



**Quality Assurance
Assessment System Guide**

Date: October 17, 2023

Prepared by: Sheila Walden, Ed.D.,
Director of Accreditation, Assessment & Analytics
Ernest Andrew Brewer, Ed.D.,
Assistant Dean for School Engagement
Jessica Stupec, Certification Ombudsperson

**Florida Atlantic University | 777 Glades Road
Boca Raton, FL 33431 | 1-561-297-3000**



Table of Contents

Purpose of the Document	4
EPP QAAS Design	4
Figure 1: QAAS Components	4
Figure 2: QAAS Framework	5
The Assessment Triangle Concept	5
Figure 3: Assessment Triangle	5
Assessment Operational Framework	6
Common Assessments	6
AAC&U VALUE Rubric Standards	6
Academic Program Review	6
Annual Program Performance Report	7
Benchmark Check-Points	8
Completer Satisfaction Surveys (CSS)	8
Competency Assignments (CAs)	8
Departmental Dashboard Indicators and Key Performance Indicator Analytics	8
Diversity Data Report	8
eIPEP Standards Details Summary Reports	8
Employer Satisfaction Surveys (ESS)	8
FELE Exams	9
FTCE Exams	9
Inter-rater reliability rubric summaries	9
New Teacher Satisfaction Surveys (NTSS)	9
Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) Evaluations	9
Student Learning Outcomes	9
Figure 4: SLO Standards, by Program	10
Figure 5: Rubric Template	10
Assessment Review Framework	111
The Assessment Committee	11
The Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	11
Assessment Data Review	11
Assessment Governance	112
Appendix A: Data Terms Dictionary	13
Appendix B: Data Cadence	18
Appendix C: Standards Matrices	21
Undergraduate Initial Certification Programs Crosswalk	21
Advanced Program Example: School Leaders	27
Advanced Program Example: School Leaders Crosswalk	28
Appendix D: Course Matrix Example	29
Appendix E: Acronyms	30
Appendix F: References	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Purpose of the Document

This document describes the Quality Assurance Assessment System (QAAS) in the College of Education at Florida Atlantic University. The guide is intended as a resource and reference for faculty, administration, clinical faculty, partnering stakeholders and the college Executive Board to provide content and clarity to the assessment practices of the college. The QAAS serves to collect, analyze, and present actionable data regarding applicant qualifications, student performance, completer outcomes, enrollment and retention metrics, workforce needs and stakeholder perceptions. The goal of continuous, purposeful, planned improvement guides the focus of the QAAS.


The QAAS uses data sources available within the university, Pearson databases, and internally generated data sources within the college. The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) requires the use of some published data files. External data sources provide references to state and national comparisons. Census databases and workforce data are used for some grant-related and reporting work.

EPP QAAS Design

Florida Atlantic University's College of Education and the Educator Preparation Provider Unit (EPP) are committed to serving the community by providing effective leadership in areas of research, service and teaching at the local, state, national and international levels. Our QAAS aligns with the college mission to provide support for faculty and students as they seek to promote and sustain authentic change, excellence and equity in their respective fields, and in the organizations and systems with which they are associated. The College's programs reflect changing societal needs and incorporate web-supported delivery systems, current methodologies and research, which bring faculty and students together to improve the quality of education for all in an increasingly diverse, technological, inclusive and global society.


The QAAS is guided by a system of interwoven components; the candidate progression plan, EPP program review, and the unit review process. The candidate progression plan spans experiences from admission to the university through program completion. Grounded by a robust set of data elements in its operations, the EPP relies on the expertise of faculty, clinical faculty, adjunct faculty and trained K-12 educators for the evaluation of candidate performance on assessments to measure student and EPP outcomes and competencies. EPP program review occurs systematically as part of the FLDOE electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan (eIPEP) process, within the university Academic Program Review (APR) process, and during stakeholder and committee annual progress checks. The unit review process includes national, state and university data points used to monitor college progress and inform planning. The needs of our local service area are paramount in working with our community partners, and the expertise of stakeholders enriches dialog. The QAAS design is depicted in Figures 1 and 2.

Figure 1: QAAS Components



Source: College of Education Assessment Committee, 2019

Figure 2: QAAS Framework




Source: College of Education Assessment Committee, 2019

The Assessment Triangle Concept

The EPP’s QAAS uses Pellegrino’s (2006) assessment triangle concept (Figure 3), depicting the process of reasoning from evidence portrayed as a triad of interconnected elements. The model, defined by The Committee on the Foundations of Assessment convened by the National Research Council with the support from the National Science Foundation, is unique in that it provides a useful framework for analyzing the underpinnings of current assessments to determine how well they accomplish the goals we have in mind, as well as for designing future assessments and establishing their validity (Pellegrino, DiBello & Goldman, 2016).

Figure 3: Assessment Triangle



Source: Pellegrino, DiBello & Goldman, (2016)

The model places value on content knowledge as the cognition focus. Content as subject matter domains are measured repeatedly throughout the program, and guide the work of remediation, subsequent course interventions and improvement. The observation vertex of the triangle represents how we measure what we expect students to be able to do as they apply their learning to educational settings. We measure these performance skills in both classroom and clinical settings. During assessment practices at the program and unit levels, we look to observe the intended outcome in practice. The interpretation focus in the model represents the informal and formal methods used to make coordinated judgements in the analysis of assessment data. All three elements must be interconnected in a meaningful way to establish inferences leading to validity.

The EPP's QAAS measures student performance as outcomes, competencies, and dispositions primarily via faculty evaluations on aligned scoring guide criteria linked to competency assignments (CA) in program courses. The competencies assessed include required (FLDOE) performance indicators and competencies derived from extensive faculty input. The design requires faculty to make specific and deliberate judgments contextualized to the explicit performance levels of each criterion, using a faculty-designed rubric tool. Individualized assessment results can be used to guide student progress in consultation with faculty and advising staff. Faculty judgments can be analyzed over time at multiple curricular levels and function as a measure of learning by aggregating scoring data.

Assessment Operational Framework

Florida Atlantic University's EPP Framework is adapted from standards and indicators required by the FLDOE. These prescribed Florida Educator Accomplished Practices (FEAP) or Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS) indicators provide the framework for the knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of all EPP candidates and completers. Additionally, FLDOE directives to link clinical experiences to real-world measures require the use of the Marzano model for teacher preparation clinical assessment frameworks. To operationally link these required standards to the FAU and College of Education student learning outcomes a matrix is used as one component of the framework. The **standards matrix** (Appendix C) identifies an example of the crosswalk between InTASC Standards, FEAP and Marzano Standards. Appendix C also maps the FPLS, PSEL, and the university "3C's" standards (content, communication, and critical thinking) required of every program in the college, including those not labeled as EPP. The framework **course matrix** (Appendix D) outlines where each standard and indicator is assessed throughout multiple points in a program, as a screenshot example of one program. The data source, collection, analysis, review, reporting, and summary of both college and EPP data elements are outlined in the **data cadence schedule**, (Appendix B).

Common Assessments

AAC&U VALUE Rubric Standards

Used to meet university assessment requirements, the Association of American Colleges and Universities [Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education \(VALUE\) Rubrics](#) are used across all programs in the college. The 3Cs, content knowledge, communication, and critical thinking, are assessed as one assessment component of the [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges \(SACSCOC\)](#) accreditation requirements. For those programs assessing multiple standards, an alignment matrix is used to overlay the 3Cs, where appropriate, with other required standards and indicators.

