

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆☆ *Report*

NCATE Board of Examiners Team:

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

State Team:

N/A

State Consultant:

Ms. Kay A. Caster

NEA or AFT Representative:

N/A

Continuous Improvement Visit to:

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH
FLORIDA ST. PETERSBURG

College of Education

140 Seventh Avenue South

COQ 201

Saint Petersburg, FL 33701-5016

November 16-18, 2014

Type of Visit:

Continuing visit - Initial Teacher Preparation

Continuing visit - Advanced Preparation

BOE Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway (Updated May 2013)

Summary for Professional Education Unit

Institution Name:

Team Recommendations on Meeting Standards:

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

Not Applicable = Unit not reviewed for this standard and/or level

Team Recommendations on Movement Toward Target:

Standards	Initial	Advanced
Standard 1: Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 4: Diversity	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

Not Applicable = Unit did not select this as a target standard

I. Introduction

I.1 Brief Overview of the institution and the unit.

The University of South Florida St. Petersburg (USFSP) is part of the higher education community of greater Tampa Bay. USFSP serves students primarily from Pinellas County and Pasco/Hernando Counties in collaboration with Pasco-Hernando State College (PHSC, formerly Pasco-Hernando Community College). Candidates come from a seven county area, and in recent years, from across the state, country and the world.

As an integral and complementary part of the multi-institution University of South Florida (USF) system, USFSP retains a separate identity and mission while contributing to and benefiting from the associations, cooperation, and shared resources of a premier national research university. In 2001, the Florida Legislature passed legislation directing USFSP to pursue separate accreditation from its parent university, the University of South Florida. That process resulted in separate accreditation by the

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSOC) in spring 2006 and reaffirmation in 2011. Having begun as a branch campus in 1965, USFSP has grown from 257 students to nearly 7,000, and the number of full-time faculty members has leapt from four to 151. The university offers 23 undergraduate degrees and 17 graduate degrees.

In 2003, as it continued to move towards separate accreditation, USFSP created its own administrative structure with the appointment of a regional chancellor, as chief academic officer for the institution, and founding deans for each of the three academic Colleges--Education, Business, and Arts and Sciences. Within this structure, USFSP developed its own Faculty Senate, Undergraduate Council, and Graduate Council and began to develop and control its own programs, while continuing to offer the programs developed at USF Tampa. USFSP is also fiscally autonomous with autonomy over personnel decisions and tenure and promotion, while remaining part of the USF system.

USFSP has also defined its own mission, vision and goals, created a governance structure, and achieved separate institutional accreditation by SACSOC and national accreditation for its professional programs in Business (AACSB) and Education (NCATE). In 2011, USFSP earned the highly competitive Carnegie Community Engagement Classification, another measure of its strong emphasis on service to the community and the citizens it serves.

The College of Education serves as the sole professional education unit at USFSP. Unit faculty, in collaboration with school and community partners, are directly involved in developing and refining the philosophy, mission and vision, and program of study for the unit. Faculty came to consensus and developed the initial teacher preparation program and advanced leadership program candidate learning outcomes (CLOs), addressing both state and national professional standards as well as the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs) standards. The faculty continues to collaboratively refine the programs it offers with close attention to established candidate learning outcomes. The FolioData assessment system has also been designed around CLOs for analysis and data-informed decision-making.

The unit has 22 full-time faculty, including the leadership of the Dean and Associate Dean. In spring of 2014, there were 182 candidates enrolled in the unit's undergraduate programs and 172 in its graduate programs. In addition to offering programs at USFSP's campus in St. Petersburg, the College also offers the Educational Leadership master's program and the Elementary Education bachelors program to candidates at PHSC in New Port Richey, Florida, approximately 60 miles north of the St. Petersburg campus. The PHSC-based programs share a common curriculum and faculty with the St. Petersburg campus.

The professional education unit at USFSP offers one undergraduate degree program, the Bachelors of Science in Education (BXE), that leads to certification in both general and special education, as well as endorsements in ESOL and Reading. In addition to the BXE, the unit offers one minor in education for secondary teaching (Professional Training Option), and eleven masters-level programs. Six programs not leading to state certification do not require state approval, but were reviewed by the on-site team.

Initial Teacher Preparation programs:

- BXE. State approval through 2015
- MA Elementary Education and ESOL (Dual Track). State approval through 2015
- MAT Exceptional Student Education. State approval through 2015. This program is scheduled for termination when the last candidates graduate December 2014.
- MA Reading Education (K-12). State approval through 2015
- PTO Minor (undergraduate). State approval through 2015

Advanced Preparation programs:

- Educational Leadership Track to Certification-only program. State approved through 2015
- M.Ed. Educational Leadership Development. State approval through 2015

Advanced Non-certification programs:

- MA Elementary Education – Math & Science Emphasis
- MA Elementary Education – Curriculum & Literacy
- MA English Education
- MA Exceptional Student Education
- MS Middle Grades Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics (STEM) Education, begun summer 2012.
- Graduate certificate (USFSP) in Middle Grades Digitally Enhanced Mathematics, begun summer 2010.

Beginning summer 2014, the unit initiated a certificate in Early Childhood and Family Studies, providing early childhood paraprofessional and child care providers the knowledge and skills necessary to work with children birth to five years.

I.2 Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?

In accordance with the partnership agreement, the onsite visit was an NCATE-only visit. A state department official was available via telephone or email during the visit but was not physically present during the visit.

I.3 Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).

Two USFSP unit programs are offered on the Pasco-Hernando State College campus, located approximately 65 miles from the main campus in St. Petersburg. The available programs are the Initial Teacher Preparation program in Elementary Education and ESOL (BXE) and the advanced M.Ed. program in Educational Leadership Development. Both programs share the same curriculum and faculty as those offered on the main campus. The site coordinator and students and faculty from the Pasco-Hernando campus were interviewed onsite on the St. Petersburg campus.

I.4 Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) that affected the visit.

No unusual circumstances accompanied the onsite visit.

II. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P-12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II.1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.

