



## Compliance Audit Report 2010-2011 University of Dallas

According to Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c) An entity approved by the SBEC under this chapter...shall be reviewed at least once every five years under procedures approved by the TEA staff; however, a review may be conducted at any time at the discretion of the TEA staff. Per TAC §228.1(c) all educator preparation programs are subject to the same standards of accountability, as required under Chapter 229 of this title. The Texas Education Agency administers Texas Administrative Code rules required by the Texas legislature for the regulation of all educator preparation programs in the state. Please see the complete Texas Administrative Code rules at [www.tea.state.tx.us](http://www.tea.state.tx.us) for details contained in each rule.

Contact Information: Jerry L. Irons, Ph.D. Chairman of the Department of Education at the University of Dallas

County-District Number: 057-507

Texas Education Agency (TEA) program specialists Vanessa Alba and Mixon Henry conducted a Texas Education Agency) compliance audit on March 15-18, 2011, as required by Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c). The Generalist EC-6 certification program was the focus of the compliance audit.

Information concerning compliance with Texas Administrative Code governing educator preparation programs was collected by various qualitative means. A review of the self-report submitted on January 28, 2011, documents, student records, course syllabi, and curriculum correlations charts provided evidence regarding compliance. In addition, electronic questionnaires were sent to University of Dallas stakeholders by TEA staff. A total of fifty-one (51) out of seventy-five (75) responses to the questionnaires were received. The responses included eleven (11) out of sixteen (16) advisory committee members, four (4) out of five (5) field supervisors, seventeen (17) out of twenty-two (22) cooperating teachers, twelve (12) out of twenty (20) teaching candidates, and seven (7) out of twelve (12) principals. Qualitative methods of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence.

The following are the findings and recommendations for program improvement.

### **COMPONENT I: COMMITMENT AND COLLABORATION - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.20—GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

#### **Findings:**

Program support was indicated by the governing body of the University of Dallas educator preparation program per TAC §228.20(c) as evidenced by Dr. Jerry Irons's, Chairman of the Department of Education, and his entire department's participation in various aspects of the compliance audit. In addition, two members serving on the advisory committee were present during the opening session. They included Ms. Gina Doyle, a Hurst-Euless Bedford Independent School District teacher, and Ms. Karen Slaughter, a Region X Education Service

Center consultant. It is important to note that Charles W. Eaker, Ph.D., Dean of the Constantin College of Liberal Arts, and Bill B. Berry, Ph.D., University of Dallas Provost, were both present at the opening session. The University of Dallas educator preparation program is a part of the Constantin College of Liberal Arts.

The University of Dallas educator preparation program is a collaborative effort among stakeholders as per TAC §228.20(b). The advisory committee consists of sixteen (16) members: nine (9) from public/private schools; one (1) from Region X Education Service Center; two (2) from higher education; and four (4) from business and community interests. During the opening session presentation presented by Mrs. Barbara Khirallah, instructor in the Department of Education at the University of Dallas, evidence of collaboration and community partnerships was provided in the PowerPoint presentation. In addition to the advisory committee required per TAC §228.20(b), it is important to note that the University of Dallas has an additional advisory committee composed of university colleagues outside of the Department of Education who provide additional insight into the educator preparation program.

The advisory committee met on September 28, 2010, and on February 17, 2011. Agendas, minutes, and attendance records for the 2010-2011 academic year were available in the document review as evidence of compliance. Previous years' advisory committee meeting agendas and records were provided on a CD disk as evidence of previous years' compliance. In addition to the two meetings per year required per TAC §228.20(b), the committee met on October 27, 2010, for an evening of conversation with the University of Dallas president and on November 19, 2010, for an annual gathering of advisory committee members and candidates in the educator preparation program. An advisory committee handbook containing membership guidelines and appointments, duties and responsibilities, meeting information, minutes, and general program review was provided in the document review as evidence of compliance. Advisory committee membership composition and meetings met the requirements of TAC §228.20(b).

