Institutional Program Evaluation Plan
2001 Format

Institution: University of South Florida

**Standard 1:** All students who complete the program will demonstrate the 12 Accomplished Practices at the Preprofessional Benchmark as described in the institutional evaluation plan.

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Demonstration rate for each Accomplished Practice.

Criterion: 100% of program graduates for each Accomplished Practice.

Data Sources for 2001-2002:

Changes Made to 2000 IPEP:

Currently, all programs in the College of Education have identified evidence for documenting the Florida Accomplished Practices in each required course. Both the Undergraduate Program and the Graduate Program Committees within the College require that any substantive revisions to courses or new courses being proposed for any program must identify evidence for documenting the Florida Accomplished Practices prior to being approved. The departmental course syllabus format for both undergraduate and graduate courses has recently been revised. Copies are attached in Appendix 1. In addition, the APs continue to be documented during the final internship as a requirement for graduating.

The USF 2000 IPEP was submitted to the Florida Department of Education in August 2001 due to personnel changes; thus, the results of our 2000 IPEP review were not available until December. After reviewing the report's recommendations pertaining to Standard 1, the Dean’s Staff has begun planning a College-wide plan that will address the recommendations in the report. Faculty have embraced the need to develop an improved system for reviewing students’ attainment of the course-based assessments that have been identified for each Accomplished Practice. When the 2000 IPEP was submitted, plans were still in the development stage for the Performance Assessment System for Students (PASS). Although there was not college-wide support for implementation of the PASS system, one of the regional campuses is using the system. Programs that already require a portfolio have worked to align these around the Accomplished Practices and are currently developing and field-testing rubrics.
II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Review Findings and Review Process (Including Office/Personnel Involved):
The Internship Office, under the supervision of the Associate Dean for Teacher Education, has been responsible for collecting evidence of each student's documentation pertaining to the Florida Accomplished Practices. Although during the first few semesters of implementation, the College experienced difficulty in collecting the appropriate documents in a timely manner for use in determining graduation status, new systems have now been implemented to ensure that students do not receive a final grade until the Internship Office has received the appropriate documentation from supervising faculty. This has resulted in a strong system in which the verification process for documentation insures that students have demonstrated competency prior to graduation.

The College employs a Final Internship Evaluation Form that consists of a series of questions designed to provide University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers an opportunity to evaluate students’ performance during their final internship. Respondents provide ratings to 63 items (categorized by the individual Accomplished Practices) according to a five point rubric with 5= demonstration of Accomplished Practices at a level exceeding that expected of a beginning teacher; 4= proficient demonstration of Accomplished Practice at a level expected of a beginning teacher; 3=demonstration of the behavior at a level expected of a beginning teacher, although not consistent yet over time; 2=demonstration of Accomplished Practice inconsistently and at a level less than expected of a beginning teacher (more improvement is needed) and 1=unsuccessful demonstration of Accomplished Practice. Two additional options are provided: a response of NA is suggested when the rater has been unable to observe or review documentation that show evidence of a particular behavior, and an option of NR is given when the item is not relevant for the intern’s situation or school context. Thus, at this time a rating of 3 or higher is considered evidence that the student has demonstrated the Accomplished Practice.

Based on a review of the ratings of both the University Supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher on the individual items, University Supervisors are then asked to provide overall performance ratings on each of the twelve Florida Accomplished Practices. These ratings are provided on a three-point scale (with 1=not demonstrated, 2=partially demonstrated and 3=demonstrated). (NOTE: For the 2001-2002 year, the College is changing this form to only provide two categories: Not demonstrated and Demonstrated.) Additionally, demographic information is collected that allows for a closer examination of individual programs and/or separate school districts. Lastly, a single open-ended question is provided to capture respondent’s perceptions of the intern’s overall competency and the probability of future success as a teacher.

On average, the ratings provided by the University Supervisors were slightly lower than those provided by the Cooperating Teachers. Cooperating teacher ratings were only slightly lower for Ethics and Professionalism and Learning Environment. Based on the five-point scale, (with 5=demonstration of Accomplished Practices at a level exceeding that expected of a beginning teacher and 1=unsuccessful demonstration of Accomplished Practice) mean ratings for the University Supervisors ranged from a high of 4.8 for ethics and professionalism to a low of 4.3 for assessment. The highest and lowest mean ratings provided by Cooperating Teachers were consistent with the ratings provided by the University Supervisors and only slightly different in magnitude (4.77 and 4.37, respectively). Collectively, these results suggest...
that our interns are proficiently demonstrating their capability across the twelve Accomplished Practices.

Table 1

I. Means and Standard Deviations for Ratings of Accomplished Practices for Fall 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplished Practice</th>
<th>University Supervisor</th>
<th>Cooperating Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics &amp; Professionalism</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Learning</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Presentation of Subject Matter</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Teacher</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Percentage of University Supervisors Reporting Demonstrated Competency
(Represents Respondents from All Programs Except Early Childhood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplished Practice</th>
<th>Summative Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Demonstrated</td>
<td>Partially Demonstrated</td>
<td>Demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics &amp; Professionalism</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>99.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Learning</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Presentation of Subject Matter</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Teacher</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Percentage of University Supervisors Reporting Demonstrated Competency
(Represents Respondents Only Early Childhood Program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accomplished Practice</th>
<th>Not Demonstrated</th>
<th>Partially Demonstrated</th>
<th>Demonstrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics &amp; Professionalism</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development &amp; Learning</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Presentation of Subject Matter</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Environment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the Teacher</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance: *All Program in Compliance.*

Explanation of Exceptions for Candidates Not Demonstrating Each Practice: *Not Applicable*

III: Improvement Section


*Changes were made in the Internship Office database system enabling staff in the Internship Office to log in receipt of both the Final Evaluation Form and the Summative Rating Form used to document students’ demonstration of the Accomplished Practices. A form letter is now used to contact any university supervisor for whom internship evaluations have not been received and correctly completed. This change has eliminated the possibility of missing data. For example, during the Fall semester, the new process helped identify a university supervisor who was not completing the final internship evaluation forms correctly. A follow up conversation with the program director and the faculty member has already corrected the situation. Increased training was provided to individuals serving as university supervisors to familiarize them with the importance of these documents for accountability and program review purposes. More detailed directions were included in the Handbook for Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors and discussed during the Orientation Meeting.*
Early Childhood (Appendix 3), Music Education and Special Education are all using portfolios that are tied to the FEAPs. In all three areas, there have been pilot projects featuring electronic portfolios.

The College sponsored a Faculty Forum (February 2001) that focused on performance assessment in teacher education and which featured Barbara Harrell and Donna Gollnick, as well as faculty presentations on efforts including electronic portfolios, gatekeeping, professional seminars, and ESOL binders.