The mission of the University of South Florida and Saint Petersburg (USFSP) is to "offer distinctive

graduate and undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences, business, and education within a close knit, student-centered learning community that welcomes individuals from the region, state, nation, and world." The institution further seeks to "conduct wide-ranging, collaborative research to meet society's needs and engage in service projects and partnerships to enhance the university and community's social, economic and intellectual life. As an integral and complementary part of a multi-institutional system, USFSP retains a separate identity and mission while contributing to and benefiting from the associations, cooperation, and shared resources of a premier national research university."

The mission of the USFSP professional education unit is "to prepare exemplary teachers and school leaders for roles in a diverse and changing society. The college offers graduate and undergraduate programs that are recognized for accomplishing defined learning outcomes, supported by a foundation of applied research, and dedicated to meeting the needs of the diverse communities it serves. In pursuit of this mission, faculty are guided by a respect for evidence, the pursuit of scholarship, and the ethics of community responsibility."

The USFSP vision is "to become a premier Master's Degree level urban university recognized for its vibrant community of scholars who engage and improve its community and the world." The vision of the professional education unit is to "be recognized as a premier institution for the preparation of teachers and school leaders, enhanced by the excellence of its faculty, and dedicated to the students and communities it serves."

Completers of the USFSP College of Education's programs are expected to have the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to develop and adapt instruction to ensure all students learn. The unit has the intent to develop teachers and leaders who know the subjects they teach and are adept at instruction that crosses disciplines as required by the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs), Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS), and, more recently, the introduction of the Florida Standards (similar to Common Core Standards).

The FEAPs are Florida's core standards for effective educators providing valuable guidance to Florida's public school educators and educator preparation programs on what educators are expected know and be able to do. The FEAPs focus on high expectations, knowledge of subject matter, and the standards of the profession. The FEAPs are clearly defined to promote a common language and statewide understanding of the expectations for the quality of instruction and professional responsibility. The FPLS are set forth in rule as Florida's core expectations for effective school administrators. The standards form the foundation for school leader personnel evaluations and professional development systems, school leadership preparation programs, and educator certification requirements. Candidate Learning Outcomes (CLOs) for initial preparation programs and the advanced Educational Leadership program were developed by unit faculty "and in conversations with professional partners in the schools served by the unit."

The knowledge base for the professional education unit at USF-St. Petersburg includes the scientific knowledge produced by academic disciplines and the wisdom of practice gained through service to students, parents, and community members. The unit pursues professionalism marked by a large, complex, rapidly growing body of professional knowledge requiring years of sustained study for mastery (Goodlad, Soder & Sirotnik, 1990). Unit faculty acknowledge a scholarly knowledge base of teaching (Christensen, 1996; Cruickshank, 1990; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hill, Rowan & Ball, 2005; McCutchen, Green, Abbott, & Sandards, 2009; Shulman, 1986a, 1987, 2004; Sullivan, 2005), challenged by pressures from policymakers (Podgursky, 2006; Rotherman & Mead, 2004). The unit claims a knowledge base organized in four domains: 1) knowledge of content, 2) knowledge and beliefs of learners and learning; 3) pedagogical content knowledge, skills, and beliefs; and 4) general pedagogical knowledge (Borko & Putnam, 1996; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Cruickshank & Metcalf, 1990; Fueyo, Kooland, & Rasch, 2008; Roy, Vanover, Fueyo, & Vahey, 2012; Shulman, 2004;

Wilkerson & Lang, 2007).

The unit also claims a commitment to offering programs designed to help educators become thoughtful persons, active citizens, and reflective practitioners. The unit's overarching theme is "Preparing Teachers for a Changing World," leading to a "Vision for Professional Practice" (Darling-Hammond and Bransford, 2005). Three organizing themes guide the unit's programs: Knowledgeable Professionalism, Reflective Teaching, and Collaborative Leadership. The unit's knowledge base is organized around these themes.

Knowledgeable Professionalism. The unit knowledge base comprises requisite knowledge in four domains: 1) knowledge of content, 2) knowledge and beliefs of learners and learning, 3) pedagogical content knowledge, skills, and beliefs, including the ability to use computer technology to support cognitively demanding instruction; and 4) general pedagogical knowledge, particularly pedagogy of the profession of teacher education (Borko & Putnam, 1996; Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Cruickshank & Metcalf, 1990; Roy, Vanover, Fueyo, & Vahey, 2012; Shulman, 1987, 2004; Fueyo, Koorland, & Rasch, 2008; Wilkerson & Lang, 2007). Further, this knowledge base is conveyed within an environment that celebrates the diversity of the community and its schools and develops school professionals who engage in developmentally appropriate practice tailored to the needs of the vastly diverse group of learners who attend local schools (Comer et al, 1996; Delpit, 1995, 2006; Eisner, 2004; Gilligan, 1993; Hollins & Oliver, 1999).

Reflective Teaching. Reflective teaching is a basic tenet of instruction at USFSP. Candidates in USFSP unit programs are expected to reflect on their work and evaluating the impact of their behavior on others, both individually and in collaboration, and be responsive to the unique educational and emotional needs of each individual student (LaBoskey, 1993; Pollard & Tann, 1987; Ross, Bondy, & Kyle, 1993; Tomlinson, 2000).

Collaborative Leadership. Knowledgeable professionalism and a commitment to students' welfare, as well as to the families and communities the teacher leaders serve, are all foundations of teacher leadership at USFSP. In their study of teacher leadership, Lieberman and her colleagues (Lieberman & Miller, 2004) identify four domains of skill and expertise: 1) teacher as researcher, 2) teacher as professional, 3) teacher as curriculum and instructional leader, and 4) teacher as ethical decision-maker. Unit faculty promote these characteristics among candidates in both initial and advanced programs. The following Candidate Learning Outcomes (CLOs) establish the unit's expectations for completers of its initial teacher preparation programs, including the MA in Reading Education (K-12) program, which the state of Florida treats as an initial program.