An electronic questionnaire was sent by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) staff to all sixteen (16) advisory committee members prior to the compliance audit. Eleven (11) of the sixteen (16) members responded to the questionnaire. Three (3) of the eleven (11) respondents, or twenty-seven percent (27%), have served on the committee for twelve (12) months or less and eight (8) respondents, or seventy-three percent (73%), have served on the committee for four (4) years or more. The TEA advisory committee training PowerPoint presentation was provided to the department chair for use prior to the visit and evidence of that training was provided in the February 17, 2011, meeting minutes. Additionally, TEA staff offered advisory committee training during the opening session. Advisory committee members stated that they had already received training.

Nine (9) of the sixteen (16), or fifty-six percent (56%), of the advisory committee members responded in the questionnaire that they participated in the design, revision, and major policy decisions affecting the educator preparation program. Since a sizeable percentage (44%) of respondents indicated that their input was not being requested during advisory committee meetings, it is recommended that more opportunities be provided for all advisory committee members to provide input into the design, revision, and major policy decisions of the educator preparation program.

Seven (7) of the nine (9), or seventy-eight percent (78%), of the respondents reported that they reviewed the types of field-based experiences provided to candidates. Two (2) respondents skipped this question on the questionnaire. There was concern expressed by the University of Dallas program staff that the advisory committee should not be able to provide input into the field-based experiences of candidates in the program since all of the advisory committee members are not educators. TEA staff stated that this is a requirement of TAC§228.35(d) and their exception was duly noted. As a result, it is recommended that the program staff use an advisory committee template to ensure that all aspects of governance are covered at advisory committee meetings and that the information be documented accordingly. Advisory committee meeting templates were provided electronically to Dr. Irons, Chairman of the Department of Education, and Ms. Kay Haaser, University of Dallas certification officer, for their use during the required advisory committee meetings.

In the advisory committee questionnaire, the advisory committee members were asked to identify the strengths and areas to strengthen within the University of Dallas educator preparation program. The committee members responded that areas of strength included that members were knowledgeable about the program and that they used a variety of data to evaluate the program. Areas the program can strengthen included communication between the advisory committee and university staff and providing more participation in the evaluation of the program.

**Based on the evidence presented above, the University of Dallas is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.20 – GOVERNANCE OF EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS.**

## **COMPONENT II: ADMISSION CRITERIA-Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §227.10 - ADMISSION CRITERIA**

### **Findings:**

Admission requirements for the University of Dallas educator preparation program were detailed in the self-report. In addition, information was available on the website, in the University of Dallas 2010-2011 Bulletin (university catalogue), and in brochures provided in the document review. Mrs. Barbara Khirallah, instructor in the Department of Education, in her opening presentation, explained that all undergraduates at the University of Dallas matriculate through a core of courses. The core consists of a specific sequence of fifteen (15) courses in the following disciplines: English; Economics; History; Philosophy; and Theology. In addition, the core also includes up to ten (10) additional courses in the following departments: Life Science; Physical Science; Mathematics; Fine Arts; and Foreign Language. Core coursework includes seventy-two (72) to seventy-six (76) semester credit hours that each candidate must complete successfully prior to entering the education major concentration. These hours were noted in candidate folders in a "Degree Plan Checklist".

In order to be admitted into the University of Dallas educator preparation program that leads to a Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies and Texas teacher certification, an applicant must have an overall grade point average of two point seven five (2.75) on a

