



Florida Site Visit Framework

© 2017. Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. All rights reserved.

In furtherance of its charitable purposes, Teacher Prep Inspection-US, Inc. (TPI-US) asserts full intellectual property rights to this Framework and to any work conducted by TPI-US through use of this Framework. This includes the TPI-US process of teacher preparation program site visits and related records, reports, documents, products and other material sent in conjunction with this process.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or using any information storage and retrieval system without permission in writing by Teacher Pre Inspection-US, Inc.

Notes on how review area scores are determined:

1. Reviewers will analyze available evidence and will check all the criteria for inadequate before considering higher judgment scores.
2. The team will use a preponderance of evidence within each review area to determine the score—except where/when constraining criteria described in number 4 come into play.
3. The guidance provided by this framework is not exhaustive and must be considered in the wider context of program quality.
4. Constraining criteria are indicated where relevant (i.e. the overall review area score can NOT be Good if criteria X is not at least Good).
5. Likely sources of evidence are meant to serve as initial guidance and are not considered exhaustive.
6. Reviewers will triangulate evidence in order to ensure judgments capture typical aspects of the program. Triangulation allows reviewers to trace connections that might exist between a course and other sources of evidence as well as how similar pieces of evidence come to bear on more than one review area.
 - a. For example: A reviewer will connect evidence from observing a program’s early literacy course with evidence from observing candidates teaching reading with comments graduates, principals and faculty make about the quality of reading instruction. These two pieces of evidence could then inform judgments in areas 2 (Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods), 3 (Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance) and possibly even 4 (Program Performance Management).

REVIEW AREA 1: Quality of Selection

Context and Rationale: This review area addresses the program’s responsibility to select candidates that show potential and/or fit for the teaching profession. This can be demonstrated in a variety of ways including standardized tests, pre-admission GPA, auditions interviews, etc. *This review area is for informational purposes only.*

Essential questions being answered:

- What principles, criteria, and recruitment/selection practices drive the selection of program applicants?
- What is the quality, as determined by pre-selection GPA and/or standardized test scores, of recent cohorts?
- What efforts are underway to make the program candidates and program completers more representative of the student population of the schools and/or district(s) served by the program?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:

- Data on pre-selection GPA of all candidates in most recent cohort
- Standardized test score data (ACT, SAT, GRE) for most recent cohort
- Demographic data on current cohort, most recent completer cohort, local or state K-12 students and teacher workforce
- Handbooks or policies outlining the program’s admission criteria and process
- Conversations with program staff about selection criteria and recruitment initiatives

Indicator 1.1 – Selection				
Criteria	4 - Strong	3 - Good	2 - Weak	1 - Inadequate
GPA ¹	All of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with a GPA of 3.0 or greater.	At least 75% of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with a GPA of 3.0 or greater.	Less than 75% of the most recently admitted cohort of students are selected with a GPA of 3.0 or greater.	GPA for more than 50% of the most recently admitted cohort of students is below 2.75 –OR– The program is unable to provide data to reviewers on the individual pre-selection GPA of all admitted candidates.
Standardized Tests ²	Teacher candidates selected for the program are drawn from the top third of the college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are drawn from the top half of the college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests.	Teacher candidates selected for the program are drawn from below the top half but above the bottom third of the college going population, as measured by appropriate standardized tests (i.e., above the 33 rd and below the 50 th percentiles of the standardized test national distribution of test takers).	Teacher candidates selected for the program are drawn from the bottom third of the college going population. –OR– The program is unable to provide data to reviewers on the individual ACT/SAT scores of all admitted candidates.

¹ All programs should be able to provide review teams with the pre-admission grade point averages (GPA) of all admitted candidates.

² This applies to programs housed in institutions that use nationally-normed standardized tests in their admissions processes; community and state colleges and post-baccalaureate programs generally do not require standardized test scores like ACT, SAT, or GRE and so this criterion does not apply in those situations. For programs that cannot provide standardized test data but are housed in an institution that can provide this information, reviewers will look at the institution average for the most recently admitted class.

Indicator 1.1 - Selection (continued)

<p>Demographic Representation of <u>enrolled candidates</u></p>	<p>The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates makes a significant contribution to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years AND the program has a written plan with clear objectives and timelines.</p>	<p>The demographic profile of enrolled teacher candidates contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over the past two consecutive years AND the program has a written plan with clear objectives and deadlines.</p>	<p>There is little evidence that progress has been made on selecting candidates whose diversity contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.</p>	<p>The program does not enroll a population of teacher candidates that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and has no concrete plans for becoming more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.</p>
<p>Demographic Representation of <u>program completers</u></p>	<p>The demographic profile of program completers makes a significant contribution to a teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over at least three consecutive years AND the program has a written plan with clear objectives and timelines.</p>	<p>The demographic profile of program completers contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program, as shown by evidence that progress has been made over the past two consecutive years AND the program has a written plan with clear objectives and deadlines.</p>	<p>There is little evidence that progress has been made on producing new teachers whose diversity contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.</p>	<p>The program does not produce a population of completers that contributes to a local teacher workforce more representative of the K12 students and has no concrete plans for becoming more representative of the student population of the schools and/or the districts served by the program.</p>