1. Candidates will evidence current knowledge of subject matter, theories of learning, and human development. (knowledge)
2. Candidates will create an environment that fosters positive interaction, inquiry, critical thinking, and student success, using communication skills and technology as appropriate to reflect a progressive classroom. (create an environment, technology, communication)
3. Candidates will value and respect all children and their families, and will value the knowledge and skills necessary to support each student's success. (dispositions)
4. 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. (teaching)
5. 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. (beyond teaching, diversity)
6. Candidates will engage in reflective practices regarding their own pedagogy, knowledge, values, and role as an educational leader; this practice will enable them to plan appropriately for their own continuous professional development. (professional development)

7. Candidates will be able to critically analyze specific situations using an ethical framework and professional code of conduct for individual students, colleagues, and institutional rules and policies, and advocate for just and appropriate resolutions. (ethics, leadership)
8. 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. (data, responsible decision making)

The following Candidate Learning Outcomes (CLOs) establish the unit's expectations for completers of its Educational Leadership degree program and certificate Educational Leadership program:

1. Candidates will develop, articulate, and implement a critical vision for their school that will promote success for all students.
2. Candidates will evidence current knowledge of subject matter.
3. Candidates will foster a culture that promotes positive organizational health.
4. Candidates will demonstrate an ethic of caring and ethical reasoning and behavior that places the well-being of children first.
5. Candidates will promote instruction that maximizes student learning.
6. Candidates will address issues of social justice as they model leadership within the school community.
7. Candidates will provide leadership in collaborating with families and other community members to mobilize resources that promote student learning.
8. Candidates will engage in reflective practices to enable them to plan appropriately for their own professional development.
9. Candidates will make use of assessments to inform their decisions and actions.

The unit's assessment system is a powerful data base called FolioData, developed and coordinated internally by a unit faculty member. FolioData is a dynamic system that collects and analyzes candidate performance and unit effectiveness data from multiple sources, including program-identified "Critical Assignment," institutional data, and data provided by the state such as licensure examination results and employer surveys. The system generates reports that are provided to campus and unit leaders, program faculty, and school partners. An assessment committee oversees data collection and analysis, dissemination of reports to stakeholders, and system refinement. The committee includes representatives from unit programs, and meets monthly to review data received since the last meeting to recommend data-informed changes to the faculty and unit leadership. The assessment system is aligned with established Candidate Learning Outcomes.

III. Unit Standards

The following pages contain a summary of the findings for each of the six NCATE unit standards.

Standard 1

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 Overall Findings

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

The University of South Florida St. Petersburg offers programs leading to initial licensure in elementary education, K-12 exceptional student education, and English as a Second or Other Language (ESOL). The Master of Arts in Teaching in Exceptional Student Education is scheduled for termination in fall

2014. The Master of Arts in Educational Leadership Development, the Educational Leadership Track to Certification-only, and the Master of Arts in Reading Education are advanced programs that lead to licensure. The MA in Educational Leadership Development and the Bachelors of Arts in Education are also offered through coursework at Pasco-Hernando State College in New Port Richey, Florida. The IR Addendum and interviews with faculty confirm that this is not a separate program, but is the same program offered at an alternate location by the unit faculty. There are several certification-only programs (i.e., MA in Elementary Education with mathematics and science emphasis; MA in Elementary Education with curriculum and literacy emphasis; MA in English Education; MA in Exceptional Student Education; MS in Middle Grades STEM Education; and graduate certificate in Middle Grades Digitally Enhanced Mathematics. The Professional Training Option (PTO) is an alternative certification program for those interested in teaching at the secondary level. All licensure programs have state approval through 2015.

All programs that end in licensure have data uploaded into an in-house developed system called FolioData. The online FolioData Assessment system and data available onsite verified that the unit has at least three years of data available for review. The online exhibits and onsite interviews and review of artifacts confirmed that candidates in both initial and advanced programs possess in-depth knowledge of content and pedagogical content. One of the primary measures of candidate performance is state-mandated assessments based on Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAPs). Both teachers and school professionals must demonstrate content knowledge through the Florida Teacher Certification Exam (FTCE, General Knowledge Test), Subject Area Tests (Reading), or the Professional Exams (Florida Educational Leadership Exam). Candidates must have 100% passing rate on these assessments in order to graduate from the program. Exhibits in the IR, the IR Addendum, and data in the FolioData system provide data on passing rates for these assessments.

In addition to state-mandated assessments, both the initial and advanced programs have identified critical assignments that measure candidate performance on course outcomes aligned to the conceptual framework and state and national standards. Data from these critical assessments were provided through the FolioData system. The unit provided a list of critical assignments for each program area and course within the program, including the name of the assignment and matching state standards and competencies. Candidate data was available from Fall 13 through Fall 14 which included the number of submissions and the pass/fail rates. Multiple submissions of critical assessments are permitted. An onsite review of the data shows a success rate with few exceptions. These assessments are aligned to state standards with elements that address content knowledge and skills. Certification-only programs and non-licensure advanced programs do not use FolioData; however, programs maintain data on candidate performance. These data was made available during the onsite review. The data for these programs demonstrates the same high level of pass rates as the candidate data for licensure programs. The online exhibits and onsite interviews and review of artifacts confirmed that candidates in both initial and advance program possess in-depth knowledge of content and pedagogical content.

A review of syllabi for both initial and advanced programs (provided as attachments to the IR) show that coursework is aligned to competencies that reflect candidate's development of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge and skills, and the professional knowledge and dispositions that positively impact student learning. The assessments included in the coursework, as well as the state-mandated tests, demonstrate an alignment to appropriate state competencies which reflect professional and national standards.

Initial Programs

Candidates in initial licensure programs are assessed through multiple forms of assessment as outlined in matrices which identify courses in each program along with the outcomes and assessment points. Data reviewed onsite via FolioData included multiple years of candidate data on critical assignments and state-mandated exams. The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices are assessed during coursework and once in the final internship. The critical assignments measure candidate knowledge and skills relative to each of the state standards and competencies. The Florida Educator Accomplished Practices

are assessed during coursework and once in the final internship. Candidate performance data on the Florida Teacher Certification Exam (FTCE, General Knowledge Test) and Subject Area Tests (Reading K-12) were verified onsite via the FolioData system. While candidates may take the tests more than once, all candidates must pass the exams to meet graduation requirements; therefore, 100 percent passing rate is reflected in data for program completers. The Professional Training Option provides an alternate route for licensure to teach at the secondary level; however, according to the IR, the count of candidates and completers in minors is not reported.