Academic Program Review

The university Academic Program Review (APR) responds to the Florida Board of Governor's Regulation [6C-8.015](#) requiring all academic programs at FAU to be reviewed at least every seven years. The College of Education APR was completed in [2016](#). Program reviews ensure that academic programs are administered and delivered effectively, efficiently, and consistent with FAU's mission and the Board of Governors' strategic priorities. The results of program reviews are expected to inform strategic planning, program development, and budgeting decisions at the university level, and, when appropriate, at the state level.

Program review processes in the State University System must emphasize the assessment of student learning outcomes and continuous program improvement. All aspects of a program—undergraduate and graduate education as well as teaching, research, service, and community engagement activities—are covered in the self-study. The APR is conducted in addition to any external accreditation process and should be seen as a complement to existing accreditation procedures. Several principles guide the APR process:

- The review is aimed toward action plans for the future, rather than solely evaluating a unit's current situation
- The review defines a unit's goals and action plans in accordance with the overall mission and strategic plan of the university
- A clear action plan is the outcome of the review process which enables assessments of accomplishments
- The review demonstrates accountability to university stakeholders and should be considered as an additional measure of institutional effectiveness

The APR helps the unit establish its goals and direction and allows the university to make decisions on resource allocation, priorities, and actions which strengthen and improve the unit as well as align its direction with the university's strategic plans. The results of the APR are important for examining how the unit contributes to the university's mission and how it presents itself to external constituents. Thus, the overall aim of the APR is to enable continuous improvement and to support the aspirations of FAU.

The Review Team is made up of internal and external members. The role of the Review Team is to ensure the integrity of the APR, provide feedback to the unit, and provide recommendations for improvement. The Review Team reads the self-study, conducts a site visit, and prepares a final report. The external members and the FAU internal member of the Review Team receive an honorarium, and all travel expenses are covered by the university.

The FAU internal reviewer is a critical member of the site team. This member is responsible for meeting with the external members of the review team and coordinating the written review. It is expected that the internal reviewer will be present at all meetings on campus and will serve as a host to the external reviewers. Academic program review at FAU is composed of the following elements:

- Self-study by the unit
- Consultation on self-study with other FAU representatives (see below)
- Selection of the Review Team
- One- to two-day site visit
- Report by Review Team
- Unit and College response to Review Team recommendations and corresponding implementation agreements ("Action Plan")
- Review by the Office of the Provost
- Presentation of program review to Board of Trustees for their approval
- Mid-cycle progress check by the unit

Annual Program Performance Report

The Annual Program Performance Report (APPR) mandates that program completer data is based on performance metrics specified in Florida Administrative Code (FAC) Rule [6A](#), in accordance with Statutes [1004.04\(4\)\(a\)3](#), [1004.85\(4\)\(b\)](#), and [1012.56\(8\)\(c\)2](#) shall be based on completers employed as instructional personnel in Florida public schools and private* schools, if applicable. This annual report card demonstrates performance metrics on the Florida state-approved teacher preparation programs. The performance metrics must include:

- Placements rates* (Florida Statute 1008.385(2))
- Retention rates
- K-12 student performance on statewide assessments ([Florida Statute 1012.34](#))
- K-12 student performance by subgroups ([Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, 20 U.S.C s. 6311\(b\)\(2\)\(C\)\(v\)\(II\)](#), Florida Statutes 1004.04(4)(a)3.d., 1004.85(4)(b)4., and 1012.56(8)(c)2.c.)
- Results of program completers' annual evaluations ([Florida Statute 1012.34](#))
- Production of completers in teacher shortage areas (bonus only) ([FAC Rule 6A-20.0131](#), [Florida Statute 1012.07](#))

Each APPR shall receive a summative rating score between 1.0 and 4.0 that is the average of all performance target level scores received by a program. If the program is eligible for the bonus performance metric for the production of program completers in a statewide critical teacher shortage area, the summative rating score is weighted and calculated as follows: (1) sum the value of each performance level scores, excluding critical shortage area; (2) multiply this sum by 0.8; (3) divide the sum by the number of performance values calculated - this value is the *Pre-Summative Rating*, excluding the critical teacher shortage performance value (CTSPV); (4) multiply the critical teacher shortage performance level value by 0.8 - this provides the *Critical Teacher Shortage Bonus Value*; (5) add the Pre-Summative Rating and the Critical Teacher Shortage Bonus Value - this yields the *final Summative Rating* for the program. APPR data analytics and APPR trend analyses are reviewed by program faculty, department committees and by leadership committees in the college and are provided on the [College of Education's Reports and Publications website](#). The chart below provides a depiction of the formula and calculation.

Because of the passage of HB 1203 (2022), beginning in 2022-2023 school year, the performance metrics for the APPR have changed to:

- Candidate readiness based on passage rates on educator certification examinations (under s. 1012.56, as applicable)
- Performance of students in prekindergarten through grade 12 who are assigned to in-field program completers on statewide assessments using the results of the student learning growth formula adopted (under s. 1012.34).

- Results of program completers' annual evaluations (in accordance with the timeline as set forth in s. 1012.34).
- Workforce contributions, including placement of program completers in instructional positions in Florida public and private schools
- Results of the program completers' survey measuring their satisfaction with preparation for the realities of the classroom
- Results of the employers' survey measuring satisfaction with the program and the program's responsiveness 154 to local school districts.

Benchmark Check-Points

As described in the Candidate Progression Plan (Figure 2) benchmark check-points monitor candidate progression throughout the program. Along with meeting university policy regarding academic progress, candidate progress is assessed using admission data, performance on course CAs, GPA, required passing test scores, pre-clinical audit, clinical performance data, program completion and follow-up after program completion.

Completer Satisfaction Surveys (CSS)

The college launches an online satisfaction survey to all program completers using the FLDOE completer file data identifying any FAU EPP completer hired in a public school in the state of Florida. The data set arrives at least 18 months after students complete programs, and includes most email addresses of both completers and their employing principals. The annual report of the survey provides trend data analysis for program review.

Competency Assignments (CAs)

The faculty and leadership of the college have collaborated with discipline specialists to identify where specific competency assessments can be used to measure candidate performance. Demonstrating these program outcomes aligns to FLDOE requirements of all EPP candidates, and serves to inform programmatic change. Reports of candidate performance by individual student, program aggregate, by standard or indicator, and by term guide the reflective practices and analyses used to identify gaps, and prioritize the need for revisions to program curricula.

Departmental Dashboard Indicators and Key Performance Indicator Analytics

The [Departmental Dashboard Indicators](#) (DDIs) are data points that provide a framework for assessing the status of academic programs. DDIs give a ready indication of the department's level of performance and are provided on an annual basis on the FAU's DDI website for the [COE](#) and other colleges review. Although the DDIs assist departments and colleges in evaluating their programs, they are only a part of the self-evaluation and improvement process. [Key Performance Indicators \(KPI\)](#) highlight University data such as enrollment, retention, time to graduation, demographics, information about programs available at FAU, among other data. These dashboards promote institutional effectiveness and help the university and college administrators with planning and decision-making. Users have real-time access to operational data that is presented in a meaningful way, empowering management, staff and stakeholders to quickly understand and monitor strategic goals. Colleges respond to KPI metrics each term, and state performance funding is linked to these metrics. KPI metrics are kept on an internal dashboard for review.