Indicator 1.1 – Selection (continued)

<p>Admission Process (e.g. audition, interview, etc.)</p>	<p>The program uses multiple measures³ in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine fit and/or promise for teaching in its admission process, systematically monitors whether these measures result in effective teacher candidates, and provides evidence supporting the impact of these measures.</p>	<p>The program uses measures in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process and informally monitors how these measures impact candidate effectiveness.</p>	<p>The program uses some measures in addition to standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA to determine potential for teaching in its admission process, but does not monitor the impact of the measures on candidate effectiveness.</p>	<p>The program does not examine any potential or fit for teaching measures beyond standardized test scores and pre-selection GPA.</p>
--	---	--	---	--

DRAFT

³ This may include measures beyond application and background checks such as: recommendations, interviews, auditions, videos, micro-teaching, etc.

REVIEW AREA 2: Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods

Context and Rationale: This review area focuses on how well the program ensures teacher candidates acquire content knowledge and key teaching methods and skills needed to be an effective educator. The site visit focuses on coursework and related experiences offered by the program to develop the content knowledge and teaching skills of teacher candidates and the impact these bring to improving student learning. Multiple sources of evidence are used to make this judgment; one of these sources is direct observation of teacher candidates so that reviewers understand how successfully coursework and related program content convey key content knowledge and teaching methods to all teacher candidates in the reviewed program.

Note on elementary reading and math criteria: The specific criteria set forth in the framework are included as core, research-based components of developing children’s literacy and mathematical skills. As such, reviewers will look for the specific aspects of reading and math as outlined.

*Note on online learning:*⁴ The online program teaching faculty knows the primary concepts and structures of effective online instruction and is able to create learning experiences to enable teacher candidate success. This includes providing clear expectations, timely accurate feedback on assignments and assessments, active learning opportunities and use of assessments projects, and assignments that meet learning goals and assess learning progress by measuring candidate achievement of the learning goals.

Note on alternate certification programs (MAT, Post-Bacc Certification-Only): The site visit will assess how the progra determines that its candidates have mastered relevant content knowledge before they complete the program, and how the program responds to any content knowledge improvement that may be needed for admitted candidates as a result of the program’s assessment of their content knowledge.

Essential questions being answered:

- How does the program ensure individual teacher candidates have a secure knowledge of their content (especially Scientifically-Based Reading Instruction, Math, other subject areas in elementary programs and secondary content areas for secondary programs)?

⁴ For more information please see the National Standards for Quality Online Teaching
https://gsw.edu/Assets/Academic%20Affairs/files/IEP/NACOL_Standards_Quality_Online_Teaching.pdf

- How does the program ensure teacher candidates are well equipped with key teaching techniques and methods (particularly classroom management, assessment, differentiation, academic feedback, questioning skills) to bring about advancements in student learning and achievement?
- What connections (e.g. scenarios, simulations, peer teaching, assignments) are made in courses between course knowledge and its application to teaching practice so that candidates learn how to apply their coursework knowledge?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:

- Observations of program courses (including multiple sections of the same course when these are offered)
- Course syllabi
- Conversations with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, school staff (cooperating teachers, supervising teachers, principals), and recent program graduates
- Program handbooks
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Surveys of program graduates and employers
- Degree Plans

Note on “constraining criteria” for ELEMENTARY Education Program Site Visits: The quality of literacy training delivered by the program to all teacher candidates **must be good or better** in order for the final judgment on Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods to be good.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge ⁵				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Weak	1 – Inadequate
<p>*(ELEMENTARY) Literacy Training (To include content knowledge, strategies, and application defining learning goals for all learners at various stages of reading and writing development.)</p>	<p>Coursework and training provide comprehensive, systematic and sequential training of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components⁶ of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, consistently enabling elementary teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, ensuring that the progress of all students is good or better. These elements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling 	<p>Coursework and training address, systematic, sequential training of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction, enabling elementary teacher candidates to teach students how to read effectively, enhancing the progress and learning of the students they teach. These elements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling 	<p>Coursework and training address some components of scientific research/evidence-based reading instruction within the five essential components of reading paired with elements of early literacy instruction and inconsistently enables elementary teacher candidates to progress the learning of the students they teach. These elements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oral language development 2. Explicit, systematic, and sequential instruction in the areas of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phonological processing and phonemic awareness • Phonics instruction • Spelling 	<p>Coursework and training d not enable elementary teacher candidates to teach literacy including scientifically based reading instruction.</p>

⁵ States may require use of Praxis or other state content knowledge tests (e.g. FTCE in Florida); while programs find this necessary in order to meet state requirements, it is not sufficient in assessing content mastery to ensure that all admitted candidates have a secure grasp of content knowledge.