Candidate data for the required internship is aligned to state competencies that include components on assessing student learning and using those assessments in designing instruction. Teacher Work Sample data and examples provided onsite show that candidates consider their impact on student learning, collect data on planned interventions, and reflect on the process. Data verified through FolioData during the onsite visit support information presented in the IR that candidates have the knowledge and skills to consider student data in developing meaningful learning experiences. Initial licensure programs assess candidate dispositions as part of the final internship assessment. Data supports that candidates have the skills and knowledge to evaluate and assess student data so they can plan, implement, and evaluate instruction. A review of course artifacts and onsite interviews support that candidates use student assessments and assignments and reflect on identifying and implementing best practices that maximize student learning. As indicated in the IR and verified during the review of data provided onsite, all candidates scored successfully on the dispositions assessment.

Advanced Programs

Candidates in advanced programs are assessed through critical assignments which are aligned to state standards and competencies. The Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) are assessed twice in the program - once in coursework and once in the final internship. In addition, candidates must pass the Florida Educational Leadership Exam (FELE). Candidate data was verified onsite via the FolioData system. Data demonstrate that candidates master the FPLS competencies. A review of Pass/Fail rates for submissions show that few candidates have to resubmit assessments to meet standards. Interviews of the College of Education Assessment Committee verified that faculty work with candidates if they do not meet the mastery requirement, 85 percent, on critical assignments (Educational Leadership). All programs set a mastery level to determine pass/fail status. The number of submissions and pass/fail designations are entered into FolioData; however, the final pass/fail rates generally reflect a 100 percent passing rate as passing the assignments is a program requirement. These two types of assessments, critical course assignments and the state-mandated exams, demonstrate that candidates possess knowledge and skills related to students, families, and communities; use research to inform practice, use technology, and can explain concepts in standards.

Data for candidates in the Master of Arts in Reading are entered into the FolioData system including portfolio assignments and scores on the Florida Content Area Exam in reading. Data were verified onsite via the FolioData system. Data show that reading candidates possess content and pedagogical content knowledge. The data show that candidates successfully complete a practicum which includes a case study of a student with reading difficulties and how those difficulties are addressed.

Non-licensure programs at the advanced level are not included in the primary data system housed in FolioData; however, data for a minimum of three years were available onsite from the various programs. Data provided onsite included descriptions of key assessments, data on performance of students enrolled in the courses, outcomes of comprehensive projects, and documents showing course expectations and alignment to competencies and standards. A review of these data showed that individuals in these programs complete course assessments at a high rate of success. A review of course syllabi showed that experiences provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate content knowledge and pedagogical skills, consider student data in making instructional decisions, and are aware of state and national standards in planning effective instruction.

Advanced candidates demonstrate knowledge and skills related to student learning through practicum experiences. Educational Leadership candidates complete a practicum aligned to the Florida Principal Leadership Standards in which they demonstrate their knowledge and leadership skills to assume roles as leaders in the schools. Data verified onsite via FolioData demonstrate that 100 percent of candidates meet these competencies. Part of this experience includes an action research project which addresses a real problem in the schools where the candidates are based. Likewise, candidates in the reading program complete a case study on a student with a reading difficulty. An onsite analysis of advanced candidate data reveal a 100% passing rate on assessment of these practicum and research experiences.

Candidates in the Educational Leadership program complete a self-evaluation of their professional dispositions. Data presented in the IR and verified through an onsite review of the data provided via FolioData show that candidates' scores ranged from 2.71 to 3.00 on a 3-point scale. Reading candidates are reviewed mid-program on dispositions based on the International Reading Association standards. The onsite review of data verifies the information in IR reporting that the majority of reading candidates have acceptable scores. Onsite interviews and discussions with candidates support that they consider dispositions as a priority and work to develop dispositions that promote leadership and positively impact student learning outcomes. The unit makes an attempt to obtain feedback from graduate employers, but the return rate is too low to make any conclusions. The unit is working to address the low return rate.

1.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 1.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 1.2.b.

1.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

N/A.

1.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

1.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Across both initial and advanced programs candidates demonstrate that they are reflective practitioners. Interviews with candidates and graduates showed that they had well-developed conceptions of what it meant to be a reflective practitioner focused on meeting the needs of all learners as reflected in the conceptual framework. Interviews with faculty, graduates, and candidates resounded with a common theme that experiences promoting reflection were interwoven throughout course expectations and modeled by instructors. Presentations of action research by both initial and advanced program candidates and a review of teacher work samples clearly indicated that reflection was a pivotal component of their process as they engaged in teaching and leading. Both initial and advanced candidates engage in reflective practices which becomes a tool for professional growth across their experiences in coursework and as they transition to role in the schools.

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

1.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

1.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

AFI	AFI Rationale
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.	Evidence from exhibits and group and individual interviews onsite with faculty, candidates, and other stakeholders clearly supported wide distribution of and familiarity with the unit's conceptual framework. Assessments in the FolioData system are also aligned with the conceptual framework.

1.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

AFI	AFI Rationale
None.	

1.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs are recommended for this standard.	

1.4 Recommendations

For Standard 1

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 2**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 Overall Findings**What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

The FolioData Assessment System demonstrates integrated collection, analysis, and monitoring of various data forms from program entry through program exit (i.e. beginning, midpoint, final). The FolioData Assessment System collects data for initial and advanced candidates on a four-tiered system at the following points: (1) admission to the program; (2) entry to unit assessment system; (3) admission to the final internship; and (4) exit/graduation. The FolioData Assessment System collects the following data: (1) state licensure assessments; (2) professional-content based assessments; (3) assessments of planning; (4) assessments of professional dispositions; (5) assessments on candidate's impact on student learning; (6) assessments of internship, practicum, or other clinical experience; and (7) assessments of program completers. The unit designed and implemented the FolioData Assessment System which reflects a model of collaborative leadership where unit administrators and faculty along with various stakeholders (i.e. candidates, school partners, community members) develop a comprehensive data assessment system to emanate the broader institutional vision and mission.