Diversity Data Report

First drafted in 2006, the [Diversity Data Report](#) is a biannual report presented to the College of Education as a resource. The report summarizes diversity data with filters including university, college and departmental data, State University System data, teacher workforce data, FAU and K-12 student data, and US Census Bureau data. The report trends reflect the changing South Florida culture, and add breadth to the work of the Diversity Committee of the college. Live links offer faculty and grant writing teams easy access to diversity database resources.

eIPEP Standards Details Summary Reports

The electronic Individual Program Evaluation Plan (eIPEP) reports are required annually of all initial certification programs in the college. The FLDOE monitors the submission portal to ensure it responds to changes in state statute and rule. The reports require program matrices aligned to required state standards, evidence of other state required plans, summaries in response to APPR scores, and overall program evaluation. Any program changes must be noted in the eIPEP system each fall.

Employer Satisfaction Surveys (ESS)

The FLDOE required the ESS until 2014, when a survey was generated by the state. The college has continued to launch the employer satisfaction survey using the FLDOE completer file data identifying any FAU EPP completer hired in a public school in the state of Florida. The data set arrives at least 18 months after students complete programs, and includes most email addresses of both completers and their employing principals. The annual report of the survey provides trend data analysis for program review.

FELE Exams

Designed for Principal Leaders, the Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) is required of all School Leader candidates. The exam is aligned to FELE standards, and consists of three subtest areas. FAC Rules [6A-5.080](#) and [6A-4.00821](#) outlines that the standards “serve as Florida’s core expectations for effective school administrators and are based on contemporary research on multi-dimensional school leadership. They represent skill sets and knowledge bases needed in effective schools. The Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) is aligned to these standards and allows candidates seeking certification in Educational Leadership to demonstrate mastery of the requisite competencies and skills.”

FTCE Exams

The Florida Teacher Certification Exams (FTCE) are required by the state of Florida under FAC Rule [6A-4.0021](#), and include language that “the written examinations shall include subtests of English language skills, reading, writing, mathematics, professional skills, and subject area specialty”. The first portion of the FTCE cycle includes the General Knowledge (GK) exam. Four subtests comprise the GK exam including English language skills, Reading, Mathematics and an essay portion. The GK is required for admission to the College of Education, along with a 2.5 GPA and 60 hours completed. The second portion of the FTCE exams includes the Professional Education (PEd) exam, and Subject Area Exams (SAE). The requirements for SAE vary by degree and degree level. FTCE exams are aligned to FEAP standards, and those programs listed in Figure 4 would be required to pass FTCE.

Inter-rater reliability rubric summaries

Using Livetext by Watermark analytics, inter-rater reliability rubric summaries are available for departmental faculty round table review, where the reliability of CA rubrics can be explored. The combined assessment evaluation of CAs by faculty and adjunct faculty in the college makes evaluation essential to the assessment practices of the college.

New Teacher Satisfaction Surveys (NTSS)

The college launches an online satisfaction survey to all program completers using the FLDOE completer file data identifying any FAU EPP completer hired in a public school in the state of Florida. The data set arrives at least 18 months after students complete programs, and includes most email addresses of both completers and their employing principals. The annual report of the survey provides trend data analysis for program review.

Student Perception of Teaching (SPOT) Evaluations

Serving as the end of course evaluations, the [SPOT](#) report analysis provides individual faculty and department chairs specific data regarding course rigor, and student perceived learning. The college Aggregate SPOT Data Report presents data as overall college, then by online courses, undergraduate courses, graduate courses, and by each department.

Uniform Core Curricula (HB 1203, 2022)

(gg) “Uniform Core Curricula” means all state-approved teacher preparation programs must provide evidence of candidates completing training noted in corresponding Sections 1004.04(2) [ITP], 1004.85(3) [EPI], and 1012.56 (8) [PDCP], F.S., in addition to:

1. Scientifically researched and evidence-based reading instructional strategies... Instructional strategies for foundational skills may not employ the three-cueing system model of reading or visual memory as a basis for teaching word reading.
2. Strategies appropriate for the instruction of English language learners... ITP Candidates, shall have completed a college or university level 3-credit hour overview or survey course which addresses at an awareness level the areas specified in Rule 6A-4.02451, F.A.C., Performance Standards, Skills, and Competencies for the Endorsement in English for Speakers of Other Languages.

Student Learning Outcomes

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) measures, at the aspirational level, exist to inform student progress and guide our students through the metacognitive process of learning. As our EPP students engage in both pedagogy and andragogy simultaneously, measures of content, skills and dispositions serve as a model for best practice in their future classroom careers. While many of our standards are prescribed, the faculty own some specific indicator language, depth and breadth of assessment practices and the ability to continuously improve assessment practices. Outside of the EPP Initial and Advanced Certification programs, the college assessments align to the Florida Board of Governor, [Regulation 8.016](#), Academic Learning Compact (ALC); 3C’s; and rubric language is derived from the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) [Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education \(VALUE\) Rubrics](#). Some additional measures respond to direct discipline-specific programs, or other accreditation requirements. Figure 4 describes individual College of Education programs, and the SLO standards measured.

The SLOs are assessed within program courses with identified competency assessments labeled as competency assignments (CA). Faculty and adjunct faculty, as curriculum discipline experts, design the assignments to capture student performance indicators aligned to each standard. Rubric design is also the work of faculty experts, resulting in an infrastructure that supports the alignment of standards to learning objectives and the assessed student performance. CAs are altered by department faculty, and continuous improvement related to assignment specifics and rubric measures are part of program review within departments. The data cadence schedule shares the scope of the SLO data as a source of quality assurance.

Figure 4: SLO Standards, by Program

Program	Level	Standards				
		FEAP	FPLS	ALC 3C	ASHA/ CAA	CACREP
Adult and Community Educational Leadership	M,S,PhD			x		
Counselor Education	M, S,PhD			x		x
Curriculum and Instruction	M,S,PhD			x		
Early Care and Education	B			x		
Educational Leadership Higher Education	M,PhD			x		
Educational Leadership School Leaders	M,S,PhD		x	x		
Educational Psychology	M			x		
Elem Education/ESOL/Reading	B	x		x		
Elementary Education	M			x		
Environmental Education	M			x		
Exceptional Student Education	M, PHd			x		
Exceptional Student Education/ESOL	B	x		x		
Instructional Technology	M			x		
Reading Education	M	x		x		
School Counselors	M,S	x		x		x
Secondary Education	B,M	x		x		
Speech Pathology and Audiology	M			x	x	

Common to SLO measures, rubric scoring provides feedback to students and serves as the basis for SLO (3C's) performance outcome measures. Following a unit review exploring the actionability of SLO data, the Assessment Committee decided to research rubric scoring models for possible revision. For over two years the committee reviewed rubric formats shared at conferences, university websites and other sources, and approved the addition of rubric level and label revisions. The new rubric format was then shared with each department for final approval, and the format was applied to all rubrics in the college over the 2018-19 academic years. The advantage of an added rubric level includes an opportunity for faculty to assist students as they develop skills in the program courses, and adds a more discreet level of aggregate data analysis. An example of the rubric scoring format is presented in Figure 5.

In 2006 the College of Education contracted with Livetext to implement an assessment tool into all initial and advanced certification programs. By 2007, the college launched the collection of student performance data, with evidences, to include all programs in the college. The ability to analyze data as disaggregate and aggregate filters proved essential to the assessment plan of the college.

