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Background Information:

Texas A&M International University was created in 1970 as a satellite center of Texas A&I University in Kingsville, Texas. From 1977-1989, it was known as Laredo State University. In 1989, it became part of the Texas A&M University system. In 1995, it moved to the present location and became a four-year institution. Thus, Texas A&M International University (TAMIU) has been preparing teacher in South Texas for 37 years. TAMIU currently prepares teachers through three routes – traditional, post-baccalaureate, and alternative certification.

Alternative Certification Program Approved in 2003

TAMIU alternative certification program was approved to offer Early Childhood-Grade 4 Bilingual Generalist certification. The instructional delivery system was a combination of university coursework and seminars with field supervision as the candidate served as “Teacher of Record” in an internship.

Post Approval Visit 2006-2007

The purpose of the TEA post approval visit was to review the Undergraduate Teacher Preparation Program and the AT3P (alternative) program. The undergraduate program employs a three-block system that gradually exposes TAMIU students to the public schools through various practicum experiences. The AT3P works as an alternative certification program.
that requires a degree and encompasses a 9 month internship with four required university courses.

The following were program recommendations made as a result of that visit:

- Continue to utilize TxBESS mentoring strategies and ensure that it is consistently provided to all campus mentors;
- Require that university supervisors and field supervisors participate in extensive training to ensure quality and consistency to all pre-service teachers;
- Foster communication in a systematic and intentional manner between the university supervisory personnel and campus mentors/cooperating teachers;
- Continue to provide resources to expand and support the field team personnel;
- Continue your constant search for improvement in meeting the needs of the community and the university;
- Continue to collect and analyze retention data for certified program completers who remain in teaching after three and five years;
- Ensure that certification personnel are trained to submit ASEP information and appropriate score reports for educator candidates;
- Build on your potential and continue to design cutting-edge teacher preparation programs.

Technical Assistance Visit Requested by TAMIU 2011

On January 12-13, 2011, the university requested assistance to review conflicting student reporting data. At that technical visit, data reporting requirements and Texas Administrative Code §227, §228, §229 were discussed.

Accreditation Status 2010

TAMIU received the status of “Accredited” with an Action Plan (based on Sept 1, 2009-Aug 31, 2010 data) because the program had one or more demographic groups that did not meet the passing standard of 70% set for this academic period.

Accreditation Status 2011

TAMIU received the status of “Accredited-Warned” because the institution had not met the 75% standard for two demographic groups per TAC 229.4(h). The status was based on data for the period September 1, 2010, through August 31, 2011.

Oversight Compliance Audit 2012

The compliance oversight audit was required because TAMIU’s accreditation status was reduced from Accredited with Action Plan to Accredited- Warned. The reduction was due to failure “to meet the performance standards in any two genders or ethnicity demographic on any of the four performance indicators set forth in subsection (a) of this section for two consecutive years, regardless of whether the deficiency is in the same demographic group or standard.”
Accreditation Status for 2012

TAMIU received the status of “Accredited-Probation” because the institution had not met the 80% standard for two demographic groups per TAC 229.4(h) for two consecutive years. The status was based on data for the period September 1, 2011, through August 31, 2012.

Data Analysis:

Information concerning compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) governing educator preparation programs was collected by various quantitative and qualitative means. A self-report was submitted to TEA on November 11, 2012. An on-site review of documents, student records, online course material, and curriculum correlations charts provided evidence regarding compliance. In addition, TEA sent electronic questionnaires to Texas A&M International University stakeholders. Out of the 53 questionnaires completed, eight (8) out of twenty-four (24) advisory committee members, nineteen (19) out of ninety (90) educator candidates, five (5) out of seven (7) field supervisors, six (6) out of twenty-one (21) campus principals/administrators, and fifteen (15) out of ninety (90) cooperating teachers/mentors responded to the questionnaires. Quantitative and qualitative methods of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence. Evidence of compliance was verified using a rubric aligned to Texas Administrative Code.

Scope of the Compliance Audit:

Texas Education Agency Educator Preparation Manager, Sandra Jo Nix, and Program Specialist, Mixon Henry, conducted an oversight compliance audit of Texas A&M International University (TAMIU), 5201 University Boulevard, Killam Library Room 429, Laredo, Texas, on December 4-6, 2012, as required by Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c). The scope of the audit was restricted solely to verifying compliance with Texas Administrative Code §227, §228, §229, and §230. The curriculum focus of the compliance audit was the Generalist EC–6 – Reading and the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 certification areas. The following are findings and recommendations for program improvement.

Opening and Closing Session:

The opening session on December 4, 2012, was attended by 32 individuals including Dr. Ray M. Keck III, President, Dr. Pablo Arenaz, Provost, and Dr. Catheryn Weitman, Dean of the College of Education, TAMIU faculty and staff, and advisory committee members. The closing session was held on December 6, 2012, and was attended by the individuals mentioned above as well as 35 other individuals.