Data are shared with a variety of unit constituencies (i.e. candidates, faculty, administrators, internship office, internship supervisors, cooperating teachers, academic advising office, and assessment committee). 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. More specifically, an assessment committee reviews data, at minimum, 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. Therefore, it is made public on the unit website and in student handbooks. Within exhibit 2.4h, a schedule is provided to show the systematic data collection efforts instituted by the program and across the unit.

In the 2012-2013 Employers Survey, employers rated 90% of completers from USFSP College of Education as Highly Effective or Effective in the following FEAPS: Assessment, Communication, Continuous Improvement, Diversity, Ethics, Human Development, Knowledge of Subject Matter, Environment, Planning, and Technology. More specifically, the highest ratings emerged in Diversity and Ethics (70% Highly Effective/20% Effective). The area of preparation highlighted as an area of focus for USFSP College of Education was: Role of the Teacher (80% Highly Effective or Effective; 20% Not Very Effective or Ineffective). The FolioData Assessment System generates employer satisfaction reports as well as standard-based reports and internship placement reports to improve its overall program delivery.

Given what is learned through data sharing, decisions are made to ensure the improvement of the unit, program, and candidates as faculty members participate in ongoing collaborative endeavors. For example, during an on-site meeting with the Assessment Committee, it was mentioned that the MS Middle STEM education program did not have a dispositional assessment. Faculty from this advanced program collaborated with faculty from the Educational Leadership program and developed a dispositional form for the math program. As part of the assessment system, program data are also collected and analyzed by the Assessment Committee and submitted to the unit and program. The unit's assessment of program indicators is part of a cycle of data collection, analysis, reporting, and planning for improvement. The FolioData Assessment System focuses on the collection of data on primary unit or program assessments for its teacher or administrative licensure programs.

Each academic program has a representative on the Assessment Committee who is voted onto the committee by faculty members. The Assessment Committee meets monthly where they discuss different data points at the program and unit levels. The majority of issues or concerns affecting programs emerging at the Assessment Committee are relegated back to the respective program with any necessary recommendations. Program faculty have the option of proceeding with the recommendation or moving in an alternative direction. For assessment issues requiring more detailed attention and/or unit approval, there is a system in place through which programs engage. The process of program revisions and realignment occurs with the use of curriculum maps and the identification of courses, internships, and learning experiences focused on developing knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Critical Assignments are required for candidate submission as common program assessments across the unit. Within the advanced program of Educational Leadership, candidates upload assignments to the Folio Data system and the faculty instructor assesses the quality of the program assessment as meeting or not meeting the criteria. The summative data approach requires candidates pass 85 percent or more of the criteria to have successfully fulfilled assignments. Within the initial program of Elementary Education, candidates are required to submit a Teacher Work Sample. The assessment approach is formative in its implementation as the focus becomes process-oriented and not outcomes-driven to demonstrate mastery. Candidates are informed about the requirements of the assessment system in the EDG 4012 course, "Introduction to Standards-based Education." Assessment expectations are continuously relayed to the candidates throughout the program of study. New courses, EDF 6931: Technology and Data Introduction to Standards-Based Education for initial program as well as EDG 6931: Technology and Data Analysis for School Leaders and EDA 6061: Principles of Educational Leadership for advanced programs, are used to orient candidates about the assessment expectations within the first semester of their academic program.

The assessment system reflects the conceptual framework of Reflective Teaching, Knowledgeable Professionalism, and Collaborative Leadership. The assessment system is reflective of the conceptual framework and professional state standards (i.e. Florida Educator Accomplished Practices, Florida Principal Leadership Standards) and the Candidate Learning Outcomes demonstrating alignment between the individual courses, collective programs, and the broader unit. Relevant activities are integrated across the program and within the courses to show how data can be used as a resource for teaching and learning. According to candidates interviewed, some classes require hands-on presentations. Through the use of action research, candidates demonstrate the importance of data usage in project-based learning activities for addressing practical issues emerging in classroom settings. Candidates also express how program faculty model the conceptual framework given their professional dispositions and content expertise. Faculty ask candidates to provide feedback on ways to improve the delivery of course and/or program related activities. What candidates know and must be able to do reflect the Candidate Learning Outcomes as previously developed by program faculty. Additionally, at the program level, systematic processes are instituted to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency of measures at the program level. Curriculum matrices, portfolios, and assessment information are included

in internship syllabus. The assessors are trained on tools, opportunities provided for candidate remediation, and candidates have the right to file grievances. An on-site meeting with the Assessment Committee involved a discussion of the role of course rubrics for providing the framework for establishing fairness. Exhibit 2.4 contains specific processes which demonstrate the deliberate steps taken to ensure fairness, accuracy, and consistency with the assessment system.

2.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 2.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 2.2.b.

2.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

Empty text box for performance summary.

2.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

The development and implementation of FolioData have centralized the data collection, analysis, and evaluation processes. Candidate data related to portfolio assessments, internship evaluations, candidate disposition data, internship placements, and other forms can be entered directly into the system. 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 demonstration of continuous improvement includes the integration of new courses for the program. These new courses, EDG 4012 course, "Introduction to Standards-based Education" and EDF 6931: Technology and Data Introduction to Standards-Based Education at the initial level as well as EDG 6931: Technology and Data Analysis for School Leaders and EDA 6061: Principles of Educational Leadership for advanced programs, are used to orient candidates about the assessment expectations within the first semester of their academic program.

2.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Empty text box for areas of the standard being addressed.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric

of the target level rubric for this standard.	for this standard.	rubric for this standard.	for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

2.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

2.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

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

2.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

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

2.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
The unit does not regularly and systematically collect and analyze candidate performance data to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations for non-certification advance programs.	While there is a comprehensive assessment system for the initial program and the advanced program in Educational Leadership, there is no comprehensive assessment system for those advanced programs not licensed by the state. NCATE standards require that all programs preparing candidates for work in schools to be assessed, even though the state does not require reporting on non-certification programs.

