



St. Petersburg College

Elementary Education Program Inspection Report

Inspection Dates: February 20-24, 2017

This inspection was carried out by the Teacher Preparation Inspectorate in accordance with the *Teacher Preparation Inspection Handbook (2017 Revision)*. Inspection focused on the St. Petersburg College elementary education teacher preparation program.

The inspection draws upon evidence from program leaders, faculty, teachers and school leaders, from observation of teaching in schools visited during the inspection, and from documents and data about the program. This evidence has enabled inspectors to make judgments against all parts of the inspection framework.

Inspection judgments

Key to judgments: Grade 4 is strong; grade 3 is good; grade 2 is needs improvement; grade 1 is inadequate.

Name of Provider/Name of Program

Quality of selection for teacher candidates	2
Quality of content knowledge and teaching methods	3
Quality of clinical placement, feedback, and candidate performance	3
Quality of program performance management	3

The key strengths of the program are:

- Content area coursework is taught well in literacy, math, science and social studies enabling candidates to demonstrate competence and confidence in content skills and pedagogy when instructing their students.
- Clinical placement is a strength because of its length and the because of the quality in selection of classroom co-operating teachers. In addition, field supervisors are provided with both initial and ongoing training enabling them to effectively monitor the performance of teacher candidates.
- The program leadership is committed to getting better through the collection of good quality data which is rigorously monitored for the purpose of continuous improvement. This is evident through coursework monitoring and changes, ongoing data review and clear connections to practice. The program has implemented multiple recommendations from prior TPI-US inspections and the impact of those improvement efforts are evident.

Key areas of improvement include:

- Ensure the consistency of high quality written and oral feedback so that it meets high standards and always has an explicit focus on student learning. In addition, feedback should always identify observed strengths and most important weaknesses. Salient weaknesses should be addressed even when they are identified outside the candidates' selected area for focus.
- Improve coursework to better meet the needs of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) and Gifted students so that content, process and product are differentiated throughout while also providing practice using classroom management techniques to enable teacher candidates to be better prepared when on their own. Coursework should embed academic feedback and address levels of questioning throughout all content areas enabling candidates to repeatedly learn and apply these skills.
- Monitor more frequently and closely both the quality of coursework instruction and the quality of coursework content and assignments with the intention to replicate best practices already present in other existing high quality coursework and instruction so that all meet the same standards of quality.

Inspection Judgments

Quality of Selection:

Needs Improvement (2)

The program should work to improve the quality of program selection to good by:

- Ensuring at least 75% of admitted candidates have a Grade Point Average (GPA) of 3.0 or higher.
- Continuing the efforts which produce the best results for recruiting and retaining diverse enrolled and completer candidates over multiple consecutive years.
- Initiating a monitoring plan that produces evidence that the admission measures currently in place are accurate predictors of future teacher effectiveness.

Inspection Findings

1. Grade Point Average (GPA): GPA needs improvement. Inspection evidence indicates that in the current Elite Educator Program (ELITE) cohort, 80% of candidates has a GPA greater than 3.0. In the current Elementary Education Program with Reading endorsement (ELED) program, data shows that 71% of candidates have a GPA of 3.0 or above. When both programs are combined, data indicates that 73% of candidates are at 3.0 or above and if averaged over the past five years, 63% of candidates' GPA are above 3.0.
2. Standardized tests: This criteria is not required for the ELED program so it does not apply. For ELITE, the program accepts Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores for math and reading at 460 or above. Current data shows ELITE candidates to have reading SAT scores at 500 or higher and math SAT scores at 430. The national average for SAT scores is 495 for reading and 511 for math. This shows that ELITE reading SAT scores are drawn from the top half of the college going population whereas math is below the average. The program accepts

American College Testing (ACT) scores at 19 or above and current candidates have ACT scores at 28. The national ACT average is 21.3 which demonstrates that ELITE candidates are drawn from the top half based on this test.