*Constraining criteria

⁶Five essential components of reading: phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension

<p>(ELEMENTARY) Literacy Training (continued)</p>	<p>3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs</p>	<p>3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.</p>	<p>3. Fluency 4. Comprehension 5. Vocabulary instruction to include morphology 6. Grammar/syntax 7. Written expression 8. Formal/informal assessment practices that inform literacy instruction 9. ELL 10. Learning Differences to include dyslexia and students with learning disabilities as well as other learning needs.</p>	
<p>(ELEMENTARY) Math Content:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numbers & Operations • Algebra & Functions • Geometry & Measurement • Data Analysis & Probability <p>Math Pedagogy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conceptual understanding • Problem solving • Fluency 	<p>Coursework and training address, comprehensively and in depth, all major elementary math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy to foster conceptual and procedural mastery of math instruction, and consistently enable teacher candidates to teach math highly effectively ensuring that the progress and learning of all students is good or better.</p>	<p>Coursework and training address, in depth, all major elementary math content areas and key aspects of math pedagogy to foster conceptual and procedural mastery of math instruction, and enable teacher candidates to teach math effectively such that they can enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach.</p>	<p>Coursework and training address some elementary math domains and key aspects of math pedagogy AND/OR inconsistently enable teacher candidates to teach math such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.</p>	<p>Coursework and training d not enable elementary teacher candidates to teach elementary math in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.</p>

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge (continued)

<p>(ELEMENTARY) Other subject areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science • Social Studies • Professional Development and/or Capstone Coursework⁷ 	<p>Coursework and training consistently enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to <i>teach</i> highly effective lessons in elementary subject areas so that the progress and learning of all students is good or better.</p>	<p>Coursework and training enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to <i>teach</i> effective lessons in elementary subject areas so that the progress and learning of all students is good or better.</p>	<p>Coursework and training inconsistently enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to <i>teach</i> elementary subject areas such that candidates can enhance the progress and learning of their students.</p>	<p>Coursework and training not enable teacher candidates to master the content knowledge and skills necessary to <i>teach</i> effective lessons, particularly in elementary subjects in order to enhance the progress and learning of their students.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

DRAFT

⁷ Courses here could be teaching skills and strategies as well as content-specific in focus.

Indicator 2.1 Content Knowledge (continued)

<p>(ALT CERT) Content Mastery⁸</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment • Proactive efforts to address any deficiencies 	<p>The program ensures that all candidates consistently demonstrate mastery of relevant content knowledge, and the program has clear evidence that it takes steps to assess candidates' content knowledge, and—where necessary—provides highly effective support so that candidates' content mastery results in the learning and progress of all students being good or better.</p>	<p>The program ensures that most candidates demonstrate relevant content knowledge, provides evidence that it has taken steps to assess content knowledge, and has some evidence of providing support, where necessary, so that the majority of candidates' content mastery enhances the learning and progress of the students they teach.</p>	<p>The program inconsistently ensures that candidates demonstrate relevant content knowledge, and/or there is little evidence that the program assesses their content knowledge and/or, where necessary, provides little support to enable candidates to have, or gain, content mastery as a result student learning is inconsistent.</p>	<p>The program does not ensure candidates' ability to demonstrate adequate content knowledge, and the program does not have steps in place to support candidates, where necessary, in gaining mastery of relevant content as a result student learning is significantly inhibited.</p>
<p>(SECONDARY) Core Subject Area</p>	<p>The program consistently assesses relevant content knowledge of candidates and provides support where needed to ensure comprehensive knowledge of content so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects highly effectively and the learning and progress of all students is good or better.</p>	<p>The program assesses relevant content knowledge of candidates and usually provides support where needed so that coursework and training enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects effectively, ensuring that they can enhance the learning and progress of the students they teach.</p>	<p>The program inconsistently assesses relevant content knowledge of teacher candidates, providing little support when necessary and/or coursework and training inconsistently enable teacher candidates to teach secondary subjects so that they are able to enhance the progress and learning of the students they teach.</p>	<p>There is little evidence that the program assesses candidate content knowledge. Coursework and training does not enable secondary teacher candidates to teach their secondary subject and as a result, student learning is significantly inhibited.</p>