The Associate Dean for Teacher Education along with the Program Review Coordinator visited each academic department during the 2000-2001 school year to facilitate faculty conversations regarding a set of guiding principles relative to assessment and accountability. Faculty in each department were asked to respond to key questions regarding their plans to collect and manage data that help insure student have demonstrated required levels of competency related to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed by new teachers (Appendix 4 and 5).

A number of program areas (Physical Education, Elementary Education, and Special Education) developed forms of the Continuous Teaching Cycle reports that are based on the Teacher Work Sample Methodology developed at Western Oregon University. Although not required in any program yet, the approach has gained popularity with selected faculty who will continue to use aspects within their courses or program areas.

A committee appointed by the Undergraduate Program Committee was assigned to revise the Departmental Syllabus format that has been used in the College for the past few years. The intent of the revisions was to align the document with the new NCATE standards and all new state mandates. The resulting changes were reviewed by the College Council during the 2002 year and are now being implemented within the College.

A statement was developed and reviewed by the Undergraduate Program Committee requesting faculty to indicate on their course syllabi assignments that are aligned with the Florida Accomplished Practices and the ESOL competencies. This statement was brought to the College Council for approval in Spring 2002 (Appendix 2). This affords students with better communication regarding the connection between their individual courses and their demonstration of the Accomplished Practices. For programs that use portfolios, this will be particularly helpful as the students organize the contents of their portfolios.

Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated: Many of the programs anticipate identifying capstone assignments that will be required in all sections of a particular class and that demonstrate students' demonstration of the Florida Accomplished Practices. Students will be unable to pass the course if they have not successfully passed the assignment. This approach has already been implemented to document the ESOL competencies in our endorsement programs. Continued work on rubrics for these assignments will be taking place during the 2001-2002 academic year.
**Standard 2:** 90% of the students in the program will pass the CLAST, the Professional Education, and Subject Matter Subtests of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination.

I. Evaluation Section

**Measure:** FTCE pass rate.

**Criterion:** 90% of program graduates who have taken the examination for all programs.

**Data Sources for 2001-2002:** DOE report of FTCE pass rate for each program and institutional analysis of report.

II. Data Section

**Annual Review for 2000-2001:**

Data (from 1997-98 Standard Report): **[complete the table]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prog. # (DOE Code)</th>
<th>Program Title</th>
<th># of 1998-99 Grads.</th>
<th># Taking Exam</th>
<th># Passing Exam</th>
<th>% Passing Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Emotionally Disturbed</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Industrial/Technical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Mental</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog. # (DOE Code)</td>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td># of 1998-99 Grads.</td>
<td># Taking Exam</td>
<td># Passing Exam</td>
<td>% Passing Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retardation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Specific Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Varying Exceptionalities</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>PE K-8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>PE 6-12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Industrial Arts Technical</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Although graduates have been reported by the University via the graduation certification process, no data are appearing on the reports from the DOE for the Speech Impaired Program. This was noted in the review provided from the Bureau for our 2000 IPEP and it is currently being investigated.

Programs In Compliance and Programs Not In Compliance: All programs in compliance.

Explanation For Programs Not Meeting the Criterion: Not applicable.

III: Improvement Section

Improvement Report for 2000-2001: Improvements Accomplished:

Results of the Title II report were published and shared with various constituents within the College, University, and neighboring community colleges.

Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated:

The results of the Title II report are now on the College's website and will appear in future issues of the undergraduate catalog.
Standard 3: The unit will have complied with program components mandated by State Statute or Rule, e.g., Clinical Education, Stakeholder Involvement, Essential Competencies, ESOL training, etc.

Standard 3, Indicator 1: Candidates: State mandated requirements related to candidate component of the program – including admissions, retention and progression, and program completion – are implemented and monitored, with improvements made as appropriate.

IPEP 2001 Mandates:
- Admissions Requirements
- Retention and Progression
- Program Completion
  - Passing Score on FTCE
  - Demonstration of Florida Subject Matter Content Standards and Accomplished Practices

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Compliance with State mandates.

Criteria: Not applicable.

Data Sources for 2001-2002: Changes Made to 2000 IPEP: No changes made to data sources.

II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Review Findings and Review Process (Including Office/Personnel Involved): Bachelor's Programs:

Admissions: The staff of the Student Academic Services Office review applications for admissions to ensure compliance with these requirements. The Associate Dean for Teacher Education supervises this process. Records are reviewed at different points in times: at orientation, prior to internship, and prior to graduation.

In Master's Plan II programs, the COE Office of Graduate Studies monitors admissions. Records are reviewed at different points in time, including prior to internship. During the Spring of 2001, the College Council approved a change in the admission requirements at the Master's level, allowing programs flexibility in the use of the GRE score as a requirement for admissions. Any changes in individual program admissions now reflect either a GRE score of 1000 or all sub-tests passed on the CLAST.

In Fine Arts education, the Associate Dean of the College of Fine Arts monitors admissions requirements. Although the Art Education and Dance Education programs
have been indefinitely suspended, the advisors work closely with students in the Music Education program regarding CLAST requirements. Because students take courses in this area as freshmen and sophomores, if a student has not successfully passed all sections of the CLAST, there is a hold placed on student course registration after a student has earned 45 hours and before earning 60 hours.

**Program Completion:**
No changes anticipated for the program completion requirement of passing scores on the FTCE for all teacher education graduates. See Standard 2 for current data.

See Standards 1 and 3, Indicator 2 for discussion on the program completion requirement for demonstration of Florida Subject Matter Content Standards and Florida Educator Accomplished Practices.

**Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance:** All programs in compliance.

**Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the Mandate:** Not applicable.

### III. Improvement Section

**Improvement Report for 2000-2001:** Improvements Accomplished:

**Admissions:** Increased training was provided to individuals serving as community college advisors, regional campus advisors, or central campus advisors to familiarize them with the changes in admission requirements and legislative mandates. During the 2000-2001 academic year, meetings were held involving the Chairs and program coordinators at the undergraduate level and the Student Academic Services Office to revise the College's admission policies and to phase out the Continuation Contracts that had been used to track students who had yet to pass all sections of the CLAST. Starting in Summer 2001, students applying to the College were required to pass all sections of the CLAST prior to entering the College or taking their specialization courses (Appendix 6). In Secondary Programs that do not place students in cohorts, students can self-advice and register into classes. Therefore, all classes were sequenced with pre-requisites and the first class in each specialization sequence was permitted to insure that students could not take these courses without meeting the admission requirements.