3. Demographic representation: The demographic representation of enrolled candidates and completers is good. The program has a current written Equity Report plan. This plan has been developed and monitored over the past five years and focuses on recruitment and retention of diverse candidates. The plan contains goals and objectives to continually increase the diversity and has resulted in a 5% increase in non-white candidates and a 4% increase in males over the last two years.
4. Admission process: The admission process needs improvement. ELEDL requires an associate arts degree or completion of sixty general education credits including passing all four areas of the general knowledge test and three pre-requisite courses completed. For ELITE, evidence found that the program requires two reference forms and a successful candidate interview. However, at this time, the program is not monitoring how these multiple measures impact or are predictive of future candidate effectiveness.

Quality of Content Knowledge and Teaching Methods:

Good (3)

The program should work to improve the quality of content knowledge and teaching methods to strong by:

- Providing more opportunities for candidates to learn and apply classroom management strategies. This should be accomplished by using School Based Hours (SBH) or through the use and evaluation of video assignments showing candidates practicing management strategies in the classroom so that they may receive feedback on the effectiveness of their use of strategies.
- Improving the quality of coursework in teaching methods for differentiation and academic feedback and questioning. The program should use the strong coursework and instruction models literacy, science and social studies. These models could be replicated across all courses. In addition, the current classroom management module housed in the Chalk and Wire system is a resource that should be expanded and better utilized so that candidates use this resource more frequently to improve their skills in these teaching methods.

Inspection Findings

1. Elementary literacy training: Elementary literacy training is strong. Coursework in Literacy addresses all components of Scientifically Based Reading Instruction (SBRI). Evidence is seen throughout the three different courses that these components are present while also embedding effective formative and summative assessment techniques and ESOL strategies. Such practices equip candidates with the knowledge and skills to assess all learners and provide differentiated reading instruction to meet their needs.
2. Elementary math content/pedagogy: Elementary math coursework is good. Math coursework covers all four content strands including numbers and operations, algebra and functions, geometry and measurement and data analysis and probability. Key areas in pedagogy are also covered including conceptual understanding, problem solving and fluency as demonstrated

February 2017

- through assignments, syllabi and discussions with candidates and school personnel.
3. Elementary other subject areas: Coursework in science and social studies is strong. Science coursework provides hands on, practical and investigative learning experiences and includes delivery of pre-and post- competency questions. These formative assessments enable the instructor to make content adjustments as needed to meet the needs of each cohort. Social studies coursework models a highly engaging learning climate that incorporates the Pinellas county Decision Based Question (DBQ) project so that candidates are trained in how to use technology and primary and secondary sources to advance the learning of their students.
 4. Teaching methods: Coursework in some teaching methods needs improvement. Classroom management coursework includes Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation, Success (CHAMPS) modules which provide multiple strategies and video simulations to support candidate learning yet it does not provide opportunities to practice techniques because the timing and placement in the course sequence are not aligned to School Based Hours (SBH) in the classroom. Diagnostic, formative and summative assessment strategies are taught well to candidates including analysis of county achievement data, the writing of scales and test items so that the needs of ESOL and ESE students are met. The Measurement, Evaluation and Assessment in Education K-12 course also includes how to analyze and report findings for multiple data types including how to communicate results to family and community. Across coursework, differentiation is embedded for ESOL and ESE students. This is found in multiple literacy courses including knowledge of language acquisition and in how to differentiate literacy for these subgroups in both planning and teaching through the assignments given. However, the team observed limited differentiation being provided for the gifted and/or high achieving student population. Academic feedback and questioning coursework did not always address higher order questioning strategies or equip candidates with the knowledge and skills in how to plan and use these strategies to drive dialogue and to push student thinking. In addition, most courses observed did not explicitly embed this skill into existing content. There are strong course and instructor models in Early and Emergent Literacy K-2 and Social Studies Content in Elementary Classrooms which model and embed these teaching methods and differentiation aspects with ESOL and ESE students. These models provide candidates with full exposure in how to plan for and apply all teaching methods effectively.
 5. Connections to Practice: Connections to practice is good. Coursework was found to model frequent and good instructional strategies which contain field work assignments to provide candidates opportunities to plan for, deliver and reflect on the quality of their teaching. These connections were found through assignments where candidates video themselves teaching and then submit them for feedback. For online coursework that do not have SBH, these connections are built through assignments containing real-life scenarios and use of current local district student achievement data analysis.