⁸ Content mastery of candidates is assessed and when deficiencies are evident the program takes measures to ensure those deficits are remediated so that relevant content is mastered.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods ⁹				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Weak	1 – Inadequate
Classroom management	<p>Coursework and training in classroom management equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to manage behavior and discipline highly effectively and create positive and highly engaging climate for academic learning This includes all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior • differentiate the learning environment for students in need. 	<p>Coursework and training in classroom management equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning This includes all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior • differentiate the learning environment for students in need. 	<p>Coursework and training in classroom management inconsistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Some of the following may not be present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise for good behavior • handle disruptive student misbehavior • differentiate the learning environment for students in need. 	<p>Coursework and training in classroom management does not equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to manage behavior and discipline effectively and create a positive climate for academic learning. Several of the following may not be present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • make effective use of time and materials • keep classroom on track and minimize student distraction • use contingent praise handle disruptive student misbehavior. • handle disruptive student misbehavior • differentiate the learning environment for students in need.

⁹ Key teaching skills such as academic feedback and questioning, managing student behavior, assessment, and differentiation should be embedded and integrated into different content areas such that candidates fully understand how these key skills can be used to advance student learning and how use of these skills may differ across content areas.

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods (continued)

<p>Assessment</p>	<p>Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to accurately assess K-1 student performance and progress and to adjust their instruction in response to this information. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results in their instruction so that all students, including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.</p>	<p>Coursework and training in assessment equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, understanding, and skills to accurately assess student performance and progress for most of their students and to adjust their instruction in response to this information. This includes enabling them to utilize formative assessment results so that most of their students, including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, make at least good academic progress.</p>	<p>Coursework and training in assessment inconsistently equip candidates to assess student performance and progress, including inconsistent use of formative assessment results in their instruction; not all students make at least good academic progress.</p>	<p>Coursework and training in assessment does not enable candidates to assess student learning and to use formative data to inform their instruction of students.</p>
<p>Differentiation</p>	<p>Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to highly effectively adapt the curriculum and differentiate the content, process and/or product during instruction for all students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring that all students make good or better progress in the lesson and over time.</p>	<p>Coursework and training prepares teacher candidates to effectively adapt the curriculum and differentiate the content, process or product during instruction for most students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs, ensuring most students make progress in the lesson and over time.</p>	<p>Coursework and training inconsistently prepares teacher candidates to adapt the curriculum and differentiate the content, process or product during instruction to meet the needs of all students including those with ESL, special education, and gifted needs.</p>	<p>Coursework and training does not prepare candidates to adapt the curriculum and differentiate to the content, product or process during instruction to meet the needs of students with varying learning needs.</p>

Indicator 2.2 Teaching Methods (continued)

<p>Academic feedback and questioning</p>	<p>Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills, and understanding to effectively engage all students in rigorous learning through highly effective academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and high-level questioning where students and/or teachers build off responses.</p>	<p>Coursework and training consistently equip teacher candidates with the knowledge, skills, and understanding to engage students in learning through effective academic feedback that is timely, accurate and specific and questioning that includes higher-level, open-ended questions.</p>	<p>Coursework and training inconsistently prepare teacher candidates to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning. Coursework and training may not address key components of feedback (timeliness, accuracy, and specificity) OR does not address level and variety of questioning.</p>	<p>Coursework and training do not equip candidates to engage students in learning through academic feedback and questioning.</p>
---	--	---	--	---

DRAFT

Indicator 2.3 Connections to Practice ¹⁰				
Criteria	4 - Strong	3 - Good	2 - Weak	1 - Inadequate
Connections to practice between coursework and the clinical application of coursework knowledge	Program coursework has frequent and strong connections to immediate practice (such as scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.) that provide all candidates with opportunities to learn how to apply their coursework knowledge to clinical practice.	Program coursework frequently includes appropriate and good connections to practice (such as scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.) that provide most candidates with opportunities to learn how to apply their coursework knowledge to clinical practice.	Program coursework has inconsistent relevant connections to practice with missed opportunities to include scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc., in a way that help candidates learn how to apply coursework knowledge.	Program coursework has few OR ineffective connections to practice such as: scenarios, use of videos of classroom teaching, fieldwork assignments, simulations, modeling strong instructional practices, etc.

¹⁰ Through program coursework, all candidates are provided with explicit, real-world applications of the content knowledge and teaching methods presented in coursework, and observe strong modeling of teaching methods and skills, so that teacher candidates learn *how to apply* their coursework knowledge to clinical practice situations. These connections to practice do not assume that fieldwork is the only way to learn application of knowledge to classroom settings: faculty modeling, role-playing among candidates enrolled in the course, the use of videos to demonstrate how skills or knowledge are deployed in the classroom, simulations, and avatar-based practice opportunities are some of the concrete ways connections to practice can be embedded in course content.