four point (4.0) scale and a two point seven five (2.75) in pedagogical and teaching field courses. This exceeds the minimum grade point average requirement of two point five (2.5) as required in TAC §227.10(A). In addition, a completed and signed application to the Department of Education teacher certification program is required for admission and was located in all current files and met the requirement of TAC §227.10(6). All applicants are required to demonstrate basic skills as determined by a composite score of twenty-three (23) on the ACT with a score of nineteen (19) in both the English and math portions of the test or a 1070 on the SAT with a score of 500 in both the verbal and math portions of the test. The student may also pass all portions of the THEA as evidence of basic skills attainment. The program's basic skills requirement met the requirements of TAC §227.10(4). Evidence of a completed interview as required in TAC §227.10(6) was documented in all current candidate files. During conversations with the certification officer, it was noted that each applicant interview was conducted by the certification officer. A written essay entitled, "Why do you desire to teach?" was required of all applicants. Twelve (12) semester credit hours in EDU courses for the Generalist EC-6 certification was documented in both the degree and certification plans for each candidate as required in TAC §227.10(C). In addition, certification plans for each applicant, developed by the certification officer, personal letters of recommendation, and a recommendation by the Department of Education faculty were documented in current candidate files.

Each spring the faculty in the Department of Education reviews applications for admission and makes decisions for admission into the program based on the above criteria. All applicants who are accepted into the program are admitted as a cohort. Any candidate who does not meet the University of Dallas requirements for admissions into the teacher certification program may initiate an appeal to allow that applicant the opportunity to present his/her case to justify admittance into the program as per TAC §227.10(3)(b).

A total of seventeen (17) candidate files were reviewed. Current candidate files contained all of the required items including application, transcript, evidence of basic skills, interview, written essay, degree and certification plan, letters of recommendation, and faculty recommendations.

Candidate files for the post baccalaureate program contained a transcript as required by TAC §227.10(a)(2) as well as the other required items for admissions as listed above. It was uncertain if all candidates in the post baccalaureate program had been issued a probationary certificate during their internship. TEA staff recommended that the certification officer ensure that all candidates who participate in an internship obtain a probationary certificate.

**Based on the evidence presented above, the University of Dallas is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10–Admission Criteria.**

## COMPONENT III: CURRICULUM-Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.30 - EDUCATOR PREPARATION CURRICULUM

### Findings:

There are four (4) faculty professors in the University of Dallas Department of Education. Qualifications outlined in the self-report to ensure that all faculty members possess the necessary knowledge and skills to deliver a rigorous curriculum include: an advanced degree; Texas teaching certification in the corresponding content and grade level; and more than five (5) years of experience teaching content at a specific grade level in a public or private school. The document review included resumes for each faculty member which verified that all faculty members met the University's required qualifications. In addition the website provided documentation of each faculty member's qualifications and specified the courses that each one taught.

Twelve (12) out of twenty (20) student teachers responded to the TEA electronic questionnaire. Of the eleven (11) student teachers who responded to the question about a course syllabus, one hundred percent (100%) responded that they were provided with a clear and concise course syllabus for each of their courses. Data provided in the self-report indicated that all course syllabi included instructor contact information, course description, goals, objectives, TExES standards and competencies covered in the course, TEKS addressed, focused field-based experiences embedded in the course, focused reading assignments, instructional strategies, classroom policies, and assignments tied to calendar due dates. As evidence of compliance with TAC §228.30(a), a review of all EC-6 course syllabi was conducted. It was found that the above aforementioned content was included by all instructors.

Comprehensive coverage of the seventeen (17) curriculum topics [TAC 228.30(b)], Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR), Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), and Standards, Domains, and Competencies were verified through the self-report, student teacher and mentor responses to the questionnaires, syllabi review, as well as through course alignment charts and curriculum matrices required by TEA as per TAC §228.30(a). It was noted in the candidate folder review that a signed Code of Ethics was in each current candidate's folder and was checked off as a required item in the "Checklist for Student Teaching Applicants" located on each candidate folder. It was noted that the recently revised Code of Ethics (TAC §247) was also included as an attachment in the "Teacher Education Handbook" as well as on the website.