Figure 5: Rubric Template

	Exemplary (3 pts)	Satisfactory (2 pts)	Emerging (1 pt)	Unsatisfactory (0 pt)	No Attempt (0 pt)
Standard Element 1					Failed to submit, or failed to submit on time

Source: College of Education Assessment Tool Livetext, 2019

Note: Figure 5 represents the unfilled rubric template; on actual rubrics, each criterion would have a clear description for each performance level

Assessment Review Framework

As identified in Figures 1 and 2, the college relies on three levels of assessment and evaluation to inform decisions regarding current practice and future planning. Our partnerships with a wide array of community stakeholders affords the college the luxury of a review process that responds directly to the needs of our large service area in South Florida. Faculty, adjunct faculty, department chairs, assessment specialists, advisory councils, stakeholders and leadership teams review multiple sets of data on a specific calendar (see Appendix B). Discussions among departments and faculty committees are documented and filtered to appropriate leadership for possible drafting of action plans. The feedback loop represented in Figure 2 where no changes were recommended implies that some ideas are not yet ready for implementation, or may need further discussion with additional stakeholders prior to moving forward. The SLO assessment data review is unique in that the data may inform individual student issues, or may indicate a need for course revision or CA assignment review. Shifts in state policy often require a redirection of priorities and momentum for assessment reviewers; our focus remains centered on actionable data and clearly aligned assessment practices.

The Assessment Committee

The Assessment Committee of the College of Education oversees the data collection and reporting process employed by all units to establish an assessment process of informed, capable, ethical and reflective data-informed decision making intended to improve the college's programs, systems and procedures. The committee is one of two standing committees of the college, and is composed of one member from each of the academic departments in the college, with representation from other departments as personnel resources allow. The Director of Assessment shall serve as the Chair and ex-officio member of the committee. Additional ex-officio members shall include the Assistant Dean of Accreditation and Assessment, the Office for Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics staff, and the designated faculty Chair with accreditation and program approval oversight .

The members of the committee act as liaisons with their department to ensure that a feedback loop, including the professional community of schools districts, universities, clinical experts and other stakeholders is formalized on department and committee meeting agendas, and incorporated into departmental work. The committee is charged with recommending policies intended to ensure the ongoing effectiveness of the college-wide quality assurance assessment system.

The Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics

Beginning in 2005 a dedicated director of assessment was assigned to the college Dean's Office. Serving all college academic departments, faculty and students, the need for an increase in personnel able to conduct the wide range of assessment activities mandated by university and state entities resulted in the creation of a staffed office. Moving from a model of compliance seen prior to the 2007 NCATE accreditation visit, the Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics (OA³) works to proactively attend to the specific needs of all college stakeholders. The responsibilities of OA³ include the database management of the College of Education Selected Improvement Plan (COESIP), LiveText by Watermark (LiveText), the eIPEP Candidate and Completer Report file submission, verification of employment, Title II reporting, and FLDOE annual standards details updates. State and national reporting are also generated from the office, as are all assessment plans, academic learning compacts and university assessment requirements. Requests for data reports, both from internal college databases and external sources are requested through the office. The OA³ represents the college on the University Team for Assurance of Student Learning (TASL), the university assessment committee. The office coordinates APR reviews and publishes reports to serve the needs of the college.

Assessment Data Review

Appendix B outlines the data cadence of the college including data sets used, reports generated, the month/term of the review, the person(s) responsible for the data plan, and the action resulting from the review of data/reports. Following analysis and approval by department faculty, curriculum changes require approval of the [University Undergraduate Programs Committee \(UUPC\)](#) or the [University Graduate Programs Committee \(GPC\)](#) at the university level.

Assessment Governance

Guided by the Dean's Office, the college supports many internal committees charged with the review, analysis and action of assessment data and reports. In response to the [Florida Board of Governors \(FLBOG\)](#), each unit within the university evaluates data and projects trends aligned to metric funding. The Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) manages the [electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan \(eIPEP\) portal](#) for the submission of the Candidate and Completer Report (CCR) performance data that is part of the Title II of the Higher Education Act (Title II - HEA), [sections 205 - 208](#), documentation required of all initial certification EPPs. The CCD data circles back to the college as data to be verified prior to being used as [VAM \(Value Added Measure\) baseline data](#). VAM data is reviewed, as both annual and trend data reports by departmental program faculty.

The [university Board of Trustees \(BOT\)](#) serve within the governance of the assessment system as those charged with the alignment of all college practices to FAU strategic planning. The FAU BOT provides feedback for APR plans, and supports university accreditation initiatives. The Provost's Strategic Workgroup for Ascending to the Top (SWAT) addresses student

success measures and provides a governance framework for the college as we work to admit, retain and graduate students. Our reliance on university data includes two groups essential to the assessment governance of the college; the Office of Information Technology, and the office for Institutional Effectiveness and Analysis. Both are stakeholders in the constant need for linked systems and data portal access.

The College of Education Advisory Board reviews data and reports essential to the continued success of the college. As a conduit to many informal stakeholder groups, the Advisory Board provides essential guidance and feedback to the college. The Executive Committee represents the Dean's Office support team, and serves as the team directly responsible for collective college decision making. Each member is charged with sharing information with their respective departments, and feedback to the Executive Committee is expected. Current College of Education Committees include:

[Assessment Systems \(standing committee\)](#)

[Dissertation Awards](#)

[Diversity \(standing committee\)](#)

[Emergency / COOP](#)

[Executive](#)

[Faculty Assembly Steering](#)

[Graduate Programs](#)

[Henderson School](#)

[International Committee](#)

[Kappa Delta Pi](#)

[Library](#)

[Pine Jog Board of Directors](#)

[Promotion & Tenure](#)

[Research Committee](#)

[Scholarship \(COE Advisory Board\)](#)

[Scholarship \(Departmental\)](#)

[Secondary Teacher Education Coordination](#)

[Student Achievement Council](#)

[Traditions - Incorporation Board](#)

[Undergraduate Programs](#)

[COE Representatives to University Committees](#)

Appendix A: Data Terms Dictionary

Accreditation

Accreditation is a process of quality assurance validation in which educational institutions of higher learning are evaluated. The standards for accreditation are set by a peer review board and the evaluation is done by voluntary peer reviewers.

Actionable

Sufficiently detailed and relevant to directly indicate or clearly suggest a course of action. Information is actionable if it supplies the who, what, when, where, and why that allows one to determine how to change current practice(s) to achieve the intended goal.

Aggregate

Aggregate data are data combined from several measurements, providing summary statistics.

Andragogy

The methods and principles used in adult education (Knowles, 1984). Adult students may need to focus more on the process and less on the content being taught. Case studies, role-playing, simulated experiences, clinical experiences and reflective practice are most useful.

Assessment

The term **assessment** refers to the wide variety of methods or tools that educators use to evaluate, measure, and document the academic readiness, learning progress, skill acquisition, or educational needs of students. An ongoing, iterative process consisting of four basic steps: (1) defining learning outcomes; (2) choosing a method or approach and then using it to gather evidence of learning; (3) analyzing and interpreting the evidence; and (4) using this information to improve student learning (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Authentic Assessment

An authentic assignment is one that requires application of what students have learned to a new situation, and that demands judgment to determine what information and skills are relevant and how they should be used. They are considered by some educators to be more accurate and meaningful evaluations of learning achievement than traditional tests.