Orientation meetings were held on campus with Pre-Ed students and with transfer students to provide them clear information about the College's requirements and to provide information on workshops and resources available to assist students in passing the CLAST.

Regularly scheduled meetings with local community colleges were held to share and discuss the new admissions requirements.

At the Master's level, students who have not passed all sections of the CLAST must have a minimum GRE score of 1000 (Verbal + Quantitative) and the requisite minimum GPA of 2.5 at the baccalaureate level.

Students in all teacher preparation programs at USF are required to pass the FTCE
prior to graduation. There is no change in this policy.

Program Completion: See Standard 3, Indicator 2.

Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated:

Admissions: Plans are currently being reviewed for consistency in how the 10% admission waivers are determined across both undergraduate and graduate programs in the College of Education. The College of Education anticipates using the 10% admission waiver of the CLAST only for students who provide medical evidence documenting an inability to take the CLAST during the semester they are entering the College. These students will be given one semester to take and pass all sections of the CLAST.

Program Completion: See Standard 3, Indicator 2.

Standard 3, Indicator 2: Curriculum Design: State mandated requirements related to the curriculum design component of the program – including both content and delivery -- are implemented and monitored, with improvements made as appropriate.

IPEP 2001 Mandates:

- Content Standards and Accomplished Practices
- General Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors
- Subject Area Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors
- Professional Education Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors
- Sunshine State Standards
- Instructional Strategies, Assessment of Student Learning, Technology, and ESOL
- Instruction in Democratic Values and Ethnic Appreciation
- Higher Level Math and Technology

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Compliance with State mandates.

Criteria: Not applicable.

Data Sources for 2001-2002: Changes Made to 2000 IPEP: No changes.

II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Review Findings and Review Process (Including Office/Personnel Involved): The USF 2000 IPEP was submitted to the Florida Department of Education in August 2001 due to personnel changes; thus, the results of our 2000 IPEP review were not available until December. After reviewing the report's recommendations pertaining to Standard 1, the Dean’s Staff has begun planning a College wide plan that will address the recommendations in the report.
Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance: All programs in compliance

Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the Mandate: Not applicable.

III. Improvement Section

Improvement Report for 2000-2001: Improvements Accomplished:

Content Standards and Accomplished Practices:
A faculty review of programs (including matrices from program folios and syllabi) was completed to ensure that Subject-Area Competencies and Florida Accomplished Practices continue to be thoroughly covered. A comprehensive review of syllabi was completed prior to the site visit in April 2000, and no problems with either the Content Standards or Accomplished Practices were identified. Although there is a systematic and thorough review and analysis of students' demonstration of the Accomplished Practices during the final internship, the Dean’s Staff has begun planning a College wide plan that will engage faculty and program heads in developing a system for reviewing students’ attainment of the course based assessments that have been identified for each Accomplished Practice.

General Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors:
Meetings were held with individuals serving as community college advisors, regional campus advisors, and central campus advisors to familiarize them with the changes in the general requirements for all teacher education majors. All promotional literature reflecting the College's admissions requirements has been revised and the SASS reports will reflect the new requirements for students entering the College starting in Fall 2002.

These requirements do not pertain to students entering teacher preparation programs at the graduate level.

Subject Area Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors: A previous review of all program areas by the former Director of Program Review revealed that all programs were in compliance during the 2000-2001 academic year. No changes have been made or are anticipated.

Professional Education Requirements for All Teacher Education Majors:
At the undergraduate and graduate levels, all programs already require a three-hour course on Human Development so no changes have been made or are anticipated.

Assessment: At the undergraduate and graduate levels, all programs already require a three-hour course on Assessment. For undergraduates the course is EDF 4430 Measurement for Teachers and at the graduate level the course is EDF 6432 Foundations of Measurement. For the undergraduate course, students learn to locate potential problems in their instruction using actual student data from their classroom tests. They set expectations for a group’s test performance using the complexity of the skills tested and the achievement history of class members as a group. They then summarize and analyze a group’s performance on classroom tests using the shape of score distributions, measures of central tendency (means, medians, and modes), measures of variability (ranges and standard deviations), and the location of these
measures within the score distribution. They evaluate group achievement by comparing their expectations with their observations and judging whether group achievement met or surpassed their expectations. If achievement does not meet their expectations, they use the data patterns to locate potential problems.

The “Measurement for Teacher” course teaches students to evaluate individual student progress using both criterion- and norm-referenced standards. They analyze individual student’s mastery of all objectives within a standard in order to diagnose learning problems within the standard and to prescribe next-steps instruction tailored to individual student’s demonstrated needs. Related to norm-referenced data interpretation, they use students’ mean score and standard deviation to establish categories of above average, average, and below average performance compared to class members who experience the same instruction and test. They also calculate and interpret percentiles, z scores, and T scores to describe an individual student’s standing on a particular test and to track the student’s standing within the class across tests during a term and year. This tracking aids teachers in determining whether the student is holding his/her own compared to classmates, moving ahead, or falling behind in their achievement of the standards. This provides them with critical information for student/parent conferences.

Students also learn to assess students’ status and progress in a variety of ways to improve learning. They create, administer, and interpret performance data from readiness tests to facilitate selecting appropriate standards and objectives for the observed level of the students and to place students at the appropriate level in instruction. They create, administer, and interpret data from pretests to aid efficient lesson planning (determining which skills require only review and which require direct instruction and practice). They use practice tests to facilitate monitoring student progress (time and chunking) and to enable students to practice and transfer newly acquired skills. They use posttests for accountability (grades) and for diagnosing and prescribing review or enrichment lessons that are tailored to the observed needs of individuals and subgroups in the class. The focus for all the data summary, analysis, and evaluation activities included in the course is the improvement of student learning.