In analyzing the questionnaire responses from the student teachers and cooperating teachers about how effective they felt instruction was in covering the seventeen (17) mandated topics, it was found that the following areas were identified as being effective as reported by one hundred percent (100%) of respondents in both groups: Texas Educator Code of Ethics; using a variety of instructional methods to meet individual student needs; TEKS organization, structure, and skills; how to develop a lesson; and how to use a variety of classroom assessments with students. Teaching candidates indicated in their questionnaire that they would like to see more training in the following areas: teacher responsibility for TAKS testing; standards and teaching strategies for gifted and talented and English language learners; using a variety of classroom assessments; and conducting parent conferences. The Texas Test Administrator Online Training link (<http://texas.testsecuritytraining.com/>) and possible ways to incorporate that

training into current coursework was provided by TEA program specialists to the program staff during the opening session. In contrast, cooperating teachers reported that they would like to see more instruction in classroom management, standards and teaching strategies for students in the areas of reading, English language learners, and special education.

**Based on the evidence presented above, the University of Dallas is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.30–EDUCATOR PREPARATION CURRICULUM.**

#### **COMPONENT IV: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND ONGOING SUPPORT – Texas Administrative Code (TAC) § 228.35–PREPARATION PROGRAM COURSEWORK AND/OR TRAINING**

##### **Findings:**

All courses in the University of Dallas educator preparation program are delivered in a face-to-face format and are sequenced according to the University of Dallas Education Department’s “Elementary and Secondary Teacher Certification Timetable”. During the freshman and sophomore years, candidates are required to meet the University of Dallas core requirements and establish contact with Mrs. Kay Haaser, the Education Department’s certification officer. During the sophomore year, candidates are required to meet the basic skills requirements via SAT/ACT scores or pass all parts of the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) as described in the Component II: Admissions.

During the fall semester of the junior year, candidates begin education (EDU) courses and develop a certification plan with the certification officer. It is during this time, that candidates must successfully pass the EDU 3147/3148 course entitled “Reflective Teaching”. This course provides candidates with an insight into the teaching and learning process prior to applying for admission to the teacher certification program.

Each candidate is provided with a total of six hundred seventy-five (675) clock hours of coursework which exceeds the minimum of three hundred clock hours of coursework as per TAC §228.35(a)(3). This was documented in the hours chart provided by the University of Dallas staff. The hours were also verified during the candidate folder review for current year candidates as documented on the “Certification Plan”. Candidates seeking Generalist EC-6 certification are required to successfully complete forty-one (41) semester credit hours or six hundred fifteen (615) clock hours prior to student teaching which exceeds the minimum requirement of eighty (80) clock hours per TAC §228.35(a)(3)(B).

The courses that provide the field-based experiences which are completed prior to student teaching include: EDU 3101 (Math); EDU 3102 (Reading); and 3103 (Science). The total clock-hours for these three courses is fifty-four (54) hours and exceeds the minimum of thirty (30) clock hours as per TAC§228.35(d)(1).It was indicated in the self-report that time logs, reflection journals, classroom discussions, mentor teacher signatures, lesson plans, self and peer

evaluations, and field notes were all used to document the field experiences. In conversations with course instructor, Mrs. Barbara Khirallah, student folder review, and recorded grades for the specified courses, documentation of field experiences was confirmed.

Course syllabi provided in the document review also provided evidence of compliance with the observation requirements. The EDU 3101 Math course includes a daily log requirement and ensures that candidates observe physical arrangement of the classroom, classroom management style of the teacher presenting the lessons, discipline and planning techniques, as well as the flow of the lessons presented for the EC-6 math curriculum. The EDU 3102 Reading course is taught at a local elementary school and candidates are provided with opportunities to transfer reading theory learned into practical application by presenting an in-class model lesson that implements relevant research, theory, and best practice on a reading comprehension strategy. The EDU 3103 Science course requires that candidates complete a daily reflective log that includes observing the physical arrangement of the classroom, classroom management style of the teacher presenting the lessons, discipline and planning techniques, as well as the flow of the lessons presented for the EC-6 science curriculum.