2.4 Recommendations

For Standard 2

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 3

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 Overall Findings

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

The unit has developed and implemented a comprehensive system of clinical and field experiences. These experiences are designed to support the programs' efforts to develop candidates' knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in order for all students to learn. The unit exercises its field experiences and clinical practices through formal agreements and partnerships with the Pinellas, Pasco, and Hernando school districts. Evidence provided during the onsite visit and interviews with principals and central office officials from the surrounding school districts revealed that there is broad collaboration between the College of Education and its partners.

While the review team noted strong collaboration and engagement between the unit and its school partners related to implementation of field and clinical experiences, it also noted that these partners have few formal opportunities to participate in or provide feedback regarding ongoing design and maintenance efforts related to these experiences. The review team learned that the college's advisory committee, which had been identified as the group responsible for maintaining the college's field and clinical experiences, had only recently been reinstated and did not have a role in the recent updates to the unit's assessment system and field and clinical experiences. A review of agendas from advisory committee meetings held in the last year did not indicate that any discussion of the unit's field and clinical experiences had occurred with this external body.

Field experiences are of significant intensiveness and extensiveness to support candidates' growth as educators. Candidates undergo multiple levels of field and clinical experiences depending on the program in which they are enrolled. Undergraduate field and clinical placements provide candidates with rich opportunities to engage students with exceptionalities by requiring candidates to undergo three levels of internships which occur after they have been admitted into the department. Onsite interviews with candidates, faculty, and school personnel affirmed that the unit's teacher candidates have regular opportunities to use technology in the field. They also affirmed that candidates typically bring strong instructional technology skills to their field experiences. During level two and the second phase of the third level of internships, candidates receive approximately 200 hours and 250 hours respectively, of exposure to and interaction with students who have special needs. Candidates in the graduate initial teacher programs have a similar experience during their final internship which divides the experience into two distinct phases allowing candidates opportunities to provide instruction to general education students and students with exceptionalities. The unit's response to the offsite report clarified that field experiences for candidates in the Reading and other advanced teacher preparation programs take place in their classrooms under the joint supervision of unit supervisors and school-based personnel. Interviews with the faculty of advanced level programs verified that in cases where advanced-level teaching candidates' classrooms do not meet unit-established diversity criteria, the faculty work collaboratively to ensure that there are sufficient opportunities to work with diverse learners and apply instructional strategies presented in coursework.

Depending on the program in which a candidate is enrolled, field experiences and clinical practices are evaluated in alignment with the proficiencies outlined in either the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP) or the Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS). Clinical faculty and school-based faculty support candidates during clinical practice through regular visits as well as telephone, email, and text communications. Candidates and school partners alike confirmed that unit faculty were

deeply engaged in the supervision and mentoring of candidates. Candidate performance results examined onsite in the unit's FolioData system reveal that during their clinical assessments, candidates consistently demonstrate mastery level performance in the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

The Florida Department of Education has established specific eligibility requirements for cooperating teachers in the state. The review team was provided with sample verification letters from district partners confirming that all cooperating teachers assigned by the district to work with the unit's candidates meet these state requirements. In its response to the offsite visit report, the unit clarified its efforts to ensure that cooperating teachers are trained for their roles in working with candidates during the internship phase of the program. In addition to the district-mandated Clinical Educator Training, USFSP university supervisors work with each cooperating teacher at the start of a semester to ensure they are clear on all internship assignments, can use the evaluation instruments effectively, can demonstrate use of the electronic evaluation system, and ensure they provide feedback via the Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form. University supervisors and cooperating teachers alike confirmed the occurrence of these trainings and that the established procedures and requirements are adhered to with fidelity.

3.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 3.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 3.2.b.

3.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

3.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

Evidence demonstrates that the unit continues to make efforts to improve its offerings and content delivery in the area of field experiences and clinical practice. Since 2012, the unit has aligned the intended outcomes for candidates in its initial and advanced teacher preparation programs with the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices and outcomes for its Educational Leadership program with the Florida Principal Leadership Standards.

The unit also underwent a full overhaul of its system for gathering, storing, and analyzing candidate performance data, and in the fall of 2013, piloted a new electronic assessment system called FolioData, which has modernized and systematized the unit's process of assessing candidates' performance and unit operations. According to faculty members who were interviewed, FolioData has transformed the assessment process, particularly as it relates to internship assessments, from one that was considered by candidates and faculty members to be punitive, to one that is now considered to be iterative and supports candidates' growth.

Since the last accreditation visit, the unit has also bolstered its partnerships with local schools in the Pinellas and Hernando school districts. Local school leaders and cooperating teachers who were interviewed all described robust engagement with university supervisors and unit faculty members. Through these partnerships the unit has established a substantial network of potential field placement

sites where its candidates are placed in support of the newly established BXE program and enhanced undergraduate and graduate level teacher programs. These experiences require candidates to undergo multiple levels of internships in settings that not only include general education learners but target students with exceptionalities and English-language learners as well.

3.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Empty rectangular box for text input.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

3.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

3.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

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

3.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

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

3.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs are recommended for this standard.	

3.4 Recommendations

For Standard 3

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 4**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 Overall Findings**What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?**

Diversity is a major pillar of focus within the unit and its programs. Course activities and key assessments are aligned to a cadre of expectations that articulate the unit's vision of candidates becoming educators able to understand, value, and respect the importance of diversity in the classroom. In the Bachelor of Science in Education, dual-track, and Master of Arts in Reading programs, four of the eight candidate learning outcomes expected of candidates pertain to diversity. Three of the nine candidate outcomes in the Educational Leadership program represent the unit's commitment to ensuring candidates master diversity principles. Depending on the program, candidate learning outcomes are closely aligned to either the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices or Florida Principal Leadership Standards, upon which candidates' performance is assessed. Candidates who were interviewed spoke at length about the extent to which they have been prepared for experiences with diverse learners, citing the quantity and breadth of field and clinical experiences related to diverse learners. A review of candidate performance data on key assessments revealed that candidates consistently score at an acceptable level or better on proficiencies related to diversity.

One of the most significant shifts, however, made by the unit within the last few years underscores its commitment to ensuring candidates understand the importance of diversity. This shift is the creation of the Bachelor of Science in Education (BXE) program. The BXE program is a blended-model program whereby candidates work toward both general education elementary K-5 and Specialized Education certification. Candidates also receive preparation leading to endorsements in ESOL and Reading. A multi-level system of clinical and field experiences was designed to ensure that candidates in the BXE program have extensive and robust experiences working with students who are English-language learners and with students with exceptionalities. Candidates who were interviewed confirmed that the program places a significant emphasis on ensuring they have an acute awareness of the differences between and among learners.