Quality of Clinical placement, Feedback and Candidate Performance:

Good (3)

The program should work to improve the quality of program performance management to strong by:

- Placing all candidates in either high performing or improving schools to ensure they gain substantial practical experience in settings which will further help them to develop their skills effectively.

February 2017

- Improving the quality of written feedback forms to ensure they explicitly have a clear link to student learning throughout and that this focus drives the entire conference process. Embellish existing forms so that program supervisors have a place and a process for capturing key salient weaknesses when areas for improvement lie outside the focus area selected by the candidate.
- Increasing the consistency of expectations between the field supervisors and cooperating teachers because even though there is generally a shared level of expectation, there is a small number of instances this high bar of expectation is not reached because of missed opportunities with communication between the two roles.

Inspection Findings

1. Clinical Placement, timing and length: Clinical placement, timing and length are strong. Candidates are placed for a full year allowing them to experience both the pre-planning and close of school. In addition, candidates are provided multiple placement opportunities during pre-practicum to experience school based hours.
2. Selection of clinical placement schools: Selection of clinical placement schools needs improvement. Although the program makes an effort to place candidates in varied highly diverse schools, including high-minority and high-poverty, evidence found that not all candidates are currently placed in either high performing or improving schools based on recently released data from the State of Florida.
3. Selection of mentor teachers: Selection of mentor teachers is good. Mentor teachers are selected based on their Highly Effective or Effective evaluation status, have had at least three years teaching experience, received a recommendation from their principal and have participated in clinical training on the use of the observation instrument.
4. Observation forms used by supervisors: The observation form used by program supervisors is good. Noted strengths include ways to observe and evaluate engagement, use of formative assessment and demonstration of candidate content knowledge. However, although reference to student learning is made, this reference is not always explicit enough. Furthermore, there is not a place for observers to capture and refine key weaknesses seen outside the area of selected focus. The team found this omission to be a gap in helping the candidate receive feedback on most important next steps and areas for growth.
5. Program supervisor and mentor training: Supervisor and mentor training is good. Field supervisors have attended a total of sixteen days of training including Marzano's instructional shifts and learning goals, the new teacher evaluation framework and inter-rater reliability training. This initial training has been followed by ongoing training through the Center Education Leadership (CEL) which has provided opportunities for field supervisors to observe expert models delivering high quality oral feedback to candidates as well as calibrations on use of the forms. In addition, the program will be delivering ongoing training for faculty and field supervisors on the topic of how to improve delivery of high quality oral and written feedback. The program provided mentor teachers summer training that included a cross walk of SPCs instrument to the Pinellas county's Marzano observation instrument. Classroom cooperating teachers also participated in training provided through Pinellas county on mentoring skills and clinical observation training.