In conversations with Dr. Irons, Chairman of the Department of Education at the University of Dallas, about the self-report and the coursework offered, it was discovered that the six (6) hours of test preparation for both the content area and PPR TExES exams are embedded within the coursework provided. Specifically, EDU 4343 Principles of Elementary Education contains a lesson where candidates are required to read, study, and discuss the PPR EC-6 preparation manual. As a result, it was recommended that the program provide six (6) clock hours of test preparation for the TExES content and EC-12 PPR exams that is not embedded in other coursework as per TAC §228.35(a)(3)(C). During further conversations with program staff, it was discovered that the University had recently made a change to how they offered the six (6) hours of test preparation based on what they believed TEA would want to see. Because of this, it was recommended by TEA program specialists that in order to remain current regarding Texas Administrative Code, the program appoint someone to follow State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC) and State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings, read the Educator Standards and Educational Testing Service (ETS) newsletters, participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Standards, and participate in the Dean/Director Meetings.

All coursework and training is completed prior to issuance of a standard certificate as per TAC §228.35(a)(4). This was confirmed during the candidate folder review in the form of a "Course Degree Plan" and a "Certification Plan" that is checked off as each candidate progresses through the coursework required for the program of study. In addition, student teaching as a twelve (12) week course is documented as EDU 4147 Elementary Directed Student Teaching Seminar and meets the requirements of TAC §228.35(d)(2). Candidates are required to meet weekly during this course during the semester of their twelve (12) week student teaching experience. Topics covered in this seminar include: student teaching guidelines; teacher educator standards and Code of Ethics; TEKS/TAKS/STAAR/TExES; education and legal issues; bilingual and English as a second language education; special education; and the student teaching experience.

There are six (6) cooperating teachers working with student teachers in the University of Dallas educator preparation program this semester. Sufficient evidence of cooperating teacher training

exists as per TAC§228.35(e). It was documented in the self-report that cooperating teachers received training from the University of Dallas educator preparation program and receive certificates of completion. This was also verified in the cooperating teachers' responses to their questionnaire. Ten (10) of the seventeen (17) respondents, or fifty-nine percent (59%), reported that they received training from the University of Dallas, and fourteen (14) of the seventeen (17) respondents, or eighty-two point four percent (82.4%), reported that they received training via the "Cooperating Teacher/University Supervisor Handbook". It is important to note that because the program has twenty (20) candidates in the program this academic year, the university staff handpicked their cooperating teachers and met with them regularly prior to placing student teachers in their classrooms. The information regarding cooperating teachers was verified in conversations with the certification officer because it was noted that each cooperating teacher training had a separate date. A "Cooperating Teacher Orientation Meeting" form that included the name, date, and signature of the cooperating teacher and field supervisor for each cooperating teacher was available in the document review. Topics covered included among other things: cooperating teacher roles and responsibilities; field supervisor roles and responsibilities; goals and objectives of the student teaching program; the Code of Ethics as specified in TAC §247; confidentiality; and Texas teacher educator standards. Among the resources used as references for cooperating teachers were: *Qualities of Effective Teachers* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) by J.H. Stronge and *The First Days of School* by H.K. Wong and R. T. Wong.

There are currently five (5) field supervisors for student teachers in the University of Dallas educator preparation program. Sufficient evidence exists that each field supervisor is an experienced educator as per TAC §228.35(f). Professors in the university's Department of Education serve as field supervisors for the student teachers. It was documented in the self-report that field supervisors are experienced educators currently certified in Texas, former principals or administrators currently certified in Texas, current faculty members at the University of Dallas, and have a minimum of five (5) years of teaching or administrative experience. This was verified in the field supervisor questionnaires. Four (4) of the five (5) field supervisors completed the questionnaire and one hundred percent (100%) reported that they held an advanced degree, Texas teacher certification, more than five (5) years of classroom teaching experience, and were currently a faculty member or instructor in the program. In addition, two (2) of the four (4) respondents, or fifty percent (50%) reported that they held a Texas administrator certification and one (1) of the four (4) respondents, or twenty-five percent (25%), reported that they had served as a principal/superintendent. This was confirmed in a review of vitas for each field supervisor during the document review.