**Classroom Management:** All program chairs have been requested to identify steps that will be taken to add or modify an existing course to meet the requirement for Classroom Management. In Physical Education, for example, the department is revamping a course entitled Classroom Management in Physical Education. The course will be officially approved and part of the required coursework by the end of Fall 2002. The Varying Exceptionality program already requires a three-hour course, EEX 4604 Behavior Management for Special Needs and at Risk Students, that was updated and approved this spring by the Undergraduate Program Committee. At the graduate level, an existing course was revised to address all needed competencies. Elementary Education and Early Childhood are revising their programs to reflect the required Classroom Management course. In Elementary Education a methods course, entitled “Classroom Management, School Safety Ethics, Law and Elementary Methods,” was revised this year and brought to UPC for program approval. Likewise a graduate course was developed in Elementary Education and approved by the Graduate Program Committee and College Council to address the required competencies related to classroom management. A 5000 level course was also developed in Secondary Education and approved by the Graduate Program Committee.
reading: Physical Education faculty have been collaborating with the Reading faculty in Childhood Education to develop an appropriate course that will be offered during the 2002-2003 year in reading. It is anticipated that other K-12 program areas such as Business Education will also use this course. The Special Education department has added an additional reading course that addresses reading across the content areas. The twelve hours of literacy coursework now required in Elementary Education now include: RED 4310 Reading and Learning To Read, RED 4511 Linking Literature Assessment to Instruction, LAE 4314 Teaching Writing, and LAE 4414 Teaching Literature in the Elementary School, Grades K-6. Early Childhood has courses ready to bring forward for approval in the early fall. The Secondary Education Department already had a literacy course in the Science Education program, the Math Education Program, and the English Education Program. A new course was developed and approved this year, Reading and Basic Skills in the Content Area, that incorporates the reading skills required for the Social Studies Education Program. The Foreign Language Program has a pre-existing course that addresses the literacy requirement. All programs anticipate that the requirements will be fully met by Fall 2002.

Sunshine State Standards: No changes from the 2000 IEP report. All programs continue to be in compliance. At the undergraduate level, students are linked to the DOE’s web site from the EDF 4430 web site in order to study the Sunshine State Standards (SSS) for the subject(s) and grade level(s) they plan to teach or are currently teaching. For their midterm portfolio, students classify a selected SSS by type and level of learning, and prepare a task analysis to identify subordinate skills required for their students to achieve the standard. Eight weeks are spent working with the SSSs as they learn to create classroom tests to assess students’ progress on the standard and adapt their original tests to accommodate ESOL and other exceptional students.

Instructional Strategies: All students in the undergraduate teacher preparation program except for Physical Education and Special Education take EEX 4070 Integrating Exceptional Students in the Regular Classroom. Historically, this course has provided students with instructional strategies that address exceptionalities, achievement levels, and other specialized circumstances. In lieu of this course, students in the Physical Education programs take PET 3640 Adapted Physical Education. For Special Education students, instructional strategies are embedded specifically within the Clinical Teaching course and infused throughout other courses required in the program. All specific program areas address learning styles within their individual methods courses.

Technology: All students entering the undergraduate teacher preparation programs are required to take Introduction to Educational Technology. Knowing that many of our students complete this course at the community college level, there have been considerable efforts taken to infuse technology throughout the upper division courses within the program areas. Faculty model the use of technology in their course instruction using state of the art resources provided within the College. They also require students to access the internet to review resource materials related to course objectives, identify and use resources on the internet for their lesson planning, use
technology to communicate with the instructor and classmates via Blackboard and WebCT, and use technology such as PowerPoint, webbing tools, databases, and graphing software to develop and present course assignments. Selected programs such as Music Education, Special Education, and Early Childhood Education have invested considerable time and resources to assist their students in developing electronic portfolios as an option to paper portfolios. The College applied for and received a PT3 grant, which will be used to help provide support and assistance for continued infusion of technology into the College's teacher preparation programs. On the Tampa campus, the College has acquired 2 Apple iBook carts that allow faculty to bring computers into any classroom and to access the internet via the wireless technology installed in the building. Faculty being hired are continuing to bring a high level of technology skills into their course instruction (e.g. MathVids being used in Clinical Teaching in Special Education).

Competencies for technology are infused throughout the graduate programs and the use of technology for the required courses in research design, EDF 7410, and statistics, EDF 6407, is extensive. In Counselor Education, instructional strategies are addressed in MHS 6200 (Appraisal), and use of technology is incorporated into internship experiences. In Reading Education, the program requires a course in Literacy and Technology. A strand running through all the courses listed under assessment above focuses on instructional strategies for diverse learners.

ESOL: The College had previously submitted and received approval for an ESOL endorsement in five undergraduate program areas: Early Childhood, Elementary, Foreign Language, English, and Special Education. As part of that process, faculty in these program areas identified where each of the 25 ESOL Competencies are addressed and assessed. Procedures for field experiences and a portfolio assessment process were developed and implemented. In addition, a new 3-hour course, entitled, FLE 4365, ESOL Competencies and Strategies, was developed and is required within all of the other program areas.

With the current model, the primary means of determining whether a student meets the ESOL Performance Standards has been through a portfolio, which is a collection of students’ work from ESOL-specific (two fifths of the portfolio contents) and ESOL-infused (three fifths of the portfolio contents) courses and field experiences. The portion of students’ work from ESOL-specific and ESOL-infused courses was derived from the five-course endorsement model—all programs require two ESOL-specific courses, and they infuse the content from the remaining three courses into other classes and internships. ESOL faculty who teach the capstone ESOL-specific course review the portfolio, make recommendations for remediation as necessary, and co-sign with the professional seminar instruction from the main program area once all ESOL Performance Standards are sufficiently demonstrated. The portfolio has also provided documentation of ESOL infusion in various targeted courses.

Although the portfolio has been a useful means of accountability, both for students and for the programs, administering it in large programs has become unwieldy and, for certain programs, unmanageable. On the Tampa (main) campus of USF, Early Childhood and Elementary Education, the department graduating the largest number of students, has found it nearly impossible to ensure that each student receive the appropriate support to successfully complete the portfolio, and they requested assistance from their ESOL colleagues and the college administration to examine
alternatives to the setup of the portfolio.

Faculty from the Early Childhood, Elementary, and ESOL programs as well as the college administration met to resolve the problems noted above, and after careful deliberation, all agreed that a curricular enhancement, adding a third ESOL-specific course, and a modification to the portfolio’s contents and review process would alleviate many of the logistical problems that had made the previous portfolio so difficult to administer. The ESOL faculty has recently created a new ESOL-specific course, Second Language Acquisition and Literacy Development in Children and Adolescents, based on the areas of difficulty that the Early Childhood and Elementary Education students had in documenting the attainment of the ESOL Performance Standards in their portfolios. The course provides an in-depth treatment of Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Literacy theory to practice and provides students with multiple opportunities to document the ESOL Performance Standards that were elusive in the previous two-course model. An addendum has already been sent under separate cover to the Florida Department of Education for approval (Appendix 7).

At the graduate level program faculty are preparing folios for add-on of the ESOL endorsement to Master’s Plan II programs in Elementary Education, Special Education, English Education, and Foreign Language Education. Students in all other programs will take the undergraduate ESOL anchor course to meet the 60-hour ESOL requirement.

ESOL is infused in all courses in the Reading Education program, and the majority of students are already practicing teachers with the required ESOL endorsement.