Across initial and advanced level programs, evidence provided by the unit shows that between the unit's

full-time and part-time faculty members, candidates have sufficient opportunities to interact with diverse faculty members. The faculty is comprised of both men and women at approximately 26 percent (17 of 65) and 74 percent (48 of 65) respectively. Faculty demographic data show that approximately 11 percent (7 of 65) of faculty members represent racially diverse backgrounds. Though the overall number of faculty who represent racial/ethnic diversity is small, the unit assures that all candidates have opportunities to interact with diverse faculty by positioning faculty members, who represent diversity, to teach key courses. One such course is the Introduction to Diversity course that all undergraduate education program candidates are required to complete prior to being admitted to the College of Education.

Candidates in initial and advanced programs have adequate opportunities to interact with other candidates who represent diversity. Twenty-six percent of the candidates within the unit represent racial/ethnic diversity and candidates across the unit represent both genders at a rate of approximately 14 and 86 percent males and females respectively.

The unit uses its FolioData assessment platform to track school demographic data for the purpose of making determinations about which schools are suitable for field and clinical placements and which are not. By importing school demographic data from the state into FolioData, the unit is able to ensure the schools in which candidates are placed have sufficient diversity along four primary domains: race/ethnicity (at least 5% non-white population is required), gender (at least 30% male or female population is required), English-language learners (at least 3% ELL population is required), and socio-economic status (at least 5% free-reduced lunch required). School visits and interviews with university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and school leaders revealed a strong sense of collaboration between the unit and school-based staff to ensure that placements are meaningful and adhere to the state's and unit's standards related to P-12 student diversity.

4.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 4.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 4.2.b.

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, the unit has gone to considerable efforts to position itself as an area leader in the preparation of teachers and educational leaders who value, respect, and understand the importance of teaching to ensure all students can learn. One of the most significant advancements made on the part of the unit since the last visit, underscoring its commitment to diversity, is the creation of the Bachelor of Science in Education (BXE) program which prepares candidates to teach mainstream students, those with exceptionalities, and English-language learners with equal proficiency. Candidates who complete the BXE program, are eligible to receive State of Florida certifications in Elementary Education and Specialized Education, and endorsements in ESOL and Reading. Candidates also exit the BXE program with approximately 450 hours of clinical preparation working with special needs students in addition to the nearly 450 hours of clinical preparation they receive working with general education students.

The program has also made a significant strides in its outreach and efforts to partner with local high-needs schools in St. Petersburg and the local county school districts. As a result, the College of Education has forged several ties with some of the more challenged schools with an emphasis on providing services and experiences aimed at enriching lives and broadening horizons. One such partnership exists with Fairmount Park Elementary School, a local high-needs school identified as

consistently failing. The college provides a number of services directly to students at the school, not the least of which is a commitment that all students in the undergraduate programs spend a minimum of 15 hours providing different levels of community service on-site at the school as part of their requirements in the Intro to Diversity course. The College of Education also operates the Bridge to Success summer camp program that serves children from struggling schools and impoverished neighborhoods in the area. The review team learned that candidates in the program are often counselors in the program. These programs which target, minority and disadvantaged students provide candidates with additional opportunities to engage with diverse students outside of their normal internship experiences.

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 diverse local school districts and of the state.

4.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

4.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

present and which is not in their findings.]	
----------------------------------------------	--

4.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales

4.3.a What AFIs have been removed?

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

4.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

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

4.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs are recommended for this standard.	

4.4 Recommendations

For Standard 4

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)
Advanced Preparation	Movement Toward Target (developing or emerging)

Standard 5

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 Overall Findings

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

All requests for information and clarification were adequately addressed by the unit in the Offsite Report Addendum and during the onsite visit. Information was provided clearly identifying clinical faculty and delineating fulltime and part time faculty by program. As described in the offsite report, faculty are qualified with appropriate educational backgrounds.

As indicated in the offsite report, faculty are actively engaged in scholarship, service, and teaching,

consistent with unit and institutional policies. Tenure-track faculty have documented appropriate professional experiences, but, although there is reference to policy (5.4.d) for determining professional development for part-time faculty who are not on tenure-track, no consistent data on those professional experiences were documented. Faculty have various ways to access professional development, including regularly institutional and system scheduled professional development offerings (onsite interviews, Online Learning and Instructional Technology Services Professional Development Summer Sessions 2014 and Online Learning and Instructional Technology Services Professional Development Fall 2014) as well as six credit hours per year of paid classes. Faculty scholarship was documented onsite through interviews with unit and institutional leaders and faculty, electronic exhibits (5.1 Tenure and Promotion Procedures), and through a wide array of recent scholarly work displayed during onsite visit. Also, the Sunday evening social event during the onsite visit included multiple examples of faculty, candidate, and faculty/candidate collaborative scholarship. Distance Learning Trainings support both integration of educational technology practice and online class instruction and are designed in response to faculty surveys. Various trainings, such as ESOL and Common Core training, are provided for faculty by the unit either onsite or online. Additional trainings are determined by the faculty themselves and in collaboration with a peer review committee and the Dean in the annual review process. Other self-directed trainings may be approved by the Dean upon request. The Dean may suggest specific professional development for faculty whose annual review indicates a need for remediation. Funding for professional development is included in the unit budget and supplemented with grant funding. Faculty must document their own professional development each year as part of the annual evaluation process.

All fulltime and part-time faculty have ESOL credentials or have completed an ESOL training module to support the BXE program. Interviews with faculty and candidates confirmed that the effective use of instructional technology is consistent across programs.