Sufficient evidence exists that each field supervisor has been trained as a field supervisor per TAC §228.35(f). It was documented in the self-report that field supervisors received the following types of training: orientation to student teaching/internship and handbook review. It was reported in the field supervisor questionnaires that three (3) out of the four (4) respondents, or seventy-five percent (75%), received annual training and two (2) of the four (4), or fifty percent (50%), received training on an as needed basis. This was also verified in the document review. In addition, it was noted that each field supervisor had attended training and signed and dated a "University Supervisor Orientation Meeting" form. Topics for training included among other things: field supervisor roles and responsibilities; goals and objectives of the student teaching program; the Code of Ethics as per TAC §247; suggested calendar dates for the student teaching assignment; appraisals: formative and final appraisal with recommendation;



and teacher placement files. It is also important to note that in conversations with the University of Dallas Department of Education staff that all field supervisors are current University of Dallas professors and they attend a yearly summer retreat where they discuss any upcoming changes to field supervision requirements.

Sufficient evidence exists that initial contact by the field supervisors with the student teaching candidate occurred within the first three weeks of assignment as per TAC §228.35(f). It was documented in the self-report that the initial contact was documented via the field supervisor contact log and a signed observation form. This was verified in both the field supervisor and student teacher questionnaires. One hundred percent (100%) of field supervisors and student teachers reported that the first contact occurred within the first three weeks of assignment. This was verified in the candidate folder review as being the first meeting of the EDU 4147 Student Teaching Seminar course.

Sufficient evidence exists that the program provided a minimum of three formal observations during the student teaching practicum as per §TAC 228.35(f)(2). It was reported in the self-report that three formal observations were required during the candidates' student teaching practicum, that an observation instrument is used to document those observations, and that the observation form is signed by the field supervisor and teaching candidate. It was also reported that the first formal observation occurred during the first six weeks of placement. This was confirmed by TEA program specialists during the review of candidate files. Each current candidate file contained a completed Professional Development Appraisal System (PDAS) type "Formative and Summative Appraisal Instrument" that contained the name of the student teacher being observed, the name of the field supervisor, the date of the observation, the name of the school where the student teacher was observed, the time of the observation, the subject area that was being observed, the topic of the lesson, and the grade level. There was a record of four (4) formative observations for each candidate, which exceeds the TAC §228.35(f)(4) minimum requirement of three (3) observations during student teaching.

It was unclear whether or not all candidates were observed for a total of forty-five (45) minutes because not all of the "Formative and Summative Appraisal Instrument" forms indicated a start and end time. It was reported by student teachers in their questionnaire that nine (9) of the eleven (11) respondents, or eighty-two percent (82%), had been observed for approximately or more than forty-five (45) minutes. The length of the observations was clarified in conversations with the program staff and documented accordingly for current candidates. It was recommended that all "Appraisal Instruments" used by field supervisors include both the start and end times and that training occur for all field supervisors to ensure future compliance with TAC §228.35(f)(1).

Sufficient evidence exists that field supervisors document all instructional practices observed and provide written feedback through an interactive conference as per TAC §228.35(f). This was reported in the self-report and verified in student teacher questionnaire responses, during the document review, and in conversations with the program staff. Ten (10) of the eleven (11) respondents to the student teacher questionnaire, or ninety-one percent (91%), reported that they were provided with written feedback of their observations and a debriefing with their field supervisor. The completed observation forms were located in candidate files and contained PDAS Domains, PDAS evaluation dimensions, guiding questions for field supervisors to

consider when observing student teachers, and comments/feedback based on the observation. In addition, a rating scale of zero (0), not observed/not applicable, to four (4), greatly exceeds expectations, for each domain observed is provided for the student teacher.