In School Psychology, students take EDF 6288, Instructional Design, and SPS 6700, Academic Interventions for the learning styles requirement

In Speech Impaired, SPA 6413, Augmentative and Alternative Communication is a course that emphasizes the use of technology and strategies appropriate for exceptional students, and ESOL modifications are included in an elective accent modification course. The other aspects of this requirement are not applicable to this discipline.

Instruction in Democratic Values and Ethnic Appreciation: At the undergraduate level, the required course, EDF 3604, Social Foundations, addresses democratic values, and the ESOL courses address ethnic appreciation. There is also a heavy emphasis on democratic values and ethnic appreciation in the Diverse Populations course, which is offered each academic year semester to over 300 students. In the Special Education program, all students take a pro-seminar focused on Diversity.

For Master's Plan II programs, Elementary and Special Education majors are required to take EDF 3604. The College will explore this issue for other programs.

In Counselor Education, students take MHS 6420, Counseling Special Population Groups, which includes attention to ethnicity.

In Reading, ethnic appreciation is infused in a few courses, e.g., RED 6116, Current Trends in Elementary Reading Instruction; RED 6365, Reading in Secondary and
Higher Education; RED 6540, Classroom Diagnosis of Reading Problems; RED 6544, Remediation of Comprehension Problems; and RED 6545, Remediation of Reading and Writing Vocabulary Problems. In the practicum course in the new program, students will be required to tutor individual children and assess their literacy learning throughout the semester. Democratic values are part of candidates' undergraduate curriculum.

In School Psychology, students take SPS 6938, Social Psychology, which focuses on character development and appreciation of diversity in a pluralistic society and EDF 6883, Issues in Multicultural Education.

In Speech Impaired, SPA 7931, Multicultural Variations in Language, is required. These issues are also covered in electives in African-American Narratives and Latino Language Development. (Students are required to take nine hours of electives plus an additional five hours in the non-thesis option.)

**Instruction Related to Higher-Level Mathematics and Technology:** This indicator is applicable only to elementary education and mathematics education at the bachelor's and master's level. The course requirements have not changed.

**Improvement Plan for 2001-2002:** Improvements Anticipated:

Some programs anticipate identifying capstone assignments that will be required in all sections of a particular class and that demonstrate students' demonstration of the Florida Accomplished Practices. Students will be unable to pass the course if they have not successfully passed the assignment. Work on rubrics for these assignments will be taking place during the 2001-2002 academic year.

A statement was developed and reviewed by the Undergraduate Program Committee requesting faculty to indicate on their course syllabi assignments that are aligned with the Florida Accomplished Practices and the ESOL competencies (Appendix 2). This statement will be brought to the College Council for approval in Spring 2002. This will afford students with better communication regarding the connection between their individual courses and their demonstration of the Accomplished Practices. For programs that use portfolios, this will be particularly helpful as the students organize the contents of their portfolios.

A committee appointed by the Undergraduate Program Committee was assigned to revise the Departmental Syllabus format that has been used in the College for the past few years (Appendix 1). The intent of the revisions was to align the document with the new NCATE standards and any new state mandates. The resulting changes will be implemented within the College. A similar process was completed at the graduate level as well (Appendix 1).

The College received a PT3 grant that is anticipated to provide increasing support and technical assistance for faculty to infuse technology into their instruction and course assignments. Baseline data are being collected to examine the impact of the grant activities on graduates' perceptions of their skills to use technology.
The University is launching a technology Portal system that provides a web-based shell for every course offered enabling faculty to enhance their course instruction with web based resources and to easily communicate with students enrolled via official university email addresses.

As of the fall semester, the SASS reports for students in all teacher education programs will reflect the new changes insuring that no student can graduate without taking the specified courses that meet these requirements.

Standard 3, Indicator 3: Clinical and Field-Based Component: State mandated requirements related to the clinical and field-based component of the program are implemented and monitored, with improvements made as appropriate.

IPEP 2001 Mandates:
- Content and Focus of Clinical Experiences
- Internship Supervision and Site Selection
- Length of Final Internship

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Compliance with State mandates.

Criteria: Not applicable.

Data Sources for 2001-2002: Changes Made to 2000 IPEP: A new Summative Rating Sheet has been developed and implemented.

II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Review Findings and Review Process (Including Office/Personnel Involved):

Internship Supervision and Site Selection:

College/University Instructors: All instructors who instructed or supervised preservice field experience courses or internships met at least one of the following criteria: specialized training in clinical supervision; a valid professional teaching certificate; or at least 3 years of successful P-12 teaching experience.

In Counselor Education, the Program Coordinator who has a valid certificate plus three years of experience supervises all candidates.

In Reading, all candidates are supervised by full-time faculty who meet the above stated requirements.

In School Psychology, all interns have a university internship instructor who holds a valid certificate in School Psychology and has at least three years of
experience and who has completed either coursework/experience in supervision or who has completed “clinical educator” training.

In Speech Impaired, all supervisors are required to have a teaching certificate and at least three years of teaching experience plus a Florida license in speech pathology.

District Personnel: in a growing number of districts, the districts and the College faculty are jointly determining the selection of cooperating teachers and school sites. This has changed considerably from previous practice due to a number of special initiatives such as the PDS without Walls program, the Secondary Education Field Experiences Model, and the Chrysalis and TRUST programs in addition to ongoing collaborative efforts between the regional campuses and their respective school district personnel. Monitoring of the school district personnel's credentials is still primarily the responsibility of the districts. In Hillsborough County as part of their charter school district status, a new set of guidelines has been jointly developed and approved permitting cooperating teachers to meet the state guidelines via a course from the university, the district sponsored training, and/or approval by the principal in exceptional cases.

In all other school districts, the personnel and teachers who supervised or directed teacher preparation students, including counselor education, school psychology, and speech impaired, during field experience courses or internships have evidence of "clinical educator" training. For Speech Impaired, district supervisors must also have a Florida License and ASHA certification.

School Sites: Students in all programs (including School Psychology and Speech Impaired) have field experiences in multiple school sites. The sites represent the full spectrum of school communities, including urban settings; thus, all programs are in compliance. (The departmental personnel involved with early field experience placements monitor this.) Counselor Education students are typically placed in “needy” schools. In School Psychology, students are placed in school districts that provide comprehensive educational services to diverse populations of students, families, and communities. Particular emphasis is placed in schools identified as “low performing” and schools in which the majority of students qualify for school lunch.

Clinical Content:

All programs include a variety of experiences that are graduated and which afford students with a complete and thorough picture of the schools in which they will be employed. Most notably, the Secondary Education program has created a continuum of early field experiences that involve clinical faculty in a variety of schools co-determined with the school districts. In addition, the new internship form that is correlated to the Accomplished Practices was used for all final internship students. Changes were made for the Early Childhood Program forms to include AP #2 Communication which had been omitted earlier. These records are maintained, reviewed, and logged into a database by staff in the Student Academic Services Office and the Dean’s Office.
In School Psychology all of the elements required in the new statute are addressed. Students take a series of practica (total of 800 clock hours) prior to final internship providing for a progressive level of responsibility for student learning and classroom management.

