced in the narrative. It is understandable that the 2012 revision and realignment would result in changes to the assessments. It would be helpful to have a table or chart specifying the assessments in place before the realignment and those in place after the realignment with clear lists of the data that is available for the various assessments. This would help clarify the number of administrations for which assessment data are reported.
- (5) What data are available for the Elementary Education bachelors program and the Educational Leadership programs at New Port Richey?
- (6) What does the unit do with the state Value Added Measures (VAM) data? How do these data reflect on the preparation of teachers? Do these data apply to other school professionals?
- (7) Will the BOE team have access to more recent data than 2011-12? Note that CAEP requires three years of assessment data for programs undergoing continuing accreditation review.

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Based on legislative mandate and policy revision, the state of Florida required all institutions to revise their initial and advanced teacher education and licensure programs (2010). In response, the unit at the University of South Florida-Petersburg revised the conceptual framework; revised and realigned program curriculum matrices and assessment instruments; and designed and implemented a new assessment system (FolioData), as well as the candidate orientation to program expectations, guiding standards and the assessment system. The revised conceptual framework has served as an important measure for generating evaluation approaches instituted in the newly created assessment system. The process of revision and realignment occurred with the use of curriculum maps and the identification of courses, internships, and learning experiences focused on developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Particularly with the design and implementation of the assessment system, the unit created its own assessment management system called Folio Data, which generates data, standards-based reports, internship placements, and employer satisfaction and graduate surveys. Additionally, new courses were developed and selected existing courses were re-designed to address program revisions and to orient candidates to related data collection and analysis needs.

The assessment system is a comprehensive integration of data collection, analysis, and monitoring of various measures conducted at multiple points from entry through exit. The assessment system focuses on the following components for initial and advanced candidates: (1) admission to the program; (2) entry to Unit assessment system; (3) admission to the final internship; and (4) exit/graduation. The data can be disaggregated to identify areas for improvement that need to be addressed specifically for operational and policy purposes. The data collected by the Unit include the following: (1) state licensure assessment; (2) professional-content based assessment; (3) assessment of planning; (4) assessment of professional dispositions; (5) assessment on candidate's impact on student learning; (6) assessment of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience; and (7) assessment of program completers.

Review of the data occurs within the Unit and findings from the data are used for the purposes of program improvement. Using the FolioData system, data are collected and shared with Unit stakeholders (i.e. candidates, faculty, administrators, internship office, internship supervisors, cooperating teachers, academic advising office, and assessment committee). The external body of community members is called the School Partnership Committee and opportunities are presented for them to provide feedback to the assessment system. More specifically, an assessment committee reviews data twice a year and presents to the faculty and advisory boards. The committee meets to examine different parts of the assessment system, provide data analyses, and offer recommendations for unit and/or program changes. Information is communicated to the faculty each semester and then submitted to the College Council for approval and then made public (i.e. unit website, student handbooks).

At the program level, standardized processes are in place to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of evaluation measures. Programs integrate the use of curriculum matrices, and require portfolios. Assessment information is included in internship syllabi, assessors are trained on tools, opportunities are provided for candidate remediation, and candidates have the right to file grievances.

Unit data are collected at the program level for both program improvement and candidate performance. The unit collects data at the entry, midpoint, and exit points. The data are purposed to measure the readiness, learning capacity, and dispositions of the candidates. Candidate data are collected and reviewed by designated faculty and results shared with faculty at the program level. Faculty use candidate data to monitor the quality of candidate progression in the program.

Program data are also collected twice a year and reported to the university assessment office as well as the unit and programs. The unit's assessment of program indicators is part of a cycle of data collection, analysis, reporting, and planning for improvement. The assessment system focuses on the collection of data on primary unit or program assessments. Data-based decisions occur according to the review of the unit data that occurs each semester through the program coordinators during faculty meetings. Data from shared unit assessments are disseminated biannually during unit faculty meetings.

The unit does employ disposition policies and procedures which faculty are to use when assessing the conduct of the candidates. Faculty members are required to complete a Professional Attributes Assessment Form on all of the candidates in their respective courses. If candidates score below '3', a Referral Form will be completed on those candidates. The Teacher Education Review Council reviews the Referral Forms and makes recommendations to the Department Chair about how they are to proceed.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

2.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The unit has been engaging in continuous improvement. Efforts have been put toward centralizing the data system particularly since the processes had been decentralized in their operations. The development and implementation of FolioData have allowed data to be retrieved from one location and candidate data (i.e. portfolio assessments, internship evaluations, candidate disposition data, internship placements, etc.) can be entered directly into the system. External data (i.e. state licensure exams, employer satisfaction and graduate surveys, etc.) are provided and can be accessed from the Assessment Committee or others who have been approved. All the assessment data and reports are now accessed by the users of the assessment system (candidates, faculty, supervisors, cooperating teachers, etc.) with appropriate access level. Programs are required to submit assessment data summaries that are reviewed by the unit's leadership team, assessment committee, and other coordinating committees. Any significant trends in data are highlighted and recommendations are made to the unit, departments and programs.

Another change focuses on enhancement to the portfolio course. Within this course, candidates are apprised of the expectations of the program, updated standards, timelines and feedback loops, and related course module updates. Both the initial level course (EDG 4012) and the advanced course (EDG 6931) have been modified to provide clear insights into the demands of the teacher education and/or leadership programs.

A final focus has been placed on the creation of an internship placement diversity database. The database can monitor the field experiences and analyzes data regarding the diversity of placements. The database is inclusive of school demographics from Florida Department of Education and school state exam grades (i.e. FCAT scores). The FolioData identifies problems with placement diversity and allows the opportunity to for steps to be taken to remedy the issue.

2.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No AFIs were cited for this standard in the last accreditation report.

2.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

2.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) How often does the faculty meet to make program changes based upon the data?
- (2) How often are the data reviewed?
- (3) What is the process used to share data results with candidates and stakeholders?
- (4) What are the roles of committees in the review and application of assessment data?
- (5) What is the nature of involvement of school partners in the evaluation and refinement of the unit's assessment system?
- (6) How does the School Partnership Committee directly participate in the improvement of the assessment system and interpretation of assessment data?
- (7) In what format are data presented to the assessment office and to faculty and stakeholders? Once the data come from the Assessment Committee, when and how are data shared with faculty and stakeholders? What does the review cycle entail?
- (8) How are data from the external review process used to inform decisions about policies, procedures, and programs?
- (9) Who can access the data from FolioData?

- (10) What evidence validates that FolioData is sufficient for management of the assessment system? How does it integrate with the institution's overall data management systems?

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice

The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Consistent with the unit's conceptual framework, clinical practice and field experiences are viewed as an opportunity for candidates to model and develop their knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in order for all students to learn. The unit exercises its field experiences and clinical practice through formal agreements and collaboration with the Pinellas, Pasco, and Hernando school districts.

In collaboration with the unit's Internship Office, the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences is responsible for managing all aspects of the unit's clinical and field experiences for initial programs. These responsibilities include maintaining the application process, coordinating field placements, facilitating intern activities, supervising university supervisors and cooperating teachers, and ensuring that the communications and printed materials related to field and clinical practice are in keeping with university, state, and national standards. Evidence was not provided to establish similar services and assurances for advanced programs. There is no evidence related to field and clinical experience expectations for the advanced reading program.

Design and maintenance of the field and clinical experiences fall under the purview of the Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Advisory Boards. These boards are comprised of unit and clinical faculty members, as well as representatives from partner school districts. Rosters identifying members of the advisory boards were provided to the review team and demonstrated that members represent a diverse spectrum of instructional and leadership backgrounds. However, the rosters provided did not show participation of members from the unit and university at large. Also, it was difficult to ascertain whether these groups meet routinely as the sample Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Advisory Board meeting agendas and member invitations provided show no evidence of activity having occurred within those groups since the fall of 2011.

Depending on the program, candidates are required to undergo multiple levels of preparation throughout their field and clinical experiences. Candidates in the undergraduate Bachelor of Science in Education program take part in early and final internship activities. During the early internship, candidates spend two days per week for a full semester in a K-5 setting, which primarily involves observation and modeling of effective practice. During the early internship, candidates begin to gradually assume responsibility, directing student contact including small group instruction and lesson preparation. This is followed by the culminating student teaching internship where candidates spend five days per week for a full semester, and which involves whole class instructional planning, implementation, evaluation and self-assessment.

Candidates in the graduate initial teacher programs have a similar experience during the final internship. However, depending on the discipline, graduate initial teacher program candidates

participate in an early practicum rather than a full early internship. Evidence provided in the form of letters and memoranda show a high degree of collaboration between the unit and local school districts on teacher placements.

Day to day support, observation, and mentoring of candidates engaging in clinical practice is facilitated by a network of university supervisors and cooperating teachers provided through the unit's partnerships with local school districts. The qualifications and responsibilities of University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers are outlined in the Intern Manuals. Cooperating teachers must have at least three years of service in the Florida state school system and be highly competent, demonstrating expertise in the classroom. They must also be able to demonstrate skill in interpersonal relationships.

Standard 1.4 of the Florida Department of Education Criteria for Initial Program Approval identifies additional requirements for cooperating teachers. They are as follows: (1) Evidence of clinical educator training; (2) Successful demonstration of effective classroom management; and (3) Evidence of ESOL credentials (if applicable). Sample verification letters from district partners reveal that each fall, the unit's partners provide verification that all cooperating teachers assigned by the district to work with the unit's candidates meet these state requirements. Although the expectations of Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors are clearly defined and it is well documented that these expectations are adhered to, no descriptions or evidence were provided to illustrate the process employed by the unit to ensure that Cooperating Teachers, in particular, are trained to uniformly apply the unit's observation rubrics, evaluate performance, and provide meaningful formative feedback, consistent with university standards.

Before candidates are allowed to transition to the internship phase of the program, they must successfully complete all appropriate sections of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. During the internship, the preparation of candidates is further validated within the Student Teacher Work Sample that is divided into multiple components and aligned to the candidate learning objectives. Candidates have multiple opportunities for self-reflection and individual assessment and are expected to share these reflections within their seminar classes in order to support strengthening of their individual teaching practice.

Evidence does not support that the unit has a comprehensive process in place by which it ensures that all candidates, initial and advanced, participate in field and clinical experiences that include students with exceptionalities and students from diverse ethnic/racial, linguistic, gender and socioeconomic groups.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

3.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Since the most recent accreditation review (2009), the unit has undertaken a number of efforts targeted at ensuring that it is moving along a trajectory of continuous improvement. In the fall of 2013, the unit piloted a new electronic assessment system called FolioData that has systematized

the process of assessing candidates' performance throughout the program, including during the internship. As FolioData houses the unit's intern placement database, the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences is able to monitor the placements and progress of candidates in real-time. In addition, candidates are now able to document mastery of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices through upload of their teacher work samples in to FolioData. A new required course was added into the program curriculum to introduce candidates to the FolioData system and the new assessment procedures.

Beyond implementation of the FolioData system, the unit updated the clinical experiences to align with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and Common Core State Standards. It also entered a partnership with a local business called Artistas Café that employs individuals with disabilities. Through the partnership, candidates receive a unique practicum opportunity allowing them to engage individuals with exceptionalities in a community business setting.

3.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No AFIs were cited for this standard in the last accreditation report.

3.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. There is no evidence to show that the Teacher Education or Educational Leadership Advisory Boards have met since fall of 2011.

Rationale: While the IR mentions these advisory bodies, evidence to verify their activities was not found.

2. There was no evidence provided of a process used by the Office of Clinical Experiences to ensure candidates are systematically provided opportunities to participate in field experiences with students with diverse needs or students who represent a range of ethnic/racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Rationale: While evidence was presented to suggest that settings with diverse P-12 students are available within the unit's service area, a mechanism to plan and document diverse placements for individuals enrolled in all programs was not provided.

3.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Can rosters, agendas, and minutes of Teacher Education and Educational Leadership Advisory Boards be provided? What stakeholders are members of these groups?
- (2) What evidence is available to demonstrate that cooperating teachers are trained on university standards, placement and supervision policies, and practices related to providing formative feedback, evaluating candidate performance?

Standard 4: Diversity

The unit designs, implements, and evaluates curriculum and provides experiences for candidates to acquire and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn. Assessments indicate that candidates can demonstrate and apply proficiencies related to diversity. Experiences provided for candidates include working with diverse populations, including higher education and P–12 school faculty, candidates, and students in P–12 schools.

4.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence suggests that the unit has made a major commitment to ensuring that diversity is at the foundation of its offerings and that candidates are able to demonstrate an understanding and adherence to the unit's vision. Principles of diversity are tightly woven into the unit's curricular and field experiences, which are designed in such a way as to promote an understanding and respect for the importance of diversity in candidates' preparation and in their instruction. To further articulate its commitment, four of the eight learning proficiencies expected of candidates pertain to diversity and promotion of the belief that all students can learn. They are:

- Candidates will value and respect all children and their families, and will value the knowledge and skills necessary to support each student's success.
- Candidates will be able to engage in the teaching cycle of developing, implementing, assessing, and remediation of developmentally and linguistically appropriate instruction based on individual student needs, thus fostering the highest possible achievement for all students.
- Candidates will be able to work collaboratively with colleagues, families, and the broader community to advocate for social justice in our diverse society and to meet the various instructional needs of all learners.
- Candidates will be able to make decisions based on a rich array of data in a just, responsible manner to improve the learning of all students.

The unit's commitment to the importance of diversity is underscored by its decision since its last accreditation visit to create the Bachelor of Science in Education (BXE) program which serves as the foundation of its initial teacher programs. The BXE program was developed in part, in response to the needs expressed by the school districts in the Tampa, Florida area for teachers prepared to teach in elementary settings and to teach those with exceptionalities. Through the BXE model, candidates are required to engage in a true merged instructional model that blends general education competencies with those of exceptional education and ELL in equal parts. A review of the BXE program course of study shows that courses related to serving diverse populations and teaching English to speakers of other languages play a prominent role in the overall course offerings and required learning. As a result, candidates who complete the BXE program are eligible for Florida state licensure in elementary education as well as English as a second language.

While it is clear that the unit takes seriously its role in ensuring that the curriculum is designed to provide candidates with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to help all students learn, it is equally clear that the unit ensures that candidates have adequate opportunities to interact with diverse faculty. With that said,

The faculty is comprised of both men and women at 50 percent (5 of 10) and 50 percent (5 of 10) respectively. Faculty demographic data show that 40 percent of faculty members represent racially diverse backgrounds with 20 percent (2 of 10) described as *Hispanic/Latino of any race* and 20 percent described as *Black or African American*. Faculty composition within the unit is consistent with the faculty composition within the university as a whole. University-wide, 23 percent of faculty members represent diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds. A breakdown of faculty demographics by those who teach in the initial and the advanced programs was not found among exhibits provided. The unit reported 22 full-time faculty, including the leadership of the Dean and Associate Dean. Due to institutional budget reductions, the Unit has experienced a reduction in positions since the last review (2009) as a result of faculty departures combined with institutional redirection of funding. These positions have not been replaced with tenure-track faculty, although the Unit has successfully hired highly qualified visiting faculty in the interim.

As is the case with determining whether candidates have adequate opportunities to interact with diverse faculty, it is also clear that candidates have adequate opportunities to interact with other candidates who represent diversity. Twenty-six percent of the candidates within the unit represent racial/ethnic diversity. Candidates represent both genders as 14 percent (52 of 374) are males and 86 percent (322 of 374) are females. Candidate composition within the unit is approximately 40 percent male and 60 percent female. Within the unit, 74 percent of candidates are identified as *White*. This is consistent with the university as a whole where 74 percent of students are identified as *White* and also consistent with the surrounding counties, where 76.1 percent and 81.2 percent of the populations in Pinellas, Pasco, and Hernando counties are identified as *White*. A breakdown of candidate demographics by those enrolled in the initial and the advanced programs was not found among exhibits provided.

Sample letters and other correspondence provided by the unit suggests that the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences and the unit Internship Office work closely with local school districts to ensure that interns are placed in settings that represent broad diversity in terms of race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, learning ability and style, and mastery of the English language. A table showing a list of participating school districts in which candidates undergo field placements is provided in the evidence and shows that the school districts represent consistent diversity across the major categories. For example, between 28 and 62 percent of P-12 students attending in the districts identified represent racially/ethnically diverse groups. In addition, all districts shown have greater than 50 percent of students receiving free and reduced lunch, and between three and 12 percent of students who are English language learners. However, the list does not show the demographic data of the specific schools in which candidates are placed. Therefore, it is not possible to verify that the unit's candidates take advantage of the overall diversity of the districts in which they are placed.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

4.2.a Movement Toward Target. Based on the criteria for Movement Toward Target, provide a summary of the unit's performance.

Since its last accreditation visit, it appears that the unit has made great strides to move toward the target level with respect to its efforts to build a system of curricular and field experiences that promote a respect for the importance of diversity and cultural awareness in instruction. In 2009, the unit began admitting students into the newly developed Bachelor of Science in Education (BXE) program. The move was in direct response to the needs expressed by the local community for teachers prepared for elementary education settings and also prepared to teach students with exceptionalities and those who are English language learners. With the new undergraduate program focus came a substantial augmentation of the unit's undergraduate curriculum. Many courses have significant components related to diversity and the field and clinical practices have been reengineered to ensure that candidates have a broad range of exposure to students with exceptionalities, English language learners, and who represent diverse racial/ethnic makeup.

To further illustrate the unit's commitment to diversity, particularly with respect to ensuring that candidates are equipped to address the instructional needs of English language learners, the unit requires all faculty members to demonstrate proficiency in the area of teaching English to speakers of other languages. Faculty members are required to possess a degree in ESOL or the Florida state ESOL endorsement. The unit has also developed an online ESOL Credentialing Course for members of the faculty as an assurance that unit faculty are able to model best practices in meeting the needs of the local school districts.

The faculty within the unit is gender diverse, split evenly between male and female. The faculty is also diverse from a racial/ethnic standpoint with 40 percent identified as *Black of African American* or *Hispanic/Latino of Any Race*. Beyond race and gender, unit faculty members represent a wide range of cultural and professional experiences that enrich the learning environment within the unit.

4.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No AFIs were cited as a result of the previous accreditation visit.

4.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

1. There is no evidence to show that candidates' field placements are tracked to ensure they have opportunities to interact with diverse P-12 students.

Rationale: While evidence was presented to suggest that settings with diverse P-12 students are available, a mechanism to plan and document diverse placements for individuals enrolled in all programs was not provided.

4.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) Can the unit's diversity statement encapsulating its commitment to diversity be provided?
- (2) Can the unit provide a table showing the demographic makeup of the P-12 students in individual schools in which candidates are placed? The table provided in the evidence showed the demographic makeup of the overall school districts but did not disaggregate to show the demographics of individual schools.
- (3) Can information be provided on the demographics of clinical faculty (university supervisors and cooperating teachers)?
- (4) Can a breakdown of candidate and faculty demographics by those participating in initial and advanced programs be provided?

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development

Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Exhibit 5.4a documents the following faculty members by rank and status:

Assistant Professor, Tenured/Tenure-Track	6
Associate Professor, Tenured/Tenure-Track	8
Professor, Tenured/Tenure-Track	4
Visiting Professor	1
Instructor	2
Part time	26

The table did not identify clinical faculty. The table also lists degrees and qualification, including school experience and professional development activities to demonstrate that faculty are qualified for their roles.

Full-time faculty appear to engage in professional scholarship as evidenced by a variety of articles, activities and presentations listed in the Institutional Report and supporting documents. These scholarly and professional development activities feature evidence of emphasis on culturally responsive pedagogy and use of integrated technology. While the evidence listed in the Professional Faculty Ed Qualifications Roster verifies varied and consistent professional scholarship and professional development on the part of tenure-track faculty, there is no documentation or other evidence of tracking professional development for faculty who are not tenure-tracked. Clinical Education Faculty must adhere to the policies and practices document that outlines qualifications and training that aligns with Florida state requirements. When the faculty member's teaching evaluations are consistently below College averages, the Dean provides specific feedback and a plan for remediation. In addition to meeting with the faculty member to discuss performance, options are provided to support faculty development such as a course release to work on areas of concern in teaching, scholarship, or service. No evidence was provided to suggest that the unit facilitates professional development based upon needs identified in faculty evaluations for those not on remediation plans.

Comments from the University's completer/exit surveys indicate candidates value interactions with the faculty and confirm the effectiveness of the quality of instruction. Unit faculty model best practices and teaching strategies including offering courses through alternative delivery modes including online and blended learning formats, using evidence from this experience as a research base for improvement; however, evidence from the Student Assessments of Instruction was cited but not included. Online course registration is increasing and candidate survey results indicate satisfaction with the online teaching; but there is no supporting documentation for these statements.

Unit faculty engage in the process of Annual Review. Each faculty member's Student Assessments of Instruction (SAI) survey results are reviewed. The survey evidence provides information the faculty utilize to identify and develop new knowledge and skills and to refine their courses. Faculty are assigned time specifically in the areas of teaching, research, and service and must demonstrate satisfactory performance in each area. In cases of areas of concern in teaching, scholarship, or service, or when a faculty member's teaching evaluations are consistently below College averages, the Dean provides specific feedback and a plan for remediation. This plan includes meetings to discuss performance and may include optional support such as course release to work on professional development in the identified area of concern. The plan is described in the summary of policies, procedures, and practices for faculty evaluation, but is not described in the official Annual Review Guidelines. Evidence was not provided to establish how part time and clinical faculty are evaluated.

Faculty members are expected to serve on at least two committees in addition to meeting departmental expectations. Additionally, faculty are expected to provide service within their professional field and to the local community and schools, and to serve in leadership roles in their professional organizations. Evidence was provided in faculty vitas and in a vita data table (5.4a) to support that faculty provide professional service to the institution, the community and the profession.

Faculty collaboration in governance is a basic premise of the Unit constitution and is clearly described in that document. However, more informal, working collaboration is cited in the summary, but no documentation of at type of collaboration is provided.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

5.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Of note is clear and consistent evidence of efforts to inject increased technology into the program in a variety of ways. Faculty have migrated successfully to Canvas, using the Distance Learning Center as ongoing technical assistance. To aid in this transition, over 80 training sessions were offered to the faculty. According to the summary, registration in online classes increases; survey information from candidates indicates satisfaction with online classes; however, this documentation has not been provided. Faculty publications and professional activities also indicate use of blended learning within the classroom and faculty modeling the use of web-based tools such as WebQuest and Prezi.

5.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No AFIs were cited as a result of the last visit.

5.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

5.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) While the evidence listed in the Professional Faculty Ed Qualifications Roster verifies varied and consistent professional scholarship and professional development on the part of tenure-track faculty, there is no documentation or other evidence of tracking professional development for faculty who are not tenure-tracked. Are there data available regarding professional development/best practices for non-tenured faculty?
- (2) Evidence from the Student Assessments of Instruction was cited as a source of information in course improvement and for guiding personal choices in professional development, but no data were provided. What evidence establishes that student assessments of instruction are linked to subsequent decisions?
- (3) Are faculty who deliver off-campus programs the same faculty who teach in on-campus programs? If not, do they have the same level of qualifications as faculty who teach on campus?

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources

The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1 Preliminary Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The Unit is headed by the Dean of the College of Education (COE) who works collaboratively with the College Council to govern all programs for preparing educators. The Unit's constitution, which was revised in the Fall 2014, serves with other procedures and policies as a guide to govern college operations. The Unit constitution clearly outlines a collaborative role for the College Council and describes the constituency and functioning of that group. The College Council is further identified as an advisory group to the Dean on matters of faculty development and academic support. The constitution delineates various standing committees and identifies each committee's charge and function as well as outlining a procedure for the creation and function of ad hoc committees. It is not clear, however, which constituencies serve on the College Council, or how the unit ensures all its stakeholders are involved in decision-making about the unit and its programs.

The Curriculum and Programs Committee begins the formal approval process for a new program or a change in an existing program, allowing for collaboration among faculty in the initial stages. The proposal then proceeds through a clearly structured system of steps to ensure rigor. One example of a program which recently completed this process is the new MS in Middle Grades STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) which began Fall 2012. The Florida Department of Education requires a parallel and simultaneous program review and approval process for initial programs leading to licensure, so the Unit develops Program Approval Folios indicating how the various program components meet state standards.

Undergraduate recruitment is coordinated through Undergraduate admissions and the Unit employs a fulltime recruited for Graduate programs. Admissions practices and requirements are found in the Graduate and Undergraduate catalogs and the university academic calendar and grading policies are found in the University records and registration website.

A fulltime, professional advisor and a part-time coordinator advise undergraduate candidates and fulltime faculty advise graduate candidates. The Student of Concern Committee, consisting of program faculty and chaired by the Associate Dean, is available for candidates in need of professional behavior guidance, and USFSP Counseling and Psychological Services are also available for students in need of counseling and clinical psychology.

Although there has been a reduction in tenure-track positions due to attrition combined with institutional redirection of funding, the Unit has successfully hired visiting faculty. The Unit budget has been sufficient to support program development and professional travel and development, but has experienced recent budget cuts. Currently, the Unit experiences stable enrollment at least at the level of the last review. During 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 per pupil funding was equitable across the three colleges of the USFSP campus; additionally, the Unit has

in the past used carry forward funds. However, carry forward funds have been frozen. The Unit has successfully competed for external funds, receiving an additional monies in endowed gifts for scholarships which are eligible to receive matching contributions from the state and other agencies.

Faculty workloads are negotiated by the Dean and the College Council to allow faculty to engage in teaching, scholarship research, and services. Faculty post office hours for students and small class sizes in most programs allow faculty to be available to assist students as needed. Including the Dean and Associate Dean, the faculty consists of 22 fulltime faculty, 26 adjuncts, and 18 adjunct supervisors. Tenure earning faculty have 3:2 or 2:2 course load and release time for research assignments is available. All information is reported through the USF System's Faculty Academic Information Reporting (FAIR). Loads for supervision of interns are clearly delineated and constitute a reasonable workload.

Adjunct faculty members are an important part of the faculty, comprising over half of the education faculty listed in the roster. The Associate Dean oversees the appointment and evaluation of adjuncts; the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences oversees supervisors of candidate internship. Adjunct faculty in particular programs and endorsements are required to successfully complete professional development in order to be able to teach in the Unit.

No information was provided to support that there are adequate resources, including personnel, to support and manage the implementation of the unit's assessment system.

Classroom resources are adequate on all campuses and efforts have been made to provide classrooms with appropriate technology. Smart Boards, document cameras, projectors and computers are available in classrooms and are used for both instruction and modeling best practices. Coquina Hall contains a classroom equipped as a Mathematics Teaching laboratory with laptop computer carts and other electronic resources. The Distance Learning and Instructional Media Services unit provides both technical support and professional development opportunities for both candidates and faculty through workshops related to teaching and online learning. As well, USFSP migrated to Canvas in Spring 2014, with 80 training sessions offered resulting in 95 percent of the COE faculty fully migrating prior to the implementation deadline. The new Learning Management System is a cloud-based platform and is scalable to accommodate increased use of services. No evidence was provided about off-campus facilities, including access to library materials and instructional technology.

The new Science/Technology building (2010) earned the Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design certification. A new University Student Center and the USC and Poynter Library are available for student activities and provide a center for campus life.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

6.2.b Continuous Improvement. What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Given that institutional budget reductions have negatively impacted faculty and other resources available to the unit, the unit has provided evidence of a commitment to continuous improvement since the last visit (2009). For example, visiting faculty and part-time faculty have been employed to staff programs, new programs have been initiated, and the internally-developed FolioData assessment system have been realized in spite of overall resource reductions. Also, the new Science/Technology building, University Student Center, and the Poynter Library are available for student activities and provide a center for campus life.

6.3 Feedback on correcting previous areas for improvement (AFIs)

No AFIs were cited for this standard in the last accreditation report.

6.4 Areas of concern related to continuing to meet the standard

None

6.5 Evidence for the BOE Team to validate during the onsite visit

- (1) How does the Associate Dean oversee the quality of instruction of adjunct faculty?
- (2) What types of instructional technology other than Smart Boards are available for modeling instruction? What types of computer technology is available in the Mathematics Teaching laboratory?
- (3) What needs are driving the rapid growth of distance learning delivery?
- (4) According to the summary information, online courses are successful and are growing. Is there registration data, course lists, or other documentation to demonstrate this growth?

Sources of Evidence

Institution's Institutional Report
Annual Reports and Program Reports in CAEP's Accreditation Information Management System
(AIMS)
Website and Exhibits of Institution