It was reported in the self-report that a copy of the written feedback is provided to the campus administrator. It was unclear whether or not a copy was provided to the candidate's campus administrator as per TAC §228.35(f) because not all observations forms were signed by the campus administrator. In conversations with the program staff it was discovered that all field supervisors emailed the observation form to the campus principal and some required that the principal sign a copy. It was recommended that the program staff develop a systemic method for ensuring that all principals receive a copy of the observation form and whether the form is signed electronically or by hand, that a record of the observation form with the signature of the principal be kept in each candidate's file in order to ensure compliance with TAC 228.35(f).

Sufficient evidence exists that informal observation and coaching are provided by field supervisors as per TAC §228.35(c). It was reported in the self-report that additional support is provided to candidates through counseling and one-to-one tutoring after potential problems are discussed in department faculty meetings. This was verified during the candidate folder review in the field supervisor observation notes for each candidate. Ten (10) of the eleven (11) respondents to the student teacher questionnaire, or ninety-one percent (91%), reported that they were provided with additional informal observations and coaching as needed. This was also verified during the candidate folder review in the dates for additional observations in the "Summative Appraisal Instrument".

**Based on the evidence presented above, the University of Dallas is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.35–PREPARATION PROGRAM COURSEWORK AND/OR TRAINING.**

## **COMPONENT V: PROGRAM EVALUATION - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.40 - ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES FOR CERTIFICATION AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT**

### **Findings:**

It was reported in the self-report that the University of Dallas uses the following benchmarks and structured assessments to monitor a candidate's progress throughout the program: a staff review of grades and cumulative grade point average for all candidates in the student teaching program at the end of each semester; a process for advising candidates each semester; a process for notifying the Associate Dean and Department Chair about continuous monitoring, assessment, and evaluation of at-risk candidates through the semester; and an established "Teacher Education Review Committee" for candidates with concerns. This information was verified in conversations with program staff and during the candidate folder review. Each candidate folder contained a "Degree Plan Checklist" and a "Certification Plan Checklist" that included courses completed each semester, a semester grade point average, and an unofficial

transcript among other things to ensure that candidates are progressing as required by the program. In addition, faculty members are required to report mid-term grades for each candidate as well as administer mid-term exams for all courses that the university offers. Sufficient evidence exists that established benchmarks and structured assessments of candidates' progress throughout the program to ensure that candidates for educator certification are prepared to receive standard certificates at the University of Dallas as per TAC §228.40(a).

Candidates are required to complete the required sequence of courses each semester as verified during a review of the candidate files. The "Elementary and Secondary Teacher Certification Timetable" that is provided to candidates desiring to obtain a teaching certificate in addition to an undergraduate or post baccalaureate degree includes a specific time period when candidates are allowed to take TExES content and pedagogy and professional responsibilities (PPR) exams. Test approval for content exams is granted to candidates in the summer prior to their senior year and test approval for the PPR exam is granted during the fall semester of the candidates' senior year. Sufficient evidence exists that granting test approval is provided after admission and full acceptance into the program as per TAC §228.40(b). Candidates are expected to complete all required TExES exams prior to the end of the second semester of their senior year. In addition, a review of course syllabi and Curriculum Matrices for the Generalist EC-6 certificate found that embedded in each of the content area courses as well as the EDU 4343 "Principles of Elementary Education" included a component for test preparation. Sufficient evidence exists that the University of Dallas determines a candidate's readiness to test as per TAC §228.40(b).