COMPONENT I: COMMITMENT AND COLLABORATION - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.20

FINDINGS:

Program support was indicated by the governing body of Texas A&M International University per TAC §228.20(c) as evidenced by the participation and cooperation of Dr. Catheryn Weitman and members of the Texas A&M International University staff in various stages and aspects of the compliance audit, the presence of adequate facilities at the University, and the resources available to staff and students.
The advisory committee consists of twenty-seven (27) members. Nine (9) members of the advisory committee are from local school districts, ten (10) members represents institutions of higher education including two members from Laredo Community College, two (2) members are student representatives; one (1) member represents the education service center, and five (5) members represent business and community interests. Texas A&M International University meets TAC §228.20(b) requirements for advisory committee composition.

One advisory committee meeting for the 2011-2012 academic year was held on February 15, 2012, and one advisory committee has been held for the 2012-2013 academic year on October 12, 2012. According to attendance records, fourteen (14) members attended the February meeting. A round table discussion was the format for the meeting with the pivotal questions being: What distinctiveness does a graduate from one of our programs bring? What do you perceive as strengths? What areas do we need to emphasize? How can we be more responsive to the needs of multiple educational communities? If you could design/redesign one of our Bachelor’s and one Master’s degree programs, what would you envision? What would you like to see embedded? Minutes describing the discussion around each question were presented.

According to attendance records, nineteen (19) members attended the October 12, 2012, meeting. Among other topics, the agenda reflected discussion of changes in matriculation, recommendations for TExES testing, learning communities, program mission, goals, and student assessments in the form of student learning outcomes. In addition, a program review for 2012-2013 was presented and various curriculum areas such as kinesiology, reading, curriculum and instruction, and the Generalist EC-6 program were discussed. The advisory committee members also participated in the TEA advisory committee training and a review of the advisory committee handbook which outlined the member's roles and responsibilities. The agendas and minutes of the October 12th meeting also reflected discussion of the TAMIU students and their pre-service and student teaching experiences as required by TAC §228.35(d).

The second meeting for the 2012-13 academic year is scheduled for February 5, 2013. A tentative agenda was presented for review.

Agendas, minutes, and attendance records were unable to verify that the advisory committee met a minimum of two times per academic year as required by TAC §228.20(b).

It should be noted that the College of Education hired a new Dean of the College of Education in July of 2012. Lack of advisory committee meetings was a direct result of the transition period between leaderships. Now that the new Dean is established, the Dean assured TEA that regularly scheduled advisory committee meetings would be held.

Based on the evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.20 – Governance of Educator Preparation Programs.
COMPONENT II: ADMISSION CRITERIA - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 
§227.10

FINDINGS:
According to Texas A&M International University’s website, application, and the Texas A&M International University catalogue, to enter the teacher certification program, the candidate must:

- complete an application [TAC §227.10(6)];
- complete an interview to demonstrate oral language proficiency or Speech 1311 [TAC §227.10(6)];
- complete all core curriculum coursework with a grade of “C” or better [TAC §227.10(C)];
- complete at least one Writing Intensive Course at the 1000-2000 level [TAC 227.10(7)];
- complete two University Seminar courses (UNIV 1101 and 1102) [TAC 227.10(7)];
- complete basic skills test with required minimum scores (Test scores more than five years before applying for admission to the college will not be accepted) [TAC 227.10(4)];
- achieve an institutional GPA of 2.7 [TAC §227.10(A) requires a minimum of 2.5 GPA overall or in the last 60 hours];
- meet the University’s foreign language graduation requirement [TAC 227.10(7)].

Unofficial transcripts were presented to verify that candidates met the minimum of 12 semester credit hours in the subject-specific content for which certification was sought (official transcripts are kept in the Office of the Registrar). Texas A&M International University has policies in place that allow the program to consider a candidate’s work, business, or career experience equivalent to the academic achievement represented by the GPA requirement [TAC 227.10((3)(B)]. This policy along with policies on transfer students, withdrawal, probationary and standard certification was found in the online Texas A&M International University Catalogue 2012.

Texas A&M International University requires out-of-country applicants whose first language is not English demonstrate competence in the English language by submission of an official Test of English as a Foreign Language ibt (TOEFL) score of 69 or 193 computer-based test. Seven students took the TOEFL during the 2012-2013 academic year. The self-report indicated that there are currently 6-19 candidates enrolled in the teacher education program who were admitted from out-of-country.

In a review of twenty (20) Texas A&M International University candidates’ records, it was found that 19 had applications but none of the undergraduate students had interview questions and associated rubrics. An interview was instituted in August 2012. However, Speech 1311 was used as an “other screening instrument” for the traditional program as required by TAC §227. In addition, all records contained a signed FERPA consent to release student teaching information to the cooperating teacher, principal, or other district officials.
The self-report noted that no candidates were admitted with a grade point average of less than 2.7 overall or in the last sixty (60) hours [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(B)]. The admission GPAs in the 20 student records reviewed ranged from 2.7 to 3.95.

The self-report submitted by Texas A&M International University stated that general information about their program and its admission criteria could be found on their website and in their university catalogue [TAC §227.10(a)(7)].

Based on the evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is in compliance with TAC §227 - Admission Criteria.