CAEP Advanced Program

Advanced-level programs are defined by CAEP as educator preparation programs at the post-baccalaureate or graduate levels leading to licensure, certification, or endorsement. Advanced-level programs are designed to develop P-12 teachers who have already completed an initial preparation program, currently licensed administrators, other certificated (or similar state language) school professionals for employment in P-12 schools/districts.

CAEP Initial Program

Initial Programs are defined by CAEP as programs at the baccalaureate or post baccalaureate levels leading to initial licensure, certification, or endorsement that are designed to develop P-12 teachers.

Candidate

A student formally admitted to the EPP program. An individual engaged in the preparation process for professional educator licensure/certification/endorsement with an educator preparation provider (EPP).

Certification

The process by which a governmental agency or nongovernmental organization grants professional recognition to an individual who meets specified qualifications/requirements.

Clinical Experiences

Guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments across a variety of settings. These include, but are not limited to, culminating clinical practices such as student teaching or internship.

Completer

Any candidate who exited a preparation program by successfully satisfying the requirements of the educator preparation provider.

Content

The central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of a discipline.

Continuous Improvement

A process of gathering information about all aspects of preparation activities and experiences, analyzing that information (looking for patterns, trends, making comparisons with peers), identifying what works and what seems to be troubled, making adjustments, and repeating the cycle.

Criterion

A characteristic mark or trait on the basis of which a judgment may be made

Data

Information with a user and a use that may include individual facts, statistics, or items of information. For CAEP purposes, data include results of assessment or information from statistical or numerical descriptions of phenomena, status, achievement, or trends.

Disaggregate

A process of breaking out aggregated data according to specific criteria in order to reveal patterns, trends and other information. Data such as retention and graduation rates are commonly disaggregated according to demographic characteristics such as race/ethnicity and gender. Data from assessment of candidate learning can be disaggregated to derive information about the needs of different subgroups and ways to improve their performance (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary)

Diversity

Individual differences (e.g., personality, interests, learning modalities, and life experiences), and (2) group differences (e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, nationality, language, religion, political affiliation, and socio-economic background).

Educator Preparation Provider Unit

The EPP is a team governance structure within the College of Education at FAU that has primary responsibility and authority in preparing teachers and other professional personnel for P-12 schools. One of the major responsibilities is to ensure that degree and licensure programs offered through the unit adhere to the unit's overall mission and fully comply with state FLDOE and institutional expectations, state licensure standards, and national professional standards.

Field Experience

Teacher candidates' work in authentic educational settings and engagement in the pedagogical work of the profession of teaching, closely integrated with educator preparation course work and supported by a formal school-university partnership. Clinical practice is a specific form of what is traditionally known as field work. (AACTE "Lexicon of Practice," 2017)

Formative Assessment

Formative assessment is a process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students' achievement of intended instructional outcomes (Popham, 2008)

Full-Time Equivalent (Students)

FTE is a measurement equal to one student enrolled **full time** for one academic year. In the United States, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) has the authoritative definition of FTE students. IPEDS is a system of interrelated surveys conducted annually by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), a part of the Institute for Education Sciences within the United States Department of Education. "The full-time equivalent (FTE) of students is a single value providing a meaningful combination of full-time and part-time students. IPEDS data products currently have two calculations of FTE students, one using fall student headcounts and the other using 12-month instructional activity" (National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Calculations are explained when searching the term: "FTE" within the IPED glossary: <https://surveys.nces.ed.gov/ipeds/public/glossary>

Full-Time Students

At the undergraduate level, students are enrolled in a minimum of 12 semester credit hours. Graduate level students are enrolled in a minimum of 9 semester credit hours. Students enrolled in a thesis, dissertation preparation, or doctoral degree that is defined as full-time by the institution.

Instrument

The assessment instrument includes the form, test, survey, rubric, focus group that is used to collect data.

Internship

The culminating clinical practice experience in some settings; can be of varying duration but no less than one university semester. During the clinical internship teacher candidates assume full responsibility for a pedagogical assignment under the coaching of school- and university based teacher educators. (AACTE "Lexicon of Practice," 2017)

Note: In CAEP practice, which includes providers that are not located in either colleges or universities, there may be wider variation in the clinical internship duration and when it occurs. Some college departments have multiple clinical experiences or are entirely clinically based, while others may have less than a "semester" duration.

Inter-rater reliability

Inter-rater reliability is a measure of consistency used to assess the degree to which different judges (or raters) agree in their evaluation (or scoring) decisions of the same phenomenon. Inter-rater reliability is useful because human observers will not necessarily interpret concepts, performances or scoring categories the same way. If various raters do not agree, the effects can be detrimental and suggest either that the scale is defective or that the raters need to be re-trained. Inter-rater reliability is high when reviewers demonstrate that they consistently reach the same or very similar decisions. A formal training and calibration procedure is usually needed to achieve this result, and the calibration involves calculating reliability coefficients.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge

A core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks...deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities.

Performance Assessment

These assessments typically require students to complete a complex task, such as a writing assignment, science experiment, speech, presentation, performance, or long-term project, for example. Educators will often use collaboratively developed common assessments, scoring guides, rubrics, and other methods to evaluate whether the work produced by students shows that they have learned what they were expected to learn. Performance assessments may also be called "authentic assessments," since they are considered by some educators to be more accurate and meaningful evaluations of learning achievement than traditional tests.

Practicum Experience

Guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstrations of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in field-based assignments, tasks, activities, and assessments across a variety of settings. These include, but are not limited to, culminating clinical practices such as student teaching or internship.

Professional Dispositions

The habits of professional action and moral commitments that underlie an educator's performance (InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards, p. 6).

Professional Knowledge

A core part of content knowledge for teaching that includes: core activities of teaching, such as figuring out what students know; choosing and managing representations of ideas; appraising, selecting and modifying textbooks...deciding among alternative courses of action and analyzing the subject matter knowledge and insight entailed in these activities.

Professional Skills

An educator's abilities or expertise to impart the specialized knowledge/content of their subject area(s).

Proprietary Assessments

A descriptor for assessments used as a source of evidence for CAEP standards that are created and/or administered by states, research organizations, or commercial test organizations. Typically information about the design of the assessments, and their validation, scoring, and other attributes, is available from sponsors online or in response to requests from EPPs or states. CAEP distinguishes proprietary assessments from EPP-created assessments in which the EPP takes responsibility for design, administration and validation.

Qualitative

Assessments or analyses that can be reported narratively and numerically to provide in-depth study of an individual, classroom, or school. Qualitative assessments include, but are not limited to, in-depth interviews, focus groups, observations, case studies, and ethnographic studies.

Quality Assurance

Mechanisms (i.e., structures, policies, procedures, and resources) that an educator preparation provider (EPP) has established to promote, monitor, evaluate, and enhance operational effectiveness and the quality of the educator preparation provider's candidates, educators, curriculum, and other program requirements. Continuous improvement and accountability are dependent on the capabilities of the Quality Assurance System.

Quantitative

Assessments or data that can be reported numerically and sometimes generalized to a larger population. Common quantitative measures could include online, phone or paper surveys (if they are structured as quantitative measures); observation and other evaluative forms; and tests. They also include EPP status measures such as completion rates, incidents of support for candidates at risk.

Relevance

A principle of evidence quality that implies validity but goes beyond it by also calling for clear explanation of what any information put forward is supposed to be evidence of and why it was chosen. This principle also implies that there is a clear and explicable link between what a particular measure is established to gauge and the substantive content of the Standard under which it is listed.