REVIEW AREA 3: Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance

Context/Rationale: The final clinical experience (often referred to as student teaching or internship) offers candidates the opportunity to apply the knowledge acquired through program coursework, prior field experiences, and other activities. As such, it is essential that all candidates receive high-quality supervision and feedback. While candidate performance during observation is a central piece of evidence for this review area, reviewers are **not evaluating teacher candidates** through these observations: reviewers are judging the teaching and learning that results from the program's efforts to develop the knowledge and teaching skills of all candidates, **not the teacher candidate who is observed by reviewers**. Evidence is gathered and judgments made within the wider goal of understanding program results and how these results are achieved. While the final clinical experience is central to the review area, reviewers will include evidence on earlier clinical experiences where appropriate.

Note on Alternate Certification Programs: For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the site visit focus is on how well the program ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Essential questions being answered:

- How does the program structure the final clinical experience and select the clinical placement site?
- How are cooperating teachers and/or program supervisors chosen, trained, and supported by the program?
- What aspects of teaching and learning does the observation tool provide feedback on?
- What is the quality of the feedback candidates receive? Is it an accurate reflection of the quality of teaching and learning during the observed lesson?
- How consistent is the feedback provided by the program supervisors and classroom cooperating teachers?
- Is the feedback constructive, actionable and likely to lead to improvement in teaching and learning practices?
- How do cooperating teachers, principals, and/or program supervisors view the overall quality of teacher candidate?
- What is the impact of candidate teaching on student learning during the observed lesson?
- What is the evidence from the site visit with regards to the quality of teacher candidates?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:

- Observations of teacher candidates teaching
- Observation of feedback provided by program supervisors to candidates
- Blank and completed observations and evaluation instruments
- Conversations with teacher candidates, program faculty/staff, and school/district staff (cooperating teachers, principals, HR)
- Data on all supervisor observation scores and written comments for cohorts of teacher candidates in the reviewed program
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents with information on the selection, training and support of cooperating teachers and supervisors
- Surveys of program completers

Note on “constraining criteria”: The quality of written and oral feedback (Indicator 3.2) delivered by program supervisors to all candidates **must be good or better** in order for the key judgment on Quality of Clinical Placement, Feedback, and Candidate Performance to be good.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Weak	1 – Inadequate
Clinical placement timing and length	Teacher candidates are consistently placed at the beginning of the K12 school term (ideally at the beginning of a school year) and student teaching lasts for at least a full school term .	Teacher candidates are consistently placed within the first two weeks of the K12 school term and student teaching lasts for at least ten weeks .	Teacher candidates are not consistently placed within first two weeks of the K12 school term and/or lasts for less than ten weeks but more than six weeks .	Student teaching lasts for less than six weeks .

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement (continued)

<p>Selection of clinical placement schools^{11 12}</p>	<p>High-quality placements ensure that teacher candidates gain substantial practical experience to develop their teaching skills effectively in schools that are high performing and/or improving over the past two years a substantial portion of which have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).</p>	<p>Placements ensure that teacher candidates gain practical experience to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where most schools are high performing and/or improving over the past two years, some of which have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).</p>	<p>Placements inconsistently ensure that teacher candidates gain practical experience to develop their teaching skills effectively in placements where some schools are high performing and/or improving over the past two years, some of which have a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).</p>	<p>Placements do not ensure that teacher candidates are able to develop their teaching skills in schools that have at least some evidence of improving academic performance over the past two years and also serve a diverse student body (to include SES and/or ethnicity).</p>
<p>Selection of cooperating teachers (mentor teachers)¹³</p>	<p>Cooperating teachers are consistently chosen based on demonstrated effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.</p>	<p>Cooperating teachers are often chosen for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor.</p>	<p>Program has selection criteria that cooperating teachers be chosen for effectiveness and capacity to serve as a mentor but cooperating teachers inconsistently have these.</p>	<p>There is n clear rationale for choosing cooperating teachers for their effectiveness OR for their capacity to serve as mentors.</p>

¹¹ For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program this criterion does not apply (e.g. alternative certification programs).

¹² Team will examine up to 10 schools where most candidates are placed plus any not on that list but where the team observed.

Indicator 3.1 – Clinical Placement (continued)

<p>(ALT CERT)¹⁴ Clinical On-Site Supports</p>	<p>Programs consistently demonstrate that multiple supports are in place for candidates who are teaching, including frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as evidence that strategic interventions routinely take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.</p>	<p>Programs demonstrate that they provide some onsite support for candidates who are teaching--examples may include frequent visits to provide timely oral and written feedback that focuses on how well students are learning, as well as some evidence that interventions take place to address weaknesses in candidate performance if/when they arise.</p>	<p>Programs inconsistently demonstrate supports are in place for candidates teaching through onsite visits to assess candidate performance and/or few interventions are available if/when placement weaknesses arise OR the interventions take place inconsistently and/or are inconsistently effective.</p>	<p>Programs are not able to demonstrate supports are in place for candidates teaching. There is little or no evidence of onsite support for candidates and/or they do not make interventions when weaknesses in candidate performance arise OR the interventions are ineffective.</p>
---	---	--	--	---

¹³ For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as the teacher of record who are enrolled in the program, this criterion does not apply.