6. Quality of written and oral feedback: The quality of written and oral feedback is good. Evidence found that there are multiple examples where oral and written feedback were evidence based and accessible to view by candidates, field supervisors and faculty instructors. However, the team found that occasionally both written and oral feedback did not consistently link to student learning nor did it always identify the most salient key areas for improvement. For example, if the candidate selected an indicator other than an area of observed need, the team observed the refinement to be overlooked thereby not supporting the candidate in accurate feedback about the lesson observed. This suggests that the forms being used need an area to include and/or address either content or teaching method errors observed that may impede student learning, regardless of the indicators the teacher candidate chose for the supervisor to focus on.
7. Consistency of expectations: The consistency of expectations needs improvement. Occasionally there is a difference of expectation between some cooperating teachers and some field supervisors in that some regularly meet and discuss candidate needs and uniform procedures and expectations and others do not. Due to the differences observed in quality of communication between the classroom cooperating teacher and field supervisor, the teacher candidate did not always experience consistency in feedback while developing their skills.
8. Candidate performance: Candidate performance is good. All candidates observed showed good content knowledge. Candidates demonstrated good use of formative assessment strategies through frequent checks for understanding and use of differentiation strategies with ESOL students. Candidates were not consistently observed differentiating for Gifted and high achieving students and missed opportunities to facilitate student discussions through effective use of higher order questioning strategies to further engage their students.
9. Feedback from principals and recent graduates: Principals shared positive remarks about the quality of teacher the program produces and they attribute that to the support candidates receive for the full year of placement and the strong content knowledge coursework. Principals also noted that candidates would benefit from improved classroom management based on their observations. Recent graduates report being well prepared because of the quality of content knowledge coursework the program provided and stated that it enabled them to pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE) Subject Area Exam (SAE) for Elementary Education the first time and allowed them to feel confident and prepared to teach any elementary subject area. Graduates also commented on the positive impact of the multiple practicums and internship with school based hours and how that supported their growth as they progressed through their program.

Quality of Program Performance Management:

Good (3)

The program should work to improve the quality of program performance management to strong by:

- Improving quality monitoring for both written and oral feedback provided to all candidates during the observation process as well as regularly and rigorously monitoring all coursework and instructors to ensure all meet the same levels of quality.
- Developing a continuous improvement plan or by improving the existing annual improvement plan so that short term goals, timelines, action steps and deliverables are frequently revisited to inform the annual review. This continuous improvement plan should be revisited regularly by all of program to ensure all members are kept informed on

the progress or delays and include clear delineation of roles while simultaneously encouraging collaboration across all of leadership.

Inspection Findings

1. **Quality of data:** The quality of data collected is good. Data is of high quality and collected including teacher observation data, completer and employer surveys, FCTE exam data and focus group surveys. This data is compiled, reviewed and shared with all of program via the Annual Data Review which provides an aggregate analysis to support annual improvement planning efforts.
2. **Quality monitoring:** The quality of monitoring is good. Evidence shows the Annual Data Review is shared with all faculty for analysis. Upon reflecting on the prior year's data, faculty engaged in a collaborative effort to improve by the development of annual goals. Student and field supervisor Focus Groups are currently engaged in monitoring the impact of changes with the new observation and feedback instrument so that the program is poised to address challenges and develop areas for improvement. Although there are some current efforts in place to monitor field supervisors and the training they receive, the program needs to ensure there are consistent high quality observations occurring including the delivery of high quality oral and written feedback. Course coordinators currently make efforts to monitor the quality of coursework content across multiple instructors, however, the sharing of their observations and insights are not consistently shared amongst all faculty. Sharing with all instructors would enable faculty to know if their candidates can apply the new learning they've presented in their own coursework.
3. **Internal quality checkpoints:** The quality of internal checkpoints is good. Plans are in place which involve the monitoring of student performance using disposition forms. Intervention plans address below proficient teaching skills and adherence to policy, are scored by the field supervisor and provide multiple possible outcomes as a result of how the candidate performs while on the plan. If adequate progress is not observed, program has a process and plan in place which may include the counseling out of the program.
4. **Quality assurance improvement planning:** Quality assurance and improvement planning is good. Evidence found this exists through the analysis of the Annual Data Review. These reviews inform all faculty of survey, observation and achievement data so that instructors can work together with program leaders to adjust coursework timing and content as needed. These efforts are evident through improvements in the math, science and assessment coursework. To make these course improvements, instructors worked collaboratively with Pinellas county professional developers and teachers to improve both content and pedagogy. This improvement planning is also evident through the move to the new observation instrument as well as the initial and ongoing training provided to those who use the instrument to evaluate and provide feedback. In spite of these strengths, inspection found lacking, a continuous improvement plan at the program level which provides both short and long term goals, objectives, timelines and deliverables to inform the Annual Data Review process.
5. **Coursework clinical connections:** Coursework-clinical connections are good. These connections are monitored through field supervisors who are often also course instructors. This allows them to adjust and make immediate changes in content as well as overall course improvements for the following semester. Inspection did find however that this is not always

the case as some faculty are not supervisors and therefore are not able to observe application in the field.