It was reported in the self-report that the advisory committee evaluates the curriculum more than every twelve (12) months using a variety of data sources including: candidate test scores (certification tests and written exams); evaluation of courses and professors by candidates; comprehensive exams for each course; oral exams following student teaching; assessment of learning "Annual Report" including goals, assessments, and results submitted to the Dean; professor self-examination using university standards; and a program evaluation using TEA standards. In responses reported in the advisory committee questionnaire, it was noted that five (5) of the nine (9) respondents to the question, or fifty-five point six percent (55.6%), indicated that they participated in designing and revising the curriculum and in the overall evaluation of the program. In addition, advisory committee questionnaires revealed that non-faculty advisory committee members' input was not requested. In conversations with University of Dallas program staff. It was learned that a university advisory committee outside of the School of Education with two School of Education representatives evaluates the curriculum. The items provided during the document review included a "Faculty Appraisal Form", a "Cooperating Teacher Evaluation by the Student Teacher Form" and a "National Survey of Student Engagement" template. In addition, during the document review, it was unclear in the advisory committee minutes exactly what information was being discussed during the "Reports" portion of the agendas. This was later clarified with the certification officer that Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) data was reported. Although the University of Dallas was able to provide sufficient evidence of continuous evaluation of design and delivery of the educator preparation curriculum based on performance data, scientifically-based research practices, and the results of internal and external assessments as per TAC §228.40(c), it was recommended that the program staff begin using an advisory committee minutes template to ensure that all

aspects of governance, including program evaluation, are covered at advisory committee meetings and that the information is documented in the form of detailed minutes accordingly.

Evidence that required documentation of a candidate's eligibility for admission to the program and evidence of completion of the program are retained for a period of five (5) years after completion of the program was not found as per TAC §228.40(d). This was discovered during the candidate folder review and as reported by the certification officer and the Chairman of the Department of Education. Specifically, the certification officer stated that documentation is shredded once a candidate graduates. Technical assistance was provided to the program staff by TEA program specialists regarding the specified items that need to be retained. It was recommended that the program retain documents in a safe and secure environment that provide evidence of a candidate's eligibility for admission to the program and evidence of completion of the program for a period of five (5) years as per TAC §228.40(d).

**Based on the evidence presented above, the University of Dallas is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.40 – ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION OF CANDIDATES FOR CERTIFICATION AND PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT.**

## Senate Bill 174/Texas Administrative Code §229

### Standard I: Results of Certification Exams

Pass Rate Performance	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
	Final 80% Standard	Final 80% Standard	70% Pass Rate
Overall	100%	100%	100%

## PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION

The following are recommendations based on the findings of the Texas Education Agency Compliance Audit. If the program is NOT in compliance with any component, please consult the Texas Administrative Code and initiate actions to correct the issue IMMEDIATELY. A Compliance Status Report will be required in sixty days on compliance recommendations.

General program recommendations are suggestions for general program improvement and do not require follow-up.

**PROGRAM COMPLIANCE RECOMMENDATIONS: A Compliance Status Report will be required in sixty days.**

- Provide six (6) clock hours of test preparation for the TExES content and EC-12 PPR exams that is not embedded in other coursework as per TAC §228.35(a)(3)(C);
- Ensure that both the “Formative and Summative Appraisal Instruments” include both the start and end times and that training occur for all field supervisors to ensure future compliance with TAC §228.35(f)(1);
- Develop a systemic method for ensuring that all principals receive a copy of the observation in order to ensure compliance with TAC 228.35(f); and
- Retain documents that provide evidence of a candidate’s eligibility for admission to the program and evidence of completion of the program for a period of five (5) years as per TAC §228.40(d).

**GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS: No progress report is necessary.**

- Provide more opportunities for all, including non-educator, advisory committee members to provide input into the design, revision, and major policy decisions of the educator preparation program;
- Use an advisory committee template to ensure that all aspects of governance, including discussion of field experiences and program evaluation, are covered at advisory committee meetings and that the information is documented in the form of detailed minutes accordingly;
- Ensure that all future candidates in an internship obtain a probationary certificate;
- Follow the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings and minutes to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current Texas Administrative Code;
- Read the Educator Standards and Educational Testing Services (ETS) newsletters to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current Texas Administrative Code;
- Participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Standards to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about requirements and changes in TAC rules; and
- Participate in the Dean/Director meetings to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about requirements and changes in TAC rules.