¹⁴For programs where clinical placement is determined by employment of program candidates as teachers of record who are enrolled in the program, the site visit focus is on how well the program ensures that all enrolled candidates are receiving the support and guidance needed to develop their teaching knowledge and skills and what interventions and supports are in place to address weaknesses in placements if/when they arise.

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback				
Criteria	4 – Strong	3 – Good	2 – Weak	1 – Inadequate
Observation form(s) used by program supervisors	<p>Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) includes explicit focus on ALL :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson ● impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson ● specific, research-based classroom management strategies, ● use of formative assessment to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge 	<p>Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) addresses most (5-6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson ● impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson ● specific, research-based classroom management strategies, ● use of formative assessment to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge 	<p>Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) addresses only some (3-4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson ● impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson ● specific, research-based classroom management strategies, ● use of formative assessment to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge 	<p>Observation and/or evaluation instrument(s) addresses few (1-2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● student engagement in learning and participation in the lesson ● impact of candidate instruction on learning during the observed lesson ● specific, research-based classroom management strategies, ● use of formative assessment to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for ESL, special education, and gifted needs ● academic feedback and questioning ● Candidate content knowledge

Indicator 3.2 – Observation and Feedback (continued)

<p>Program supervisor and cooperating teacher training on observation and evaluation</p>	<p>All program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating teachers receive regular substantive training to measurable standards for reliability on methods and practices of high-quality observation and feedback.</p>	<p>All program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating teachers receive regular substantive training on methods and practices of high-quality observation and feedback.</p>	<p>Program-based supervising teachers and classroom cooperating teachers receive minimal training, at least annually, on the observation and/or evaluation instrument.</p>	<p>The program does not provide training on methods and practices of effective observation and feedback to program-based supervising teachers or classroom cooperating teachers who observe/host teacher candidates.</p>
<p>Quality of written and oral feedback*</p>	<p>Accurate written and oral feedback after each required observation has a clear link to evidence of student learning during the observed lesson, strategically builds on previous feedback, and identifies key action steps for improvement.</p>	<p>Accurate written and oral feedback after each required observation usually has a clear link to evidence of student learning during the observed lesson, builds on previous feedback, and identifies most key action steps for improvement.</p>	<p>Written and oral feedback after each required observation is inconsistent and/or inconsistently builds upon previous feedback, does not link to student learning, and/or does not directly identify action steps for improvement.</p>	<p>Written and oral feedback after each required observation is inaccurate and/or does not link to student learning and does not identify key action steps for improvement.</p>

* Constraining Criteria

Indicator 3.2 - Observation and Feedback (continued)				
Consistency of expectations	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers have consistently high expectations for candidate performance and student learning, and they work collaboratively to deliver strong feedback that is accurate and highly relevant to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers usually have consistent expectations about candidate performance and student learning, and they mostly work collaboratively to ensure that feedback is accurate and relevant to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers have inconsistent expectations about candidate performance and student learning, and/or their feedback is inconsistent or not always relevant to the needs of teacher candidates.	Supervising teachers, classroom cooperating teachers and all classroom observers provide teacher candidates with feedback that is not accurate or relevant to the needs of teacher candidates and/or expectations are not clear .

Indicator 3.3 - Candidate Performance				
Criteria	4 - Strong	3 - Good	2 - Weak	1 - Inadequate
Student engagement and candidate impact on student learning during lesson ¹⁵	All students are engaged in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching consistently advances student learning during the observed lesson.	Most students are engaged in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching consistently advances student learning for most students during the lesson.	Students are inconsistently engaged in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching inconsistently advances student learning.	Few students are engaged in learning during the observed lesson and candidate teaching does not contribute to student learning.

¹⁵ Student learning during an observed lesson can be determined by direct observation of student work in the classroom as well as evidence that students are active in debate and discussion during the lesson, discovering evidence or patterns, making contributions to the understanding of other students—or even the teacher—of a subject or topic, asking and/or answering probing questions, and providing responses to reviewer questions that demonstrate learning and understanding of lesson content.