Appendix

St Petersburg College Elementary Education Program

Information about the program:

- St. Petersburg College's ELEDR program combines college coursework related to the elementary content, the pedagogy of teaching and practical, school-based experiences. Candidates are offered multiple opportunities across semesters to engage in field placements allowing them to practice new skills more frequently. Upon completion of all requirements, graduates will have earned a Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education (K-6) with infused endorsements in both Reading and ESOL.
- In addition to the regular application process for students who have earned an associate of arts degree (A.A.), the college also participates in a pipeline program known as ELITE in partnership with Pinellas County Public School. The purpose of this is to recruit high-achieving students by engaging potential candidates into a holistic admission process aimed to determine if the student has the potential to be successful in the program and the teaching profession. The program began their third cohort of ELITE recruits in Fall 2016.
- Through its Centers of Excellence grant, the program is making ongoing programmatic improvements in coursework content quality. The program has placed a strong focus on the initial and ongoing training of their faculty and supervisors in the use of this instrument and in the process of ensuring all are providing high quality feedback to candidates during their field experiences.

Information about the inspection:

- The inspection team visited six schools, observed ten courses including two online modules, and observed thirteen interns teaching including the conference debriefs for all and some of their pre-conferences.
- Inspectors conducted discussions with six recent graduates and met with two district administrators as well as five principals. The team interviewed thirteen interns as well their mentor teachers and held interviews with three field supervisors. The inspection team also interviewed four members from the education faculty.
- Inspection team members reviewed all documents provided by the program. This included multiple syllabi, degree plans, handbooks, observation instruments and feedback tools. The team also explored online and face to face coursework delivery.
- Program representatives participated in all formal inspection daily team meetings.
- The program representative team participated in the final oral debrief including Dean Kimberly Hartman, Dr. Andrea Kelly, Dr. Wanda Santos and Carla Rossiter where the Lead Inspector presented inspection findings and areas for improvement.

Inspection Team

Suzanne Hofmann, Lead Inspector
Paulette Garza, Inspector
Sherre Heider, Inspector
Nicole Johnson, Inspector
Martin Newell, Quality Assurance

Program Representatives

Dr. Daniel Gardner

Program clinical sites and program courses

The following schools were visited to observe teaching, observe feedback to candidates from university supervisors, and to interview school leaders:

Blanton Elementary, Pinellas County Schools
Belcher Elementary, Pinellas County Schools
Dunedin Elementary, Pinellas County Schools
Pinellas Central Elementary, Pinellas County Schools
Pinellas Park Elementary, Pinellas County Schools
Tarpon Springs Elementary, Pinellas County Schools

Inspectors observed the following courses:

EDE 4226 Integrating Language Arts, Children's Literature, and Social Sciences
EDE 4304 Integrated Mathematics and Science
EDF 4430 Measurement, Evaluation, and Assessment in Education K-12
EDG 3410 Classroom Management Community K-12
EDG 3620 Curriculum and Instruction
MAE 4114 Math Content for the Elementary Grades
RED 3309 Early and Emergent Literacy K-2
RED 4511 Intermediate Literacy 3-6: Reading, Writing & Thinking
RED 4519 Diagnosis and Intervention in Reading for Diverse Students K-12
SCE 4113 Elementary Science Content
SSE 4112 Social Studies Content in the Elementary Classroom
TSL 4081 ESOL Issues and Principles of Practice 2