Length of Final Internship:

At the undergraduate level, the internship is 15 weeks in duration.

For Master’s Plan II programs, candidates participate in the same type of internship as undergraduates including the 15-week length.

In Counselor Education, students spend 15 weeks (600 hours) in a full-time internship.

In Reading the practicum is for one semester with 40 hours in the school. (Note these are practicing teachers who have already interned.)

In School Psychology, students complete a full-time, full-year internship of at least 1500 clock hours.

In Speech Impaired, after in-house practica, students have practica in schools for 16 hours/week for 12 weeks and must complete 350 clock hours with a minimum of 192 at a site.

Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance: All program are in compliance.

Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the Mandate: Not applicable.

III. Improvement Section

Improvement Report for 2000-2001: Improvements Accomplished:

A new Clinical Education course has been developed for both Special Education and Elementary personnel who are supervising interns as part of the PDS without Walls initiative. The course content was co-planned and delivered by College faculty and personnel from the participating school districts.

A new Clinical Education course has been developed for Clinical Faculty who will be working with the early field experiences associated with the Secondary Education programs.

Procedures during final internship were reviewed and revised to insure that all Final Internship Evaluations Forms are collected and reviewed in the Internship Office prior to graduation. A form letter was developed (Appendix 8) to notify University Supervisors of any forms that were missing. The letter clearly states that a student will not be cleared for graduation until these forms have been collected and reviewed for successful demonstration of the Accomplished Practices.
Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated:

The internship evaluation form will be reviewed by faculty to insure that AP#8 Knowledge of Subject Matter is addressed to best reflect the specific program areas.

A new form will be used to gather more specific information on the demographics of the nature of the placement and supervision that can then be compiled and reported.

Standard 3, Indicator 4: Annual Review and Continuous Improvement: State mandated requirements related to annual review and continuous improvement of the program are implemented and monitored.

IPEP 2001 Mandates:
- Institutional Program Evaluation Plan
- Annual Review
- Stakeholder Involvement
- Continuous Improvement
- Employer Satisfaction Survey
- Reporting Requirements (new in 2001)
- Recency of Experience (new in 2001)

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Compliance with State mandates.

Criteria: Not applicable.

Data Sources for 2001-2002: Changes Made to 2000 IPEP: No changes made.

II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Review Findings and Review Process (Including Office/Personnel Involved):

Institutional Program Evaluation Plan: The institution has an Institutional Program Evaluation Plan that outlines the manner in which the institution will address the continued program approval standards. This plan is approved by the Department of Education and is used annually to review programs.


Stakeholder Involvement: The institution conducted a Forum sponsored by the Curriculum Reform and Planning Committee (CRPC) during the Fall of 2000 at which COE faculty, alumni, local school personnel, the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Visual and Performing Arts, and local community colleges were invited to participate to discuss the College’s vision and plans around seven themes: Applications and Field Experiences, Content
Continuous Improvement:

Graduating Senior Survey: In a continuous effort to refine and adapt the variety of learning opportunities provided to students in teacher preparation programs, the College of Education seeks information from graduating seniors regarding their perceptions of various aspects of their teacher preparation programs. One aspect of this evaluation involves administration of an exit survey each fall and spring semester which includes demographic and program information, an opportunity to assess the adequacy of their program as well as other College of Education experiences, and level of satisfaction with distinct aspects of their program.

Additionally, graduates are asked to describe their plans for the next year, and a final open-ended item allows graduates to comment on program strengths and weaknesses to provide additional information deemed critical to the continued growth, development and preparation of teachers (See Appendix 9 for College summary).

1. Demographics of the Sample: For the graduating seniors’ survey administered in the fall of 2000, data were available for 10 teacher preparation programs. Approximately 150 surveys were returned. The graduates were 85% female and 15% male. The majority of the surveys were returned by graduates who were admitted on the Tampa campus (64%), 28% were from the St. Petersburg campus; the remaining 8% were from the Sarasota and Lakeland campuses (5% and 3%, respectively). The racial composition of survey respondents was 73% Caucasian, 9% African American, 13% Hispanic, approximately one percent Asian and four percent other.

2. Adequacy of Preparation: In general, the graduates reported feeling adequately prepared for their job responsibilities as teachers. To provide a broad understanding of the success of our teacher preparation programs, it is useful to examine those particular areas in which at least 90% of respondents expressed adequate preparation. Graduates felt most prepared to set high expectations for all students and reported possessing the ability to reinforce these expectations through appropriate teaching behaviors. Another noteworthy area, with 95% of survey respondents reporting adequate preparation, was graduates’ ability to use strategies characterized by acceptance and tolerance to create a classroom environment that accepts and fosters diversity. Ninety three percent of the graduates reported feeling adequately prepared to work with other professionals to design learning experiences that meet students’ needs and interests; professed an understanding of the Code of Ethics and Principles of Professional Conduct; and professed adherence to these principles. More than 90% of the respondents reported adequate preparation in areas concerned with planning instruction utilizing varied strategies and resources to provide comprehensible instruction to all students; the ability to plan instructional activities based upon established human development learning theories and concepts; the use of effective communication skills in the classroom; the ability to achieve continued professional improvement through self-reflection, collegiality and teamwork; and possession of a good grasp and understanding of subject matter. Finally, 90% of survey respondents reported adequate preparation regarding the development of instructional plans that meet students’ cognitive, linguistic, motivational and physical needs; the use of techniques and strategies for establishing effective learning environments, including strategies that provide opportunities for student input; the ability to plan instructional activities based upon a variety of information about students, to plan instruction that both incorporates and promotes a creative environment for students, and to continually seek advice, information and feedback
from appropriate sources, and interpret the information and modify instructional plans appropriately.

An area that suggests need for improvement is effective strategies for the use of technology in both the use of appropriate teaching strategies and the management, evaluation and improvement of instruction, with over 20% of the graduates reporting inadequacies in these areas (27% and 22% respectively). The results also suggest that additional energy should be focused on enhancing graduating teachers’ ability to communicate and work cooperatively with families to improve students’ school experiences. Nearly one-quarter of the survey respondents expressed that they felt unprepared in this area.