As verified by interviews with graduates and interns during the onsite visit and by additional documentation provided, unit faculty model best practices and teaching strategies. These include applying the three components of the conceptual framework: Knowledgeable Professionalism, Reflective Teaching, and Collaborative Leadership. According to intern interviews, reflective practice is emphasized and embedded in all assignments. Faculty also model professional knowledge, including the use of information communications technology through online and blended classes as well as instructional use of technology within traditional onsite classes. Faculty evaluation procedures vary among fulltime and part time faculty, and among tenured and non-tenured faculty. However, all USF-SP faculty are evaluated by students each semester and annually by supervisors. Online course offerings are expanding within the unit. Candidate survey data (Addendum 5.4) show 81% of candidates taking online courses were full-time candidates. Candidates indicate satisfaction with the quality of the courses and a desire for more online options.

Faculty service both within their professional field and to the local community and schools is documented in vita and verified in interviews. Modeling of collaborative leadership by the faculty was highlighted by both interns and graduates in interviews as well as formal collaboration delineated in the unit constitution.

5.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 5.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 5.2.b.

5.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

5.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

5.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Over 80 hours of training in digital learning have been available to faculty and additional trainings are scheduled regularly (onsite interviews, Online Learning and Instructional Technology Services Professional Development Summer Sessions 2014 and Online Learning and Instructional Technology Services Professional Development Fall 2014) These trainings provide support for faculty delivering online instruction. In interviews, candidates expressed satisfaction with their experiences and abilities in incorporating technology in the classroom. In addition to extensive training offered to the faculty to support a growing online presence, significant efforts have been made to assure all faculty are trained to support the ESOL program. All faculty are either externally credentialed in ESOL or have completed an online training module. This professional development embeds ESOL content throughout the program and also models best practices for candidates.

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

5.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**5.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

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

5.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

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

5.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs are recommended for this standard.	

5.4 Recommendations

For Standard 5

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Target Level

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

Standard 6

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 Overall Findings

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

The College of Education is the professional education unit at USF-St Petersburg. The unit is headed by a Dean and an Associate Dean. Externally, the College of Arts and Sciences provides content courses for undergraduate initial programs. A minor in education (the Professional Training Option) leads to certification for secondary teaching. Faculty from these external programs are represented in the unit's governance structure, including the Assessment Committee and College Council. Other stakeholders serving on the College Council include both school partners and community/business partners.

Rules showing faculty requirements for participation on governance committees, a flow chart of governance, vitae showing committee membership and the unit's constitution demonstrate faculty have both leadership and authority in program development and operation. The role of the College Council as a collaborative governance body and advisory group to the Dean on matters of faculty development and academic support was verified by onsite interviews. The conceptual framework component of Collaborative Leadership is modeled throughout the various governance functions of the unit and is clear to both faculty and to candidates.

The unit also offers offsite classes at Pasco Hernando State College on the New Port Richey campus. Interviews with faculty, administration, and candidates all indicate consistency in these classes with the main campus program. According to candidates and faculty interviewed, PHSC candidates are not enrolled in a separate program: rather candidates are within the courses of study of the USFSP COE and classes at either campus are equitable and interchangeable.

Access to counseling and advising was verified in interviews with candidates in both initial and advanced programs. Candidates highlighted the accessibility and responsiveness of advisors and faculty when contacted.

Classroom resources are adequate on both campuses, including a Mathematics Teaching laboratory in Coquina Hall, and are supplied with appropriate technology. Smart Boards, document cameras, projectors and computers are available in classrooms. Technical support and professional development opportunities for both candidates and faculty are provided by the Distance Learning and Instructional Media Services unit. All USFSP library materials and instructional resources are available to faculty and candidates on both campuses as well as students taking online classes. Candidates take classes from either campus interchangeably within the COE.

Although the unit has faced challenges in response to budget cuts, expansion of the program to off-campus sites, the inclusion of online classes and the additional revenue generated from grant funds has offset the effects of these cuts. Budget documents reviewed on site and interviews with both the Regional Chancellor (CEO) and the Regional Vice Chancellor (CAO) confirmed a strong institutional commitment to quality educator preparation and an equitable distribution of available resources, including personnel, to the unit. Despite financial challenges, USFSP has plans to expand with the Vision 2020 initiative (website) to a target student body of 10,000 in the next 10 years.

6.2 Moving Toward Target or Continuous Improvement

Please respond to 6.2.a if this is the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level. If it is not the standard on which the unit is moving to the target level, respond to 6.2.b.

6.2.a Movement Toward Target.

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

--

6.2.b Continuous Improvement.

What activities and outcomes demonstrate that the unit has been engaged in continuous improvement?

As verified by interviews during the onsite visit, the FolioData system has been developed to gather, access and utilize data to assess and modify programs and assessments as necessary. This system also provides the unit with the ability to monitor candidate progress toward completion of a program of study.

6.2.b.i Strengths.

What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Criteria for Movement Toward Target

NO EVIDENCE	MOVING TOWARD TARGET		AT TARGET
	EMERGING	DEVELOPING	ATTAINED
Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was not presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing as described in any aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in some aspect of the target level of the rubric for this standard.	Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence demonstrates that the unit is performing as described in all aspects of the target level rubric for this standard.
<u>AND</u>	<u>OR</u>	<u>AND</u>	<u>AND</u>
There are no plans and timelines for attaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard. [BOE specifies which is present and which is not in their findings.]	There are plans and timelines for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.	There are plans and timelines for sustaining target level performance as described in the unit standard.

6.3 Areas for Improvement and Rationales**6.3.a What AFIs have been removed?**

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

6.3.b What AFIs are continued from last visit?

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

6.3.c What new AFIs are recommended?

AFI	AFI Rationale
No AFIs are recommended for this standard.	

6.4 Recommendations**For Standard 6**

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Met
Advanced Preparation	Met

Level	Recommendation
Initial Teacher Preparation	Not Applicable
Advanced Preparation	Not Applicable

IV. Sources of Evidence

Documents Reviewed

See attachments.

Persons Interviewed

See attachments.

Please upload sources of evidence and the list of persons interviewed.

Exhibits-Hotel.docx
Exhibits Reviewed #2.pdf
Persons Interviewed.docx
Onsite Exhibits Reviewed.docx

See **Attachment** panel below.

V. State Addendum (if applicable)

Please upload the state addendum (if applicable).

Please click "Next"

This is the end of the report. Please click "Next" to proceed.