Reliability

The degree to which the result of a measurement, assessment calculation or specification can be depended on over repeated applications. A metric is said to have a high reliability when it produces consistent results under consistent conditions

Representative

The extent to which a measure or result is typical of an underlying situation or condition, not an isolated case. If statistics are presented based on a sample, evidence of the extent to which the sample is representative of the overall population ought to be provided, such as the relative characteristics of the sample and the parent population. If the evidence presented is qualitative—for example, case studies or narratives, multiple instances should be given or additional data shown to indicate the typicality of the chosen examples.

Rigor

In education, refers both to a challenging curriculum and to the consistency or stringency with which high standards for learning and performance are upheld (adapted from the Western Association of Schools and Colleges glossary).

Rubric Scoring Guide

A tool for scoring performances (e.g., samples of a candidate's work, or evaluation of evidence submitted to meet a standard), typically in the form of a table or matrix, with criteria that describe the dimensions of the outcomes down the left-hand vertical axis, and levels of performance across the horizontal axis. Rubrics are also used for communicating expectations

Stakeholder

Partners, organizations, businesses, community groups, agencies, schools, districts, and/or educator preparation providers (EPPs) interested in candidate preparation or education.

Standard Indicators

Specific learning goal objectives aligned to a particular standard, indicators reflect a measurable piece of an overall standard.

Standards

Normative statements about educator preparation providers (EPPs) and educator candidate practices, performances, and outcomes that are the basis for an accreditation review. Standards are written in broad terms with components that further explicate their meaning.

Student Teaching

The capstone, culminating clinical internship experience where the candidate assumes full responsibility for a pedagogical assignment, including delivery and assessment of the K-12 learners. Under the coaching of school- and university based teacher educators, the candidate performs the duties of an educator.

Summative Assessment

The goal of summative assessment is to evaluate student learning at the end of an instructional unit by comparing it against some standard or benchmark.

Triangulation

A technique that reinforces conclusions based on data from multiple sources, permitting complementary and/or contrasting perspectives that can deepen the interpretation of the data.

Validity

The extent to which a set of operations, test, or other assessment measures what it is supposed to measure. Validity is not a property of a data set but refers to the appropriateness of inferences from test scores or other forms of assessment and the credibility of the interpretations that are made concerning the findings of a measurement effort.

VAM

Value Added Measures are P-12 student assessment results linked with teachers who completed preparation in an EPP program. They provide evidence of P-12 students' educational outcomes as measured by standardized tests and other assessments. For CAEP purposes, VAM should demonstrate the change over time of educational outcomes, as intended by the administering state or local school district, which may provide valuable information about effective teacher preparation.

Appendix B: Data Cadence

College of Education Data Cadence					
Data Set	Report	Review Month	Academic Term	Owner	Action
Academic Learning Compact (ALC) Data	FAU Assessment System	August / September meeting; October update	Annual	Departments	Upload student performance results, respond to program changes
Admission, Benchmark and Completion data (Initial Certification Programs)	Candidate and Completer Data (CCD), previously known as Teacher Education Information file (TEI)	October	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Submit CCD to FL Department of Education; Information used to complete CAEP, DOE, US News and other reports
Aggregate student performance data, by standard	Livertext Student performance Reports	January, May, August; Summer Annual Summary	Each term; Annual	Departments and Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Review data for program evaluation, eIPEP response
Aggregate university, Pearson, college and departmental databases	CAEP Selected Improvement Plan (SIP)	ongoing	ongoing	Faculty and Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Review data for multiple requests, reports, grant submissions
Critical shortage, program evaluation data	Title II Contextual Data Report	April	Annual	Departments and Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Respond to FL Department of Education Title II items
Diversity Data	Diversity Data Report	February	Bi-Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Share with Faculty, post online for public use
Drop, Fail, Withdrew (DFW) Data	DFW Summaries	February, July, October	End of each term	Dean's Office	Student Success Strategies
Enrollment, completion, ethnicity data	USNews	December	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Submit to USNews portal
Faculty CV records	Faculty Credentialing Lists	Ongoing	Ongoing	Dean's Office	Update database, CAEP site
Faculty publishing data	Departmental Dashboard Indicator Research & Service Survey	May	Annual	Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Analysis	Inform USNews, AIMS and other reports

FL DOE Initial Certification Completer data	Annual Program Performance Report (APPR)	May	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Share with departments, faculty and publish trend reports publicly
Online Enrollment, completion, ethnicity data	USNews Online EDU	September/October	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Submit to USNews portal
Out-of-state and private schools employment verification	Verification of Employment Forms	November	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Support the collection of employment verification forms from departments for the DOE
PD/training data, record of requests	Quality Assurance Assessment Systems Guide	July	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Draft needs-based PDs
Pearson shared files, queried files, requested score data	Pearson Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE)	ongoing	ongoing	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Share reports with departments and grant-funded projects
Pearson shared files, queried files, requested score data	Pearson Florida Teacher Certification Examination (FTCE)	ongoing	ongoing	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Share reports with departments and grant-funded projects
Program change data, Areas for Improvement (AFI) responses	CAEP AIMS Annual Report	April	Annual	Departments and Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Draft changes and projections
Program flight plans and university enrollment data	Scheduling Flight Plan Reports	ongoing	end of each month	Dean's Office (Office of Academic and Student Services)	Review and alter schedule, by campus, where indicated
Student performance data	Livertext Error Report	January, May, August	Each term	Departments	Review data for program evaluation, faculty coaching
Student performance data, program matrices, program improvement narrative	Electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan (eIPEP)	November	Annual	Departments	Review data for specific eIPEP narratives, projections and program updates

Survey data (Qualtrics)	Dean 360 Evaluation Survey	Spring	Third year cycle	Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Analysis	Support launch of survey for Provost's Office review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Dean Evaluation Survey	Spring	Annual	Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Analysis	Support launch of survey for Provost's Office review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Department Chair 360 Evaluation Survey	Fall/Spring	Third year cycle	Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Analysis	Support launch of survey for Provost's Office review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Department Chair 360 Survey	Fall	3 years	Dean's Office	Support launch of survey for Dean's review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Completer Satisfaction Survey (CSS) for AP programs	April	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Distribute survey and create report for analysis and program review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Employer Satisfaction Survey (ESS) for ITP and AP programs	April	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Distribute survey and create report for analysis and program review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	New Teacher Satisfaction Survey (NTSS) for ITP programs	April	Annual	Office of Accreditation, Assessment and Analytics	Distribute survey and create report for analysis and program review
Survey data (Qualtrics)	Technology Survey for ITP programs	ongoing	ongoing	Instructional Technology within CCEI + TCHR	Report for analysis and program review
University enrollment data	FTE/Enrollment Reports	ongoing	ongoing	Dean's Office (Office of Academic and Student Services)	Retention and student success intervention
University metric data	Key Performance Indicator (KPI) data	ongoing	ongoing	Dean's Office	Create reports for college KPI presentations
University metric data and departmental plans	Academic Program Review (APR)	Fall	7 year cycle	Dean's Office	Develop reports and action plans for college initiatives, by department and by college overall

Appendix C: Standards Matrices

Undergraduate Initial Certification Programs Crosswalk

This matrix serves as a crosswalk overlapping the InTASC 2013 standards with FEAP 2023 standards and Marzano Focused elements.