3. Satisfaction with Teacher Preparation Programs: An examination of graduates’ self-ratings of satisfaction reveals that respondents are most satisfied with the feedback and guidance provided by university supervisors during their final internship. More than 90% of the respondents reported that they were at least somewhat satisfied with their overall preparation for teaching and opportunities provided to improve skills during practica and internships (93% and 92%, respectively). If we consider additional areas, we observed that 90% of our graduating teachers were somewhat satisfied with the clarity of program goals and/or intended outcomes; the integration of program elements (purposes, courses, field experiences, evaluations); feedback and guidance provided by professors and access to faculty in specific program areas. Graduates appeared much less satisfied with the guidance provided by faculty advisors and the advisors in the Student Academic Services Office, with more than 20% of respondents dissatisfied in these particular areas (23% and 34%, respectively).

4. Preprofessional Benchmarks for the Accomplished Practices: In an effort to assess overall performance with respect to the Preprofessional Benchmarks, the items on the graduating senior survey were evaluated with regard to their relationship to the 12 Accomplished Practices. The graduating seniors reported an acceptable level of performance that ranged from 71% to 94%. The highest level of success was reported for Accomplished Practices 6 (Ethics) and 3 (Continuous Improvement) with over 90% of graduates reporting acceptable performance in these areas. The area revealing the most room for improvement is accomplished Practice 12, Technology, suggesting that future efforts should be focused on enhancing students’ use and integration of appropriate technologies in the classroom. This was the only area where less than 80% of the respondents (71%) reported adequate preparation.

Alumni Survey: Every spring semester, the institution evaluates the performance of graduates by providing alumni hired in Florida public schools with the chance to rate themselves on a wide range of abilities. A set of 22 items is provided on a five-point response scale (with 1 = poor, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, 5 = excellent with an additional option of 0 for graduates who do not feel comfortable providing a rating). Graduates are also asked to provide an overall performance rating, to rate their overall level of preparation and report their willingness to recommend USF to others considering teaching. In spring 2001, data were available for graduates of 15 out of a possible 18 programs. Approximately 240 surveys were returned, representing a response rate of nearly 41%. Industrial Arts/Technical Education, Reading, and Dance were the only programs not represented. Approximately 78% of the surveys were concerned with graduates completing a bachelor's degree; the remaining 22% provided information about graduates of a master's program. The graduates were 91% female and 9% male. The majority of the surveys were from graduates working in elementary schools (69%), with 15% returned by those working in middle schools and 16% returned by
graduates working in high schools. The racial composition of the survey respondents was 82% Caucasian, six percent African American, ten percent Hispanic, and approximately one percent Asian and other. (See Appendix 10 for College summary)

To provide a broad overview of the quality of teachers' performance for the purposes of this report, survey responses are aggregated at the College level. (Additional program specific analyses were conducted for purposes of the College's review and discussion, including an analysis of the written comments. Teachers who rated themselves as average, above average, or excellent were classified as performing at an acceptable level and were distinguished from those ascribing themselves a poor or below average rating. The questions on the survey cohere around two broad categories of teacher performance: classroom practices and collaborative and professional abilities. When examining the performance of the programs collectively, the School Psychology and Guidance programs were removed as many of the survey items did not apply and were unanswerable for these graduates.

Overall the USF graduates viewed themselves quite favorably, rating the quality of their performance as acceptable an overwhelming majority of the time. Overall acceptable performance ratings across the individual items ranged from 89% to 100%. In contrast, ratings of below average or poor ranges from less than one percent to approximately 11%. When asked to rate their overall performance, the majority of alumni responded that they performed average or above, with less than one percent responding below average or poor. When asked how adequately they felt prepared, approximately 92% of the respondents replied that they were generally or very well prepared, with approximately 8% replying that they were inadequately or minimally prepared. When asked "Would you recommend USF to others considering teaching?" less than four percent of our graduates responded "definitely or probably no" and the majority responded "probably or definitely yes" (34% and 62%, respectively). When asked if alumni were currently teaching in their degree area, 97% replied yes and three percent replied no. In response to a question regarding long-range plans, over 82% commented that they intended to continue, approximately 13% were not sure yet, and only slightly more than 4% responded that they planned to quit.

In an effort to evaluate performance with respect to the Preprofessional Benchmarks, the items on the principal survey were mapped to the 12 Accomplished Practices. The highest level of performance was evidenced for Communication with 100% of the graduates rating themselves as average or above. The area that appears to have potential for improvement is Technology where acceptable performance was reported to be less than 90%. Overall performance by level revealed more similarities than differences. For most of the Accomplished Practices, level differences did not exceed four percentage points. The largest discrepancy in level was evidenced for Continuous Improvement and the Role of the Teacher with bachelor's level graduates rating themselves higher. In light of these findings, it appears that our graduates consider themselves well prepared to enter the workforce. In addition, these graduates reported that they are more than likely willing to recommend USF to future teachers. Collectively, these findings underscore the confidence of USF alumni and their high regard for our teacher preparation programs.

Employer Satisfaction Survey: Every spring semester, the institution evaluates the performance of the graduates by providing school principals in Florida public schools an opportunity to rate graduates who are employed at their schools. A set of 22 items is provided on a five-point response scale (with 1 = poor, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, 5 = excellent with an additional option of 0 for principals who do not feel comfortable
providing a rating). Principals were also asked to provide an overall performance rating and queried regarding the likelihood of their future hiring decisions and their ranking of the individual teacher in comparison to others they have worked with at similar stages in their careers. In spring 2001, data were available for graduates of 16 out of 18 programs. Reading and Dance were the only programs not represented. A total of 427 surveys were returned, representing a response rate of 71%. Approximately 80% of the surveys were concerned with graduates completing a bachelor's degree; the remaining 20% provided information about graduates of a master's program. Eighty-five percent were female and fifteen percent were male. The surveys analyzed were from all levels of school principals (Elementary-67%, Middle School-18%, High School-15%). The racial composition of the graduates represented was 89% Caucasian, 5% African America and Hispanic, and less than one percent Asian and other. (See Appendix 11 for College summary).

To provide a broad overview of the quality of teachers' performance for the purposes of this report, survey responses are aggregated at the College level. (Additional program specific analyses were conducted for purposes of the College's review and discussion, including an analysis of the written comments.) Teachers who received a rating of average, above average, or excellent were classified as performing at an acceptable level and were distinguished from those receiving a poor or below average rating. The questions on the survey cohere around two broad categories of teacher performance: classroom practices and collaborative and professional abilities. When examining the performance of the programs collectively, the School Psychology and Guidance programs were removed as many of the survey items did not apply and were unanswerable for these graduates.