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance (continued)

<p>Subject knowledge</p>	<p>Students benefit from accurate and high-quality content because candidates consistently teach exceptionally well demonstrating strong subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.</p>	<p>Students benefit from accurate content because candidates consistently teach well demonstrating good subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.</p>	<p>Students inconsistently benefit from accurate content because candidates teach inconsistently demonstrating some errors in subject knowledge, particularly in reading, literature, history/social studies, math and science.</p>	<p>Students have few opportunities to benefit from accurate content because candidates are unable to consistently demonstrate subject knowledge to ensure that lessons are taught accurately and/or inaccuracies in content adversely impact student learning.</p>
<p>Teaching Skills and Strategies</p>	<p>Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to consistently and highly effectively demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● classroom management strategies ● formative assessment and its use to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs ● academic feedback and questioning 	<p>Student learning and engagement are supported by teacher candidate ability to consistently and effectively demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● classroom management strategies ● formative assessment and its use to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs ● academic feedback and questioning 	<p>Student learning and engagement are not always supported due to inconsistent ability of teacher candidate to demonstrate the use of these teaching and learning strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● classroom management strategies ● formative assessment and its use to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning ● academic feedback and questioning 	<p>Student learning and/or engagement is impeded by teacher candidate inability to use one or more of these teaching and learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● classroom management strategies ● formative assessment and its use to inform instruction ● differentiated instruction for gifted students, ELLs and students with special learning needs ● academic feedback and questioning

Indicator 3.3 – Candidate Performance (continued)

<p>Feedback from recent graduates and principals of recent graduates</p>	<p>Recent graduates, cooperating teachers and principals of recent graduates report that program graduates make a strong positive impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.</p>	<p>Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that program graduates make positive impact on student learning without the need for targeted interventional professional development from the school or district.</p>	<p>Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that targeted interventional professional development was sometimes needed to enable the graduates to improve their impact on student learning.</p>	<p>Recent graduates and principals of recent graduates report that significant professional development was required in the first year of teaching to ensure that teaching reaches an acceptable level of effectiveness and/or to ensure that pupils make expected levels of progress.</p>
---	--	---	--	---

DRAFT

REVIEW AREA 4: Quality of Program Performance Management

Rationale/Context: This review area examines whether and how program leadership—*at all levels*—utilize data to continually improve the quality of teacher preparation and outcomes for all teacher candidates. Program performance management gives careful attention to quantitative and qualitative data, review of data quality (e.g., reliable and valid measures of clinical performance and student learning), well-established processes for performance review and action steps based on that review, and broad involvement of faculty and administrators at all levels of the program in these monitoring and improvement processes. Program performance management also includes systematic and regular attention to the quality of program coursework and faculty teaching, taking into account their impact on relevant program outcomes and to the ability of all candidates to teach well as a result of the quality of course content and faculty teaching.

Quality assurance through effective program performance management takes place by building and sustaining a culture of continuous improvement that directly engages all members of the organization. Multiple sources of information are used to monitor the performance of individual candidates, cohorts of candidates, and cohorts of recent completers. This information leads directly to action steps to improve the program as well as follow up monitoring to gauge the impact of these improvement actions. The site visit also focuses on the quality and accuracy of data used by the program to assess its own performance, in particular whether observation score data collected and reported by program supervisors is an accurate reflection of observed candidate practice and shows developing skills across time through successive observations.

Core concepts of program performance management are: full engagement of all members of the organization in continuous improvement activities; regular use of multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative information by all members of the organization working together; prompt action steps taken as the result of careful performance monitoring; the use of data to assess the effectiveness of steps taken in response to identified needs for improvement; and a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement activities embedded into the culture of the program.

Essential questions being answered:

- How do program leadership and faculty use a wide variety of information to understand candidate and cohort performance and make improvements to the program? How often?

- What is the quality of data collected and used by the program and who uses it? How does the program monitor the quality of its data and seek to improve data quality where needed?
- Does the program have—and use—quality control “gates”, transition points, or checkpoints at the end of each program stage to decide whether a candidate is ready to move to the next stage? What data are used to make these decisions?
- Does the program have intervention plans for weaker candidates? For those candidates unable to meet performance improvement goals, is there a non-certification degree track for them?
- How does the program monitor and take steps to improve the quality of coursework and teaching?
- How does program leadership monitor connections between coursework and clinical experiences and ensure that faculty know how well their students can implement course content?
- How does program leadership take action as a result of information? Frequency? What steps are taken to monitor the results of steps taken to make improvements?
- How does the program ensure it meets Florida Statutes (1004.04(2)(d), 1004.85(3)(b)3, 1012.56(8)) whereby prior to program completion, each candidate must demonstrate positive impact on student learning growth and pass all relevant portions of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE)?