FEAP A. Quality of Instruction		
FEAP 1. Instructional Design and Lesson Planning	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s)	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
b. Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s)	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
c. Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
d. Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning;	Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment
e. Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons; and	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
f. Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

g. Provides classroom instruction to students in prekindergarten through grade 12 that is age and developmentally appropriate and aligned to the state academic standards as outlined in Rule 6A-1.09401, F.A.C.	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
FEAP 2. The Learning Environment	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention;	Establishing and Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures Using Engagement Strategies	The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments
b. Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system;	Establishing and Acknowledging Adherence to Rules and Procedures	The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments
c. Conveys high expectations to all students;	Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments
d. Respects students' cultural linguistic and family background;	Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments
e. Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills;	Providing Feedback and Celebrating Progress Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
f. Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness, and support;	Providing Feedback and Celebrating Progress Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments
g. Integrates current information and communication technologies;	Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Promoting Teacher Leadership and	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and

	Collaboration	Collaboration
h. Adapts the learning environment to accommodate differing needs and diversity of students; and	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Organizes Students to Interact with Content	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
i. Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational goals.	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
j. Creates a classroom environment where students are able to demonstrate resiliency as outlined in Rule 6A-1.094124, F.A.C.	Providing Feedback and Celebrating Progress Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	Planning Standard(s)- based Lessons/ Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Communicating High Expectations for Each Student to Close the Achievement Gap Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships in a Student-Centered Classroom Communicating High Expectations for Each Student to Close the Achievement Gap Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy
FEAP 3. Instructional Delivery and Facilitation	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Deliver engaging and challenging lessons;	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content Helping Students Practice Skills, Strategies and Processes Helping Students Revise Knowledge Using Engagement Strategies Organizes Students to Interact with Content	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

b. Deepen and enrich students' understanding through content area literacy strategies, verbalization of thought, and application of subject matter;	Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content Helping Students Practice Skills, Strategies and Processes Helping Students Revise Knowledge	Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies
c. Identify gaps in students' subject matter knowledge;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Identifying Critical Content from the Standards Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
d. Modify instruction to respond to preconceptions or misconceptions;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Previewing New Content Reviewing Content	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
e. Relate and integrate the subject matter with other disciplines and life experiences;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
f. Employ higher-order questioning techniques;	Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on Content	Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies
g. Apply varied instructional strategies and resources, including appropriate technology, to provide comprehensible instruction, and to teach for student understanding;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Identifying Critical Content from the Standard(s)	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
h. Differentiate instruction based on an assessment of student learning needs and recognition of individual differences in students;	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Identifying Critical Content Using Questions to Help Students Elaborate on the Content	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Instructional Practice: Standard 8 Instructional Strategies; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
i. Support, encourage, and provide immediate and specific feedback to students to promote student achievement; and	Providing Feedback and Celebrating Progress Establishing and Maintaining Effective Relationships Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments;

j. Utilize student feedback to monitor instructional needs and to adjust instruction.	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
FEAP 4. Assessment	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Analyzes and applies data from multiple assessments and measures to diagnose students' learning needs, informs instruction based on those needs, and drives the learning process;	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress Communicating High Expectations for Each Student	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
b. Designs and aligns formative and summative assessments that match learning objectives and lead to mastery;	Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
c. Uses a variety of assessment tools to monitor student progress, achievement and learning gains;	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
d. Modifies assessments and testing conditions to accommodate learning styles and varying levels of knowledge;	Planning Standards-Based Lessons/Units Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Planning to Close the Achievement Gap	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
e. Shares the importance and outcomes of student assessment data with the student and the student's parents/caregiver(s); and	Planning to Close the Achievement Gap Providing Feedback and Celebrating Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; The Learner & Learning: Standard 2 Learning Differences; The Learner & Learning: Standard 3 Learning Environments; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
f. Applies technology to organize and integrate assessment information.	Aligning Resources to Standard(s) Using Formative Assessment to Track Progress	The Learner & Learning: Standard 1 Learner Development; Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge Content: Standard 5 Application of Content; Instructional Practice: Standard 6 Assessment; Instructional Practice: Standard 7 Planning for Instruction; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

FEAP B. Continuous Improvement, Responsibility and Ethics		
FEAP 1. Continuous Professional Improvement	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Designs purposeful and professional goals to strengthen the effectiveness of instruction based on students' needs;	Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
b. Examines and uses data-informed research to improve instruction and student achievement;	Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
c. Uses a variety of data, independently, and in collaboration with colleagues, to evaluate learning outcomes, adjust planning and continuously improve the effectiveness of the lessons;	Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
d. Collaborates with the home, school and larger communities to foster communication and to support student learning and continuous improvement;	Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
e. Engages in targeted professional growth opportunities and reflective practices; and	Maintaining Expertise in Content and Pedagogy Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
f. Implements knowledge and skills learned in professional development in the teaching and learning process.	Promoting Teacher Leadership and Collaboration	Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
FEAP 2. Professional Responsibility and Ethical Conduct	Marzano Elements	InTASC
a. Guidelines for student welfare adopted pursuant to Section 1001.42(8), F.S., including the requirement to refrain from discouraging or prohibiting parental notification of and involvement in critical decisions affecting a student's mental, emotional, or physical health or well-being, unless a reasonably prudent person would believe that disclosure would result in	Adhering to School and District Policies and Procedures	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

abuse, abandonment, or neglect as defined in Section 39.01, F.S.;		
b. The rights of students and parents enumerated in Sections 1002.20 and 1014.04, F.S.; and	Adhering to School and District Policies and Procedures	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration
c. The Principles of Professional Conduct of the Education Profession of Florida, pursuant to Rule 6A-10.081, F.A.C.	Adhering to School and District Policies and Procedures	Content: Standard 4 Content Knowledge; Professional Responsibility: Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; Professional Responsibility: Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

Source: Learning Sciences International

Advanced Program Example: School Leaders

<i>Florida Principal Leadership Standards (FPLS)</i>	<i>Florida Educational Leadership Examination (FELE) Competencies</i>	<i>Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (PSELS)</i>
1.1.a The school's learning goals are based on the state's adopted student academic standards and the district's adopted curricula;	1.1.1 Analyze and determine appropriate school learning goals using State Board of Education adopted educational standards and district adopted curriculum. 3.2.2 Identify appropriate roles, responsibilities, and practices that assure effective discipline and promote a safe learning environment.	4.a Implement coherent systems of curriculum, instruction, and assessment that promote the mission, vision, and core values of the school, embody high expectations for student learning, align with academic standards, and are culturally responsive.
1.1.b Student learning results are evidenced by the student performance and growth on statewide assessments; district-determined assessments that are implemented by the district under section 1008.22, F.S.; international assessments; and other indicators of student success adopted by the district and state.	1.1.2 Identify and analyze areas of greatest need for improvement based on state accountability measures. 1.1.3 Evaluate student learning results based on student performance and growth on assessments.	4.g Use assessment data appropriately and within technical limitations to monitor student progress and improve instruction. 4.f Employ valid assessments that are consistent with knowledge of child learning and development and technical standards of measurement.
1.2.a Enables faculty and staff to work as a system focused on student learning;	1.2.1 Identify and select appropriate strategies that assure faculty and staff will work as a learning organization focused on continuous improvement of student learning. 1.1.2 Identify and analyze areas of greatest need for improvement based on state accountability measures.	7.b Empower and entrust teachers and staff with collective responsibility for meeting the academic, social, emotional, and physical needs of each student, pursuant to the mission, vision, and core values of the school. 7.d Promote mutual accountability among teachers and other professional staff for each student's success and the effectiveness of the school as a whole. 7.h Encourage faculty-initiated improvement of programs and practices. 7.c Establish and sustain a professional culture of engagement and commitment to shared vision, goals, and objectives pertaining to the education of the whole child; high expectations for professional work; ethical and equitable practice; trust and open communication; collaboration, collective efficacy, and continuous individual and organizational learning and improvement. 7.f Design and implement job-embedded and other opportunities for professional learning collaboratively with faculty and staff