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

FINDINGS:

Texas A&M International University is approved to offer teacher certification in twenty-five (25) certification fields, three (3) supplemental fields, and seven (7) professional classes. Four (4) certification fields are currently inactive (Technology Applications EC-12, Physics/Mathematics 8-12, Health Education EC-12, and Computer Science 8-12). The Special Education supplemental certificate is also currently inactive. For the purpose of this compliance oversight audit, the Generalist EC-6 (Reading and Bilingual Education) certification was selected for in-depth curriculum review.

Texas A&M International University has sixteen (16) full time faculty members who assisted in course creation, presentation and facilitation for the Generalist EC-6 curriculum. The faculty credentials were reviewed and it was verified that thirteen (13) hold doctoral degrees, three (3) hold master’s degrees. Seventeen had teaching credential, and public/private school teaching experience. It was verified that all instructors had the credentials to provide instruction in their individual content areas.

In reviewing the Texas A&M International University curriculum syllabi and alignment charts, it was noted that the educator standards for Generalist EC-6 were not the curricular basis for instruction as required by TAC §228.30(a). Currently, the university operates two basically different Generalist EC-6 programs. One program is the Generalist EC-6-Reading and the other program is the Generalist EC-6 Bilingual. There was a common core of curriculum that all candidates would take and then there would be additional courses depending on whether you chose the reading emphasis or the bilingual emphasis route. Difficulty arose when standards necessary for both areas were only covered in one or the other emphasis area. In essence, a review of the alignment charts for the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 and the Generalist EC-6 - Reading, the degree plan outlined in the TAMIU catalogue, and in a transcript audit report, candidates were not receiving instruction in all standards required in either of the certifications specialties.

The language arts/reading alignment charts reflected that no Generalist EC-6 candidate was receiving instruction in standard 9.2 providing hands-on activities to help young students develop the fine motor skills necessary for writing.

The math alignment charts indicated that candidates seeking the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 certificate did not receive required instruction in math standards 1.1 through 1.10 (Math Concepts); standards 3.1-3.2 (Geometry and Measurement); standard 4.1 through 4.2
(Probability and Statistics); standards 5.1 – 5.22 (Logical Reasoning, Problem Solving, Connections, Communications); standards 6.5 – 6.7 (Mathematical Perspectives); standards 7.1 – 7.22 and standard 7.24 (Mathematical Learning and Instruction). The math alignment charts also indicated that no Generalist EC-6 candidate (neither Reading nor Bilingual) received instruction in standards 5.4 recognizing examples of fallacious reasoning and standards 6.1 to standard 6.4.

The science alignment charts indicated that instruction in standard 3.10 identifying potential sources of error in a given inquiry based investigation was only provided to candidates seeking the Generalist EC-6-Reading certificate.

In a the social studies alignment charts, all standards required for Generalist EC-6 social studies instruction were verified.

All Generalist EC-6 candidates (both reading and bilingual) were not receiving required instruction in theatre since dance was substituted.

The art alignment charts indicated that instruction was not provided in standard 1.8 analyzing and comparing visual characteristics of natural and human-made subjects and standard 2.7 demonstrating the safe and appropriate use of art materials/equipment.

The music alignment charts indicated that instruction was not provided in standard 1.2, standards 3.3 to 3.6, and standard 6.2.

The health alignment charts indicated that instruction was not provided in standard 1.11 developing home safety and emergency response plans, standard 1.16 promoting student participation in school-based and community efforts to address health-risk behaviors, standard 1.24 analyzing the relationship between learning and a safe school environment, standard 2.2 analyzing the interdependence of health education and the other components of a coordinated school health program. In addition, the following standards were provided only to the candidates seeking the Bilingual Generalist EC-6 certificate: standard 3.1 planning school health instruction that reflects the abilities, needs, interests, developmental levels, and cultural backgrounds of students; standard 3.2 Implementing an age-appropriate health education program; standard 3.3 providing a health education curriculum that includes the health content areas; standard 3.4 developing and utilizing strategies for effectively implementing and integrating a school health education curriculum; 3.5 integrating a health education curriculum into other content areas (e. g., language arts, math, science, social studies); and standard 3.8 involving parents/caregivers in the teaching/learning process.

The alignment charts for physical education indicated that no instruction was provided to any Generalist EC-6 candidate in standard 10.7 demonstrating competence in prevention techniques, first aid, CPR, and emergency procedures.

The alignment chart for the Bilingual Target Language Proficiency Test indicates that all standards are covered.

In summary, there appears to be major gaps in content provided to candidates and those required for the Generalist EC-6 certificate.

Not all of the seventeen (17) subject matter topics could be verified [TAC §228.30(b)]. According to the degree plans, reading instruction for all middle and secondary school teaching candidates was required in EDCI 3302 Language Acquisition and Development. However, based on the candidate response describing their perception of their preparation, fifty percent
(50%) of the respondents indicated that they did not feel prepared in reading instruction. In reviewing the alignment chart for the 17 topics, it was noted that the English Language Proficiency standards were not provided in the core courses for Generalist EC