Likely sources of evidence for this review area:

- Data over time (to include: teaching observations, evaluations, surveys, employment outcomes, impact of candidates and graduates on student learning)
- Observations of teacher candidates teaching and of program courses
- Courses taught through multiple sections or at multiple sites
- Observation of feedback provided to candidates
- Completed observation and evaluation instruments across multiple observations for whole cohorts of candidates
- Conversations with program faculty/staff, teacher candidates, and school staff (cooperating teachers, principals)
- Program handbooks, MOUs, and/or other program documents
- Program or individual candidate improvement plans, action plans, and results of the interventions
- Program outcomes such as employment, persistence, performance, feedback from graduates and employers, impact on student learning outcomes

Indicator 4.1: Program Performance Management				
Criteria	4 - Strong	3 - Good	2 - Weak	1 - Inadequate
Quality of Data	Program collects and uses multiple sources of high-quality internally and externally validated data to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses multiple sources of information, most of which are high-quality data , to monitor ongoing performance.	Program collects and uses few sources of high-quality information , relying on data of inconsistent quality to monitor ongoing performance	Sources of information collected and used for program monitoring are not high-quality data .
Internal quality control gates (or checkpoints) and intervention plans	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints and utilizes data including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that all candidates exceed high standards of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, being recommended for licensure). The program has formal interventions (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.	Program leadership monitors candidate performance through internal performance checkpoints and utilizes data including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that all candidates meet high standards of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, being recommended for licensure). The program has formal interventions (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.	Program leadership inconsistently monitors candidate performance and inconsistently utilizes data including student learning growth and FTCE results to ensure that candidates meet standards of performance before moving into the next phase of their teacher preparation (e.g., into student teaching, being recommended for licensure), and/or the program inconsistently uses formal interventions (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.	The program does not monitor candidate performance through formal internal performance checkpoints and/or the expected standards are unclear and/or they do not address Florida Statute and include student learning growth The program does not use formal interventions (including a counseling out process) for teacher candidates who do not meet program performance standards.

Indicator 4.1: Program Performance Management (continued)

<p>Quality monitoring (data sources could include: program improvement plans, candidate completion rates, feedback surveys, internal reviews, faculty study groups, faculty/peer observations)</p>	<p>The program has a formal organized system through which program leadership uses high-quality data to regularly and systematically monitor overall quality of coursework, field experiences, the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates, candidate performance and key program outcomes. This includes regular examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as regular training for supervising teachers</p>	<p>The program has an informal set of processes through which program leadership usually makes use of good data to monitor overall quality of coursework, field experiences, the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates, candidate performance and key program outcomes. This includes review of observation and feedback instruments and practices as well as regular training for supervising teachers.</p>	<p>Program leadership inconsistently monitors overall quality of coursework, field experiences, and the observation and feedback system employed to support development of teacher candidates. Examination of observation and feedback instruments and practices is not regular nor is training for supervising teachers.</p>	<p>The program does not take steps to monitor the quality of coursework, candidate fieldwork experiences, and/or the program's observation and feedback practices. Supervising teachers do not receive at least annual training to ensure consistency of approach in giving feedback to teacher candidates.</p>
<p>Monitoring coursework quality and coursework-clinical connections</p>	<p>Program leaders systematically monitor the quality of coursework and teaching and take steps to ensure there are strong connections between program coursework and the clinical component of the program, including methods for sharing information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.</p>	<p>Program leaders have an informal system in place to monitor the quality of coursework and teaching and to ensure there are good connections between program coursework and the clinical component of the program, including methods for sharing information between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance so that course instructors understand how well candidates are able to implement what they learn.</p>	<p>Program leaders inconsistently monitor the quality of coursework and teaching and do not ensure the presence of good coursework-clinical connections, and/or they inconsistently monitor how well information is shared between the faculty who teach courses and those who supervise candidate clinical performance.</p>	<p>Program leaders do not monitor the quality of coursework and teaching to ensure good coursework-clinical connections.</p>

Indicator 4.1: Program Performance Management (continued)

<p>Quality improvement planning¹⁶</p>	<p>The program has a formal system for improvement planning informed by high-quality data, involving all relevant stakeholders in continuous improvement activities, and resulting in action plans with measurable goals. There is a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement steps on program outcomes.</p>	<p>The program's quality improvement activities usually make use of good quality data and involve many key stakeholders to produce action plans with measurable goals. However, there is no formal system in place that supports a sustained cycle of monitoring, acting on results, and assessing the impact of improvement steps on program outcomes.</p>	<p>The program inconsistently makes use of improvement plans based on monitoring data to develop action steps that result in stronger outcomes for individual and groups of teacher candidates and completers.</p>	<p>Quality improvement plans are not used to examine the effectiveness of the program and secure further improvements in outcomes for individual and groups of teacher candidates and completers.</p>
---	---	--	---	--

DRAFT

¹⁶ Quality improvement planning involves all stakeholders, using results to take action for continuous improvement.