Source: ELRM School Leaders ePEP database

Advanced Program Example: School Leaders Crosswalk

Standards * FPLS	InTASC	3Cs
Domain 1: Student Achievement		
1. Student Learning Results: Effective school leaders achieve results on the school's student learning goals.	x	
2. Student Learning as a Priority: Effective school leaders demonstrate that student learning is their top priority through leadership actions that build and support a learning organization focused on student success.	x	
Domain 2: Instructional Leadership		
3. Instructional Plan Implementation: Effective school leaders work collaboratively to develop and implement an instructional framework that aligns curriculum and state standards, effective instructional practices, student learning needs and assessments.	x	Content Knowledge
4. Faculty Development: Effective school leaders recruit, retain and develop an effective and diverse faculty and staff.	x	
5. Learning Environment: Effective school leaders structure and monitor a school learning environment that improves learning for all of Florida's diverse student population.	x	
Domain 3: Organizational Leadership		
6. Decision Making: Effective school leaders employ and monitor a decision-making process that is based on vision, mission and improvement priorities using facts and data.	x	Critical Thinking
7. Leadership Development: Effective school leaders actively cultivate, support, and develop other leaders within the organization.	x	
8. School Management: Effective school leaders manage the organization, operations, and facilities in ways that maximize the use of resources to promote a safe, efficient, legal, and effective learning environment.	x	
9. Communication: Effective school leaders practice two-way communications and use appropriate oral, written, and electronic communication and collaboration skills to accomplish school and system goals by building and maintaining relationships with students, faculty, parents, and community.	x	Communication
Domain 4: Professional and Ethical Behavior		
10. Professional and Ethical Behaviors: Effective school leaders demonstrate personal and professional behaviors consistent with quality practices in education and as a community leader.	x	Communication

Appendix D: Course Matrix Example

FEAP-2013 Matrix Teaching and Learning Courses
Elementary Education with ESOL and Reading Endorsement

		ARE4313	EDF2005	EDF2085*	EDF3203	EDF3210	EDF3430	EDG3323	EDG3324	EE4070	EE44616	EME2040	EME4312	LAE4353	MAE4310*	MAE4350	RED4308	RED4348*	RED4652	RED4750	SCE4113*	SCE4350	SSE4150	SSE4312*	TLS1	TSL4080	TSL4081	
A.1 Instructional Design and Lesson Planning		Applying concepts from human development and learning theories, the effective educator consistently :																										
A.1.a	Aligns instruction with state-adopted standards at the appropriate level of rigor	X				X	X	X					X	X									X		X			
A.1.b	Sequences lessons and concepts to ensure coherence and required prior knowledge.						X	X					X						X		X	X			X			
A.1.c	Designs instruction for students to achieve mastery.						X	X									X								X			
A.1.d	Selects appropriate formative assessments to monitor learning.						X	X		X															X			
A.1.e	Uses diagnostic student data to plan lessons.						X	X		X															X			
A.1.f	Develops learning experiences that require students to demonstrate a variety of applicable skills and competencies.	X			X		X	X																	X			
A.2 The Learning Environment		To maintain a student-centered learning environment that is safe, organized, equitable, flexible, inclusive, and collaborative, the effective educator consistently :																										
A.2.a	Organizes, allocates, and manages the resources of time, space, and attention.						X	X		X																X		
A.2.b	Manages individual and class behaviors through a well-planned management system.				X		X	X		X																X		
A.2.c	Conveys high expectations to all students.						X																			X		
A.2.d	Respects students' cultural linguistic and family background.				X		X	X	X																	X		
A.2.e	Models clear, acceptable oral and written communication skills.	X					X	X														X				X		
A.2.f	Maintains a climate of openness, inquiry, fairness and support.		X				X	X																		X		
A.2.g	Integrates current information and communication technologies.					X	X	X							X											X		
A.2.h	Adapts the learning environment to accommodate the differing needs and diversity of students.				X		X	X																		X		
A.2.i	Utilizes current and emerging assistive technologies that enable students to participate in high-quality communication interactions and achieve their educational						X			X	X				X											X		
A.3 Instructional Delivery and Facilitation		The effective educator consistently utilizes a deep and comprehensive knowledge of the subject taught to																										

Source: eIPEP Elementary Education/ESOL/Reading

Appendix E: Acronyms

Acronyms	Meaning
3Cs	Content knowledge, critical thinking and communication
AAC&U	Association of American Colleges and Universities
ALC	Academic Learning Compact
AP Program	Advanced-Level Preparation Program
APPR	Annual Program Performance Report
APR	Academic Program Review
CA	Competency Assessment
CAEP	Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
CAI	Department of Curriculum and Instruction
CCD (TEI)	Candidate and Completer Data (previously known as Teacher Education Information file)
COED	Department of Counselor Education
COMD	Department of Communication Sciences & Disorders
CSS	Completer Satisfaction Survey
CV	Curriculum Vitae
DDR	Diversity Data Report
DDI	Departmental dashboard indicators
DEI	Diversity, Equity, Inclusion
eIPEP	electronic Institutional Program Evaluation Plan
ELRM	Department of Educational Leadership and Research Methodology
EPP	Educator Preparation Provider
ESS	Employer Satisfaction Survey
FAU	Florida Atlantic University
FAU BOT	Florida Atlantic University Board of Trustees
FEAP	Florida Educator Accomplished Practices
FELE	Florida Educational Leaders Exam
FLBOG	Florida Board of Governors
FLDOE	Florida Department of Education
FPLS	Florida Principal Leadership Standards
FTCE	Florida Teachers Certification Exam
FTE	Full-time Equivalent
GK	General Knowledge
GPA	Grade Point Average
GPC	University Graduate Programs Committee
IEA	Institutional Effectiveness and Analysis
InTASC	Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
ITP Program	Initial-Level Teacher Preparation Program
LT	LiveText by Watermark
LTFA	LiveText Financial Assistance
KPI	Key Performance Indicators
NCATE	National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education
NTSS	New Teacher Satisfaction Survey
OIT	Office of Information Technology

<i>PD</i>	Professional Development
<i>PEd</i>	Professional Exam
<i>PSEL</i>	Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
<i>QAAS</i>	Quality Assurance Assessment System
<i>SACSCOC</i>	Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges
<i>SAE</i>	Subject Area Exam
<i>SCH</i>	Student Credit Hours
<i>SIP</i>	Selected Improvement Plan
<i>SLO</i>	Student Learning Outcomes
<i>SPED</i>	Department of Special Education
<i>SPOT</i>	Student Perception of Teaching
<i>SWAT</i>	Strategic Workgroup for Ascending to the Top
<i>UCC</i>	Uniform Core Curricula
<i>UUPC</i>	Undergraduate Programs Committee
<i>VALUE</i>	Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education
<i>VAM</i>	Value Added Measure