Overall acceptable performance ratings across the individual items ranged from approximately 92% to 99%. The graduates' strongest attribute appeared to be engagement in self-improvement and professional development activities and the ability to write and speak in a logical and understandable style, with more than 98% performing at an acceptable level. In contrast, the quality of teachers' performance ratings below average or poor ranged from merely one percent to nearly eight percent. The principals' responses suggest that the area in most need of improvement is the use of effective classroom management techniques with respondents rating approximately eight percent of our graduates as not performing at an acceptable level.

When asked to rate the overall performance of our graduates, the overwhelming majority (>94%) of the principals rated graduates average or above with less than six percent responding below average or poor. When asked how adequately our graduates were prepared, approximately 93% of the respondents replied that our graduates were generally or very well prepared, with less than seven percent of the respondents replying that they were inadequately or minimally prepared. To the question, "Would you hire other USF graduates in your school?" not a single respondent replied "definitely no". The overwhelming majority responded "probably yes" or "definitely yes"(17% and 83% respectively), with less than one percent responding "probably no". When asked to rank graduates, nearly 50% of our graduates were ranked extremely high, with 29% in the top ten percent and 27% in the top five percent when compared to other teachers at similar stages in their careers. Only approximately seven percent received a rank below 50%.

In an effort to evaluate performance with respect to the Preprofessional Benchmarks, the items on the principal survey were mapped to the 12 Accomplished Practices. The highest level of performance was evidenced for Communication, Continuous Improvement, Ethics, and
Assessment with more than 95% of the graduates rated average or above. In light of these findings, it appears that our graduates are considered well prepared, setting a good precedent for future graduates seeking employment in Florida schools.

Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance: All programs are in compliance.

Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the Mandate: Not applicable.

III. Improvement Section

Improvement Report for 2000-2001: Improvements Accomplished:

Stakeholder Involvement
Continuous Improvement

Employer Satisfaction Survey: All required changes have already been made on the Employer Satisfaction Survey.

Reporting Requirements: Results of the Title II report were outlined and shared with various constituents within the College, University, and neighboring community colleges. This information has also been submitted for inclusion in the College Catalog.

Recency of Experience: Although the State Board of Education does not yet approve this requirement, preliminary discussions and planning have begun within the College in order to be prepared for full implementation for the 2002-2003 academic year.

Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated:

Plans are underway to post the results of the Title II report and other data required on the College's website and in the College's catalogs and promotional materials. Data will be collected and compiled starting in Fall 2002 to document faculty's recency of experience.
Standard 4: The diversity of student population enrolled in each program will, over each five-year period, increase in both the number of minority students and the number of underrepresented classes appropriate to an institution’s mission.

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Increase rate (number and/or percent) of students in each gender, ethnicity, and other category of diversity in each program.

Criterion: In the fall of 2000, the Undergraduate Student headcount was made up of 18% minority students, which is higher than the previous year of 17%. In the fall of 2000, the Graduate Student headcount was made up of 19% minority students, which is higher than the previous year of 17%.

Data Sources for 2001-2002: Institutionally developed report of the number (percent is optional) of enrolled students by gender, ethnicity, and any other underrepresented population.

II. Data Section

Annual Review for 2000-2001:

Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2000 Undergraduate Full-time Headcount</th>
<th>Fall 2000 Graduate Full-time Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Alien</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1221</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance: [all in compliance]

Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the Institutional Criterion: [all in compliance]

III. Improvement Section

Improvement Report for 2000-2001: Improvements Accomplished:

A proposal for at least a half-time appointment of a current faculty member along with a part-time graduate assistant to coordinate the Center for Diversity and Research was the top priority forwarded to the Dean from the Finance and Budget Committee for the College’s budget requests. The Dean agreed that the College would provide office space and clerical support.

Five undergraduate programs have been approved by the Florida DOE to offer ESOL endorsement: Early Childhood, Elementary, English, Foreign Language, and Special Education. In each program students complete field experiences in which they are able to plan and teach lessons to ESOL students under the supervision of an ESOL endorsed teacher or specialist.

The percentage of minorities is 1% higher at the undergraduate level than it was last year and 2% higher at the graduate level.

The College has several grants focusing on diversity. Successful linkages have been developed with culturally diverse neighborhood schools through community-based organizations, field trips of minority students to the USF Campus, and mentoring initiatives. The Department of Special Education admitted its first cohort – 1 Native-American, 1 Caucasian, and 7 African-Americans – into the newly approved doctoral program with an emphasis in Urban Special Education.

Improvement Plan for 2001-2002: Improvements Anticipated:

In spite of a 4.1% budget cut announced during the summer, all efforts are being made to proceed with the implementation of the Center for Diversity and Research to address the USF/COE Strategic Goals related to diversity.

Ongoing diversity initiatives funded by grants are expected to increase the presence of students of color in our programs and to contribute to the diversity of the teaching pool in our region.

We anticipate that the College will be successful in increasing its percentage of minorities on the faculty through upcoming searches and are waiting to have the recruitment plan for 16 vacant positions approved. An increase in minority faculty should in turn attract more minority students to the College.
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Standard 5:
A: Feedback from Florida employing districts will verify that 90% of the program graduates who complete their first year of teaching will be rehired, or in the case of "downsizing," will be eligible for rehiring.
B: The institution in its evaluation plan may set other goals related to employer satisfaction, e.g., percentage satisfied with specific program components, number of teachers receiving awards or returning for graduate study, promotion of graduates to supervisory/mentoring roles, etc.

I. Evaluation Section

Measure: Employer Satisfaction.

Criterion: 90% of program graduates who are employed in a Florida public school district will be eligible for rehire.


II: Data Section

Data on Rehirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Elementary Ed</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Specific Lrng Disabilities</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Varying Exceptionalities</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>PE K-8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>PE 6-12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Business Ed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Review Process Used:

Using the employment reports provided by the Florida Department of Education, the list of 1998-1999 graduates hired in 1999-2000 was compared with those employed in 2000-2001. The 2000-2001 list was missing 77 graduates who had appeared on the 1999-2000 list. Letters were sent to the employing districts along with a table indicating the graduates who were not rehired in the second year. Districts were asked whether or not the graduates were in fact hired and, if not, if they were eligible for rehire. All districts responded. Of the 77 graduates missing from the DOE list, 23 were in fact rehired and 52 were eligible for rehire. Two graduates – one from Pre-K/Primary Education and one from Elementary Education -- were ineligible for rehire. Consequently, the eligibility rate for Pre-K/Primary Education is 98%, and the eligibility rate for Elementary Education is 99.6%. The list of graduates included in this study is included in the attached Appendix.

### Programs in Compliance and Programs Not in Compliance:

- **All programs are in compliance.**

### Explanation for Programs Not Meeting the 90% Criterion:

- Not applicable.