

In response to the Offsite Review by the CAEP/NCATE Board of Examiners, the University of South Florida St. Petersburg College of Education offers the following:

### **Overview and Standard 1**

#### **Advanced Programs' Alignment with the Conceptual Framework**

It was noted by reviewers that the advanced programs' alignment to the Conceptual Framework is not evident as it is with the transition points in the initial certification programs. Graduate students enrolled in advanced programs are certified teachers with progress monitored at admission, within the course of study, and at program completion with intermediate monitoring of progress completed by program faculty and program coordinators throughout the courses of study. Exhibit 1.1, Advanced Programs Admission and Completion Requirements, displays the specific admission and completion requirements of each advanced program of study.

#### **Conceptual Framework**

The Conceptual Framework was modified to include citations from more recent research and to clarify and enhance the main points of the Unit's guiding principles: Knowledgeable Professionalism, Reflective Teaching, and Collaborative Leadership. Faculty, staff, and administration were notified beforehand regarding the update to citations, and recommendations were requested. Once changes were made, the draft was shared with faculty at the January 2014 faculty meeting and with the College Advisory Board at its Spring meeting. In addition, faculty and candidates created a video to share the Conceptual Framework's guiding principles with candidates in all classes. The committee received no recommendations for additional updates or changes to the Conceptual Framework, Exhibits 1.2.a, Minutes from Spring Faculty Meeting, 1.2.b, Faculty Meeting Agendas.2013 – 2014, and 1.2.c, COE External Advisory Board Agendas.

#### **Candidate Progression**

Candidates' progress prior to Fall 2013 was monitored by the faculty using specified rubrics. Collaborative Digital Network Portfolio evaluations were recorded within the system electronically and reports generated each semester indicated candidate progress within each program area. A summative review of progress occurred in the Internship Committee prior to a candidate's enrollment in practicum. Candidates were then permitted to enroll or remediated until all requirements were met. This review was completed by faculty. Satisfactory progress in courses was monitored in the Program Database maintained by the College of Education staff for all initial certification candidates. Additional reports were run by the Assessment Coordinator to ensure candidates had met 75% or better, based on instructor expectations, on all critical assignments.

The initial programs had four tiers through which each candidate passed:

1. Program Admission
2. Entry to the CDN Portfolio
3. Admission to the Practicum
4. Exit Final Requirements and Graduation

Candidates were required to meet all criteria in one tier in order to progress to the next. The CDN Portfolio results were recorded in the Collaborative Digital Network. In response to new Florida Department of Education professional practices and the change to the Unit's assessment system detailed in Standard 2, the CDN was replaced.

The BOE noted a discrepancy in the 2009-2010 Candidate Performance. The Unit recognizes the error and Exhibit 1.3, 2009-2010 Candidate Performance, is a corrected version of 2009-2010 Candidate Performance.

Candidates in advanced programs are monitored by the college at program admission and exit/completion with intermediate monitoring of progress completed by program faculty throughout the courses of study. Exhibit 1.1 displays the specific admission and completion requirements of each advanced program of study.

### **FTCE and FELE Exam Scores**

Scores from the FTCE and FELE exams for three years are attached as Exhibit 1.4, FTCE and FELE Exam Results. Passage of the FTCE and FELE exams is required for program completion resulting in a 100% pass rate. Data within the table reflect first time attempts as well as final scores. Therefore, the pass rates in the table do not reflect the 100% pass rate required for graduation. The unit uses the data from first time attempts for programmatic improvement purposes. Because USFSP education programs are approved by the Florida Department of Education, 100% of graduates must pass all requisite sections of the state required exams, FTCE and FELE.

### **Candidate Attainment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Skills, and Proficiencies**

Candidates attain and apply Pedagogical Content Knowledge, Skills and Proficiencies through multiple facets. In addition to passing the Subject Area Exam portion of the FTCE and FELE exam, candidates are required to demonstrate proficiency in each of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) or Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), as appropriate, see Exhibits 1.5.a, Candidate Attainment of Professional Proficiencies and Skills.FEAPS and 1.5.b, Completer Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills.FPLS, . More specifically, FEAP 3, Instructional Delivery and Facilitation, expects candidates to **consistently** utilize a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught. It is important to note that the Subject Area portion of the Florida Teacher Competency Exam requires candidates to pass a rigorous competency-based exam related to appropriate content knowledge and skills. Matrices of the competencies and skills related to each program are available in the digital evidence room. The Critical Task data related to FEAP 3 is attached in Exhibit 1.5.c, Critical Task Data.

### **Disaggregated TWS Data**

Disaggregated TWS data are attached as Exhibit 1.6, Teacher Work Sample Data. .

### **Dispositions for Advanced Programs**

Candidates in advanced programs are certified, licensed teachers employed in local school districts. Program faculty monitor dispositions within the courses of study, share concerns with candidates, and collaboratively develop interventions as warranted.

### **Key Assessments for Initial and Advanced Programs**

Key assessments, referred to as Critical Assignments, are listed electronically in the Unit Evaluation System available to reviewers onsite. Examples are noted in Exhibit 1.7, Critical Assignment Data Example. By selecting a course title and syllabus statement, viewers can access all critical assignments for the course and the competencies addressed by each. As candidates complete the course assignments, documentation is uploaded into the electronic portfolio. Faculty are able to track individual candidate progress in both coursework and in the final internship as required by the Florida Department of Education. In addition, candidate progress on critical assignments, by program, is available to all faculty. Reports are generated each semester and reviewed by program coordinators to ensure all candidates have passed the critical assignments with a 75% or better. This information is also discussed at the assessment meetings led by the Accreditation Coordinator.

### **Educational Leadership Survey**

In September 2013, electronic surveys were sent multiple times to Educational Leadership program completers and/or principals employing Educational Leadership completers. Only one survey was returned. The Unit is exploring other options for gaining feedback such as using Survey Monkey or conducting focus groups. Exhibit 1.8, Educational Leadership Survey Email is an example of an email survey sent to completers and/or principals employing Educational Leadership completers.

### **Data-Informed Changes to the Unit**

The Assessment Committee established and implemented a calendar of reporting to monitor candidate performance and manage and improve the Unit's operations and programs. The most recent academic years have required tremendous efforts from administrators, faculty, and staff to implement a new Unit Assessment System, adjust syllabi, and refine reporting practices to comply with the new state competencies. The Unit Assessment Committee continues meeting to evaluate data and make observations to inform programmatic decisions. Some of the changes made since the last NCATE review follow:

- A review of CDN portfolio submissions indicated a concern with candidates addressing the requirements regarding Diversity. A faculty investigation revealed the need to realign the rubric for assessing candidate success in the Florida Educator Accomplished Practice (FEAP) for Diversity in order to mirror the curricular sequence through which the candidates progress in their programs, therefore providing a more accurate assessment of candidate knowledge, particularly in the areas of social justice and advocacy. (Assessment Committee Minutes, 2010 – 2011)
- Faculty reviewed the candidate submissions to the CDN (electronic portfolio), examined the length of time for completion, and studied the number of intern applicants denied due to failure to complete the portfolio requirements. As a result of this study, the College began steps to replace the current system. (Assessment Committee Minutes, 2011 – 2012)
- Education Leadership candidates' action research presentations were reviewed by principals, deans, the university vice-chancellor, and faculty during showcases of the projects. Presentations rated highest in the area of candidate knowledge. Candidates were evaluated weakest in potential to provide for staffing and professional development to meet student learning needs and the potential to understand the influence of social, cultural,

political, and economic forces on the educational environment. As a result, the faculty reviewed the course of study to create more leadership experiences in the areas of social justice and curriculum. (Assessment Committee Minutes, 2011 – 2012).

- The Unit chose to retire the Exceptional Student Education MAT in lieu of an MA program. This decision was informed by the following: enrollment trends, inquiries from candidates, and anecdotal data from discussions with district school personnel. (Curriculum and Program, Graduate Council)

### **Evidence Supporting Familiarity with the Conceptual Framework (CF)**

In addition to the CF posters posted in classrooms and on office doors, the Unit has taken other steps to inform candidates and other stakeholders in understanding the CF:

- Candidates joined faculty in the production of a video explaining the CF.
- The Unit challenged candidates to submit “CF selfies” in a competition to best demonstrate components of the CF.
- Presentations were made to the External Advisory Board.

### **Clarification Points:**

#### St. Petersburg Programs vs. New Port Richey Programs

The Offsite Report asked about data from the Elementary Education bachelor’s program and the Educational Leadership program at New Port Richey. The programs are the same at both campuses. Candidates at the Pasco Hernando State College receive instruction from the same faculty, use the same syllabi, and have access to the same resources as candidates on the main campus. The agreement with PHSC allows USFSP to present the USFSP programs of study on the PHSC campus. As such, the Unit has never kept separate data. However, your question sparked an interest, and the Unit is now separating the data to discover possible opportunities for enriching its courses of study.

#### VAM Data: How is it used?

The USFSP College of Education receives VAM data from the Florida Department of Education. To date, the data have been analyzed and shared, but no changes have been made to the programs of study based on this information. Two years ago, as the Unit studied the first set of data, it discovered there were no scores available for undergraduate program completers. After further investigation failed to locate the missing items, the FLDOE concluded the data were unavailable. As a result, the Unit was able to use only the graduate completer data from the first report. This and subsequent VAM data were disaggregated by program, compared to state averages, discussed at Assessment Committee meetings, and shared publicly.

Exhibit 1.1, Advanced Programs Admission and Completion Requirements

Exhibit 1.2.a, Minutes from Spring Faculty Meeting

Exhibit 1.2.b, Faculty Meeting Agendas.2013 – 2014

Exhibit 1.2.c, COE External Advisory Board Agendas

Exhibit 1.3, 2009-2010 Candidate Performance

Exhibit 1.4, FTCE and FELE Exam Results

Exhibit 1.5.a, Candidate Attainment of Professional Proficiencies and Skills.FEAPS

Exhibit 1.5.b, Completer Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills.FPLS

Exhibit 1.5.c, Critical Task Data

Exhibit 1.6, Teacher Work Sample Data  
Exhibit 1.7, Critical Assignment Data Example  
Exhibit 1.8, Educational Leadership Survey Email

## **Standard 2**

### **Faculty, Data Reviews, Program Changes, and Roles of Committees**

Faculty meet at least once a semester to discuss Unit updates, university policy, changes in state requirements, and to work cooperatively on Unit improvement. However, the formal annual evaluation process is a multi-step process involving the College of Education Assessment Committee, College of Education Faculty, College Advisory Councils, and review by the Dean and administrative team of the College. As data are collected from the state and various program areas within the College of Education, the information is presented and discussed with the Assessment Committee which reviews the data, makes recommendations, and disseminates the information to corresponding program areas. A schedule of reports to the Assessment Committee is attached in 2.1, Schedule of Reporting to Assessment Committee.

The Assessment Committee is responsible for the systematic development, review, and analysis of the ongoing data collection and information systems that inform and improve the College's programs and the performance of its candidates. The Committee has representatives from the ESE program, Reading and Literacy Education, Educational Leadership, ESOL, Math/Science, Field Experience, the college's assessment coordinator, and the college dean. This is an administrative committee in the College of Education focusing on accreditation and continuous program improvement. Discussions about the findings from these various reports guide decision-making regarding improvements and/or changes in the programs and practices for USFSP candidates. Major program revisions are also discussed in meetings of the College of Education faculty as a whole as well as in individual program meetings. Minutes of the Assessment Committee meetings are approved and regularly posted on the College of Education website.

### **Unit Assessment System: Nature and Involvement of School Partners**

USFSP meets with school partners via the External Advisory Board and with individual district leaders to share information on candidate performance on state exams, progression through the FEAPs, and placement for diverse clinical experiences. In addition to sharing information, the Unit seeks recommendations and suggestions for enhancing our assessment procedures, database, and reports.

### **Sharing Data with Candidates and Stakeholders**

In addition to sharing information with faculty, assessment data is shared with candidates and stakeholders on the following College website:  
<http://www.usfsp.edu/education/about/assessment/>. This website was highlighted by CAEP as an example to other colleges and universities seeking ways to share data.

Along with posting reports and summaries of data on the COE website, these reports are shared at the External Advisory Board meetings. Information on candidate performance on state exams, progression through the FEAPs, and placement for diverse clinical experiences is presented for discussion.

### **School Partnership Committee**

Reviewers asked about the involvement of the School Partnership Committee in the improvement of the assessment system and interpretation of assessments. The purpose of the School Community Partnership Committee is to develop policy and guidelines for faculty and/or program participation in schools and communities in the interest of coordinating collaborative efforts with schools and community agencies consistent with the College mission of commitment to building meaningful professional partnerships. This committee reviews proposals involving the commitment of faculty time and/or College resources and criteria for working with schools and/or community agencies and serves as an oversight and review committee for formal and informal agreements between the College and aforementioned agencies. Three faculty members comprise this standing committee. As individual faculty, the committee members had input into the development of the assessment system and review of data, but the School Partnership Committee was not formally engaged. The College of Education Advisory Council compliments the School Partnership Committee, but remains a separate standing committee.

### **External Review Process**

The Florida Department of Education requires comprehensive annual review reports from all teacher preparation institutions. These reviews promote self-study but do not result in comments and suggestions from the department. Since the last review in 2008, the FLDOE has suspended site reviews as it revises the Approval Standards and develops a new process for conducting site reviews. The next review is tentatively scheduled for April 2016. Ultimately, the FLDOE site visit recommendations are approved by the Program Approval Board followed by the Commissioner of Education.

### **FolioData Access**

FolioData is available to all Unit administrators, faculty, administrative staff, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, adjunct professors, report access for accreditation agencies, and, to a limited degree, candidates. In addition, External Advisory Board members have access as warranted.

### **Validation of FolioData**

1. Beginning with the previous assessment system, the Unit filtered the negative items based on feedback from students, faculty, administration, and accreditation agencies.
2. All data, reporting, and forms were consolidated into one system to sustain continuity. Candidate data is available for observation from admission to graduation.
3. Data entry forms were consolidated into one system (student portfolios, program standards and matrices, internship placements, test scores, internship evaluations, etc.)
4. Each person using the system gets one account with different access levels (no multiple accounts)
5. Candidates can evaluate progress through the programs and identify areas to accomplish in order to complete their programs. Advisors can access individual student reports at any time.
6. FolioData was designed completely based on agreement with full faculty participation and agreement and included candidate feedback during piloting of the system

7. The Unit continuously seeks feedback from all users and makes changes along with assessment committee/faculty/administrative approval.
8. The assessment system completely gives freedom to faculty to update assignments, evaluation rubrics, re-evaluate submissions, pull class reports on critical assignments, etc
9. The system is built in-house giving the institution complete freedom for customization.

To maintain the integrity of the Assessment System and eliminate sources of bias, the unit established policies and procedures to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of measures.

All programs must:

- a. use standard curriculum matrices (key content and assignments) to provide candidates the opportunity to learn the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that are being assessed
- b. require portfolio course (or part of a course) during the first semester to provide all candidates the opportunity to learn the expectations on the evaluation measures including scoring rubrics and administration
- c. require all courses to provide specific assessment information to be included in the course and internship syllabus
- d. ensure that all assessors (full-time and part time faculty, internship supervisors, cooperating teachers and others) are trained on assessment tools
- e. provide opportunities for the remediation of candidate failures
- f. provide all candidates the right to file a grievance if they believe they were treated unfairly (university policy)

The institution uses Banner system for student registrations, program admissions, and graduation certifications. Banner does not let permit external program data access. Therefore, the systems are completely separate.

Exhibit 2.1, Schedule of Reporting to Assessment Committee

### **Standard 3**

#### **Assurances for Advanced Program Field Experience Placements**

The Coordinator of the Educational Leadership program monitors placements of program candidates to ensure diversity in both depth and breadth of administrative experiences. The Educational Leadership candidates are supervised by full time faculty during the Practicum course. Candidates in other advanced courses are certified, practicing teachers. Most field experiences are conducted in their classrooms with supervision, input, and guidance from program coordinators. Even employed candidates benefit from the joint supervision of faculty and school based or district administration. Faculty and/or administration that oversee the advanced programs work collaboratively with the school districts to ensure candidates are placed in the best possible setting to compliment the rich curriculum offered through the College of Education programs. This collaboration is demonstrated in the success of our graduates.

#### **TEAB and ELAB Meetings and Formation of New Advisory Board**

Prior to January 2012, the College of Education sought input via two advisory councils: the Teacher Education Advisory Board (TEAB) and the Educational Leadership Advisory Board (ELAB). The TEAB was comprised of teachers, current and former school administrators,

district administrators, university field experience supervisor, community representatives, and the college dean. The ELAB was comprised of school administrators, school district administrators, teachers, community members, faculty from the Education Leadership program, and the college dean. An example of the stakeholder involvement and input was the development of the Elementary Education/ESE/ESOL/Reading Bachelors Degree which also serves as an example of responsiveness to the state and local community.

As noted in the agendas (Exhibits 3.1, ELAB Advisory Board Meeting and 3.2, TEAB Agenda) faculty and university personnel served as facilitators of the meetings, provided presentations and information when called upon, and created the initial drafts of the agendas. In January 2012, with the introduction of a new dean, the College transitioned from two separate advisory boards into one External Advisory Board. This new board includes many of the same representative positions from the educational community and has expanded to include stakeholders from the business, arts, and local government communities as well. The first official meeting of the college advisory council occurred in Spring 2014.

During the time of transition, the Program Coordinators for Field Experiences and Educational Leadership continued meeting with representatives from the local education agencies to coordinate activities, discuss candidate progress, and glean input for improving academic programs. Exhibits 3.3 – 3.8 provide evidence of these “transitional” meetings.

### **Training for Cooperating Teachers**

Cooperating Teachers receive training in the use of the Unit’s forms, procedures, and expectations, and all cooperating teachers must complete the state mandated Clinical Educator Training. Two years ago, the Coordinator of Clinical Experiences worked with the district to update these training modules (see Exhibit 3.9, Clinical Ed Revision Committee). The modules include:

1. Diagnosis of Developing Professional's Performance
2. Diagnosis of Student Performance
3. Feedback: Conferring With Developing Professionals about Performance
4. Professional Development Plans: Their Design and Implementation.

In addition, at the beginning of each semester, the University Supervisors work individually with the Cooperating Teachers assigned to their interns in order to:

1. Ensure understanding of all internship assignments
2. Explain and review the evaluation instruments
3. Explain and/or demonstrate access to the electronic evaluation system
4. Facilitate and collect the Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form (Exhibit 3.10, Cooperating Teacher Feedback, Spring 2011 – Fall 2013)

In addition, each district provides assurance that individuals serving as Cooperating Teachers have:

1. Evidence of clinical educator training (provided by the Florida Department of Education)
2. Successful demonstration of effective classroom management strategies that consistently result in improved student performance.

### 3. Evidence of ESOL credentials (if applicable)

A letter from one of our participating districts is resubmitted as evidence of the letters provided by the districts, see Exhibit 3.11 Pinellas County Letter of Verification.

#### **Process for Ensuring Diverse Placements**

The FolioData assessment system used at USFSP allows faculty to monitor field and clinical experience placements to ensure candidates are engaged with students with exceptionalities and diverse ethnic, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. The FolioData assessment system is germane to the College of Education at USFSP and was created to meet the needs of the unit. A comprehensive review of schools is done each year. The diversity characteristics of each school is carefully reviewed and added to the system. A list of characteristics for each school is included in the database. For example, each school's racial, economic, students with exceptionalities, and English Language Learners (ELLs) statistics are included in the annual review and noted for each school. The individual student records evidenced within include flags indicating diversity. A red flag shows the school is lacking one area of diversity. As candidates progress through the process of field and clinical experiences, the Unit ensures that candidates are provided opportunities to participate in experiences with students with diverse needs or students who represent a range of ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds. Exhibit 3.12, Ensuring Diverse Placements consists of screen shots of the electronic system which reviewers can access upon the onsite visit and provides an example of two candidates' records.

In the current exhibit, the record for the second candidate indicates Campbell Park Elementary is lacking an area of diversity. By opening the link to the school (see Exhibit 3.12, Ensuring Diverse Placements), a list of data shows the gender, ethnic, socioeconomic, and linguistic makeup of the school. In this case, the school lacks a sufficient representation of ELL students. Therefore, in the following placement, the candidate is placed in New Heights Elementary. This process is monitored by the Coordinator of Clinical Education.

Exhibit 3.1, ELAB Advisory Board Meeting

Exhibit 3.2, TEAB Agenda

Exhibit 3.3, Professional Development Committee Minutes, 2011 – 2012

Exhibit 3.4, Professional Development Committee Agendas, 2011 – 2013

Exhibit 3.5, Final Inter Recruitment, Spring 2014

Exhibit 3.6, Early Career Committee Emails

Exhibit 3.7, Email Outreach to District

Exhibit 3.8, Intern Placement Meetings

Exhibit 3.9, Clinical Ed Revision Committee

Exhibit 3.10, Cooperating Teacher Feedback, Spring 2011 – Fall 2013

Exhibit 3.11, Pinellas County Letter of Verification

Exhibit 3.12, Ensuring Diverse Placements

#### **Standard 4**

##### **Breakdown of Faculty Demographics, Initial and Advanced Programs**

Exhibit 4.1, Faculty Demographics provides the requested breakdown of faculty. Duplication may be noted due to faculty members teaching in more than one program area.

## **Breakdown of Candidate Demographics, Initial and Advanced Programs**

Exhibit 4.2, Candidate Demographics provides the requested breakdown of candidates.

### **Listing of Demographics by School and Evidence of Placements**

Within the FolioData assessment system used at USFSP, faculty have easy access to the demographics of specific schools with placements. Exhibit 4.3, School Demographics provides screenshot examples of the data available for each school (reviewers will have access during the onsite visit). In this example, the New Heights Elementary School record shows the school address, contact information, map, and quick view of the diversity items and whether the school qualifies as a diverse placement (note checkmarks above the map). Further, the record includes school data for gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and ELL status.

FolioData also provides faculty with a process for tracking field and clinical experience placements to ensure candidates are engaged with students with exceptionalities and diverse ethnic, linguistic, gender, and socioeconomic groups. Exhibit 4.4 Examples of Field and Clinical Placements is a screen shot of the electronic system which reviewers can access upon the onsite visit. Exhibit 4.5, Candidate Records for Field Placement Diversity provides an example of two candidates' records. The records include flags indicating diversity. A red flag shows the school is lacking one area of diversity. As candidates progress through the process of field and clinical experiences, the Unit ensures that candidates are provided opportunities to participate in experiences with students with diverse needs or students who represent a range of ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds. In the current exhibit, the record for the second candidate indicates Campbell Park Elementary is lacking an area of diversity. By opening the link to the school (see Exhibit 4.6, School Links, a list of data shows the gender, ethnic, socioeconomic, and linguistic makeup of the school. In this case, the school lacks a sufficient representation of ELL students. Therefore, in the following placement, the candidate is placed in New Heights Elementary (see Exhibit 4.7, New Heights Elementary). This process is monitored by the Coordinator of Clinical Education.

Exhibit 4.1, Faculty Demographics

Exhibit 4.2, Candidate Demographics

Exhibit 4.3, School Demographics

Exhibit 4.4, Example of Field and Clinical Placements

Exhibit 4.5, Candidate Records for Field Placement Diversity

Exhibit 4.6, School Links

Exhibit 4.7, New Heights Elementary

## **Standard 5**

### **Growth and Professional Development**

Non-tenured faculty are engaged in the same review process as tenure-tracked faculty, see Exhibit 5.1, Non-Tenured Faculty Review. Tenure and non-tenured faculty (tenure-earning and instructors) undergo an annual review process as discussed in the Institutional Report. Based on responses from candidates' survey of faculty performance, faculty members prepare a written report outlining areas for improvement and growth. This report then undergoes a peer review in which colleagues offer suggestions for meeting the desired growth. The faculty member and

Dean meet to discuss evaluation results, goals for improvement, and opportunities growth. As necessary, the Dean provides faculty members with the professional development and support necessary to attain the desired goals.

### **Student Assessments of Instruction**

Exhibits 5.2, Example 1 of Student Assessment Report and 5.3, Example 2 of Student Assessment Report are examples of the Student Assessment of Instruction reports provided to faculty. Faculty use the information provided to monitor progress and to make course level improvements.

### **Online Course Satisfaction**

In Spring 2014, the USFSP Nelson Poynter Memorial Library conducted a student opinion survey regarding satisfaction and use of online courses. Overall, students reported enjoying their experience taking online courses at USFSP and overwhelmingly would like to see more online courses added to our offerings. On the positive side, students appreciate the flexibility that online learning provides and enjoy the use of course technologies including videos, video lectures and PowerPoint presentations. Comments narrowed areas for improvement that mostly focus on communication issues between students and their instructors as well as comments on the lack of interactivity in their courses, see Exhibit 5.4, Online Courses Survey.

Online course registration has remained strong with courses averaging between a low of 28 candidates to a high of 50.9 candidates per course across the 2009 – 2010 and 2012 – 2013 academic years. Exhibit 5.5, Online Courses and Registration displays the courses offered and the number of candidates registered for each.

### **Evaluation of Part-Time and Clinical Faculty**

All faculty in the College of Education undergo an evaluation process. Newly hired part-time or adjunct faculty are initially observed by the Dean, see 5.6, Adjunct Observation Form. Part-time, or adjunct faculty, are required to undergo a midterm evaluation. The Associate Dean provides evaluation forms to candidates to complete regarding the faculty member's instructional performance. The Associate Dean compiles the responses on each adjunct faculty member and conducts individual meetings to discuss the feedback and improvement plans, if necessary. If the numerical mean for any of the items on the evaluation fall significantly below the College averages, an improvement plan is established and the evaluation procedure is repeated the following semester. If there is no significant improvement in the student evaluation responses, the adjunct faculty member will not be rehired and information will be placed in the adjunct faculty member's performance file.

Clinical faculty, referred to as University Supervisors, are evaluated each semester by the candidates engaged in early internship. Results from these data are used to improve the quality of the instructional program, see Exhibit 5.7, Clinical Faculty Surveys.

### **Collaboration**

Collaboration is an integral component of faculty work at USFSP, especially given the nature of the undergraduate program. Many courses are co-taught to provide the knowledgeable instruction necessary to help candidates meet the competencies and expectations of Elementary

Education and ESE certification requirements. In addition, faculty and administrators collaborate with the local community to provide support, mentoring, and guidance to a local elementary school identified by the state as a “Failing” School.

### **Off-Campus Faculty Qualifications**

Faculty of record for courses offered by USFSP at Pasco Hernando State College are the same as those for courses offered in St. Petersburg. Due to the proximity of this campus, faculty and resources are shared between campuses. Sharing faculty and resources ensures the programmatic offerings at both campuses are implemented and administered consistently with unit policies and procedures.

Exhibit 5.1, Non-Tenured Faculty Review

Exhibit 5.2, Example 1 of Student Assessment Report

Exhibit 5.3, Example 2 of Student Assessment Report

Exhibit 5.4, Online Courses Survey

Exhibit 5.5, Online Courses and Registration

Exhibit 5.6, Adjunct Observation Form

Exhibit 5.7, Clinical Faculty Surveys

### **Standard 6**

#### **College Council Representation and Stakeholder Involvement**

Article 4.0 of the College Constitution states the constituencies to serve on the College Council:

The College of Education faculty is a community of scholars who are responsible for decisions related to the academic programs of the College. The College Council is the elected representative of that body.

Membership of the College Council is prescribed in Article 5.0:

(1) Two representatives shall be elected from Social/Psychological Foundations/Measurement/Technology/Educational Leadership programs, two representatives from Special Education and Secondary Education programs, two representatives from Childhood Education programs; (2) three ex officio members shall also be non-voting members of the Council: one from Advising, one College representative from the Faculty Council, as well as the Dean.

Members of the Council may be tenured, tenure-earning, or on full-time Lecturer/Instructor lines. The faculty member must remain full time throughout his/her term. All elected members shall serve a two-year term. The membership of this council shall be reviewed every five years and changes made based on any significant changes in the configuration of the College Faculty. Members shall not serve more than two consecutive terms.

Council members are elected as follows:

- (1) Any faculty member eligible to serve may also nominate representatives. Self-nominations are also acceptable;
- (2) Elections shall occur annually at the end of the Spring semester;
- (3) Elections will be announced, secret ballots counted and results published by a faculty committee assigned by the College Council;

(4) Newly elected members shall assume their office at the beginning of the subsequent Fall semester.

Through representation of the College Council and its standing committees (Curriculum and Program, Annual Review, and School Community Partnerships), as well as, via participation on the Assessment Committee, faculty are directly involved in decision-making about the Unit and its programs. Students provide input via the Officers of the Student Education Association (SEA) and the Student Council for Exceptional Children (SCEC) and other honorary societies as appropriate.

### **Adequate Resources for Unit Assessment System**

The primary personnel involved in managing and maintaining the Unit Assessment System is the Assessment Coordinator with support from the Dean, Associate Dean, Faculty, and Support Staff, see Exhibit 6.1, Support for Unit Assessment System. The use of the comprehensive data system coupled with faculty workload and committee representation demonstrate the tremendous resources available in the unit. The dedicated talent of the Assessment Coordinator underscores the college's commitment to ensuring the faculty and administration have the data needed to evaluate the ample data provided by the unit assessment system. Program improvement and changes are ongoing and supported by faculty and staff.

### **Off-Campus Facilities**

Candidates in the undergraduate and graduate programs at Pasco Hernando State College (PHSC) are taught in the classroom Building S on the New Port Richey campus. The USFSP advisor at that location has adequate space to regularly meet with candidates.

Candidates in the USFSP College of Education, including those taught at the PHSC facility, have full access to the USFSP library, instructional technology, and faculty support via email, Skype, and personal appointments as necessary. The PHSC candidates are not part of a "separate" program; they are candidates within the courses of study of the USFSP COE.

### **Clarification Points:**

#### Oversight Regarding Adjunct Faculty Quality of Instruction

Part-time, or adjunct faculty, are required to undergo a midterm evaluation. The Associate Dean provides evaluation forms to candidates to complete regarding the faculty member's instructional performance. The Associate Dean compiles the responses on each adjunct faculty member and conducts individual meetings to discuss the feedback and improvement plans, if necessary. If the numerical mean for any of the items on the evaluation fall significantly below the College averages, an improvement plan is established and the evaluation procedure is repeated the following semester. If there is no significant improvement in the student evaluation responses, the adjunct faculty member will not be rehired and information will be placed in the adjunct faculty member's performance file.

#### Instructional Technology

In addition to Smart Boards, computers, and projectors in classrooms, Document cameras are available to faculty and candidates for use in modeling instruction. The technology available to candidates at USFSP reflect or exceed the technology available to them in the surrounding school districts. Results from both employer surveys and completer surveys indicate candidates

are prepared to use technology in the classrooms for instructional, diagnostic, and management purposes, see Exhibit 6.2, Employer Satisfaction Results.2009-10 to 2011-12 and 6.3, Completer Satisfaction Survey Data.2009-10 to 2011-12.

The Mathematics Teaching laboratory contains the following: Smartboards, 15 laptops in a laptop cart, a collaborative learning room where students can project from a computer to a large screen to work on projects, computational calculators, graphing calculators, document camera, and Vernier temperature probes. Software includes but is not limited to: Microsoft Office Suite, Tinkerplots, Georgebra, multiple free Apps for the IPAD (NASA 360, NGSS Science, Educreations, Cat Physics, Google Earth, Skeptical Science, SoHo, Sun Viewer, and NatureTap).

#### Growth of Distance Learning Delivery and Documentation of Online Course Growth

The growth of distance learning delivery has evolved due to several factors: The first of which is to ensure high quality instruction to all candidates as the Unit expanded to provide courses at PHSC. Second, distance learning provides an economical option for use during a fiscally challenging period. In the past, the Unit has used carry forward funds. Careful and frugal stewardship afforded the unit ample technology support for successive years. The Unit no longer has access to these funds which has had a negative fiscal impact on the expansion of distance learning. Nonetheless, distance learning has allowed the Unit another mode of delivery to continue to meet the demand for high quality instruction. The number of courses has increased and the number of candidates per course has remained strong, averaging between 28.0 and 50.9 candidates per course, see 6.4, Online Courses and Registration.

Exhibit 6.1, Support for Unit Assessment System

Exhibit 6.2, Employer Satisfaction Results.2009-10 to 2011-12

Exhibit 6.3, Completer Satisfaction Survey Data.2009-10 to 2011-12

Exhibit 6.4, Online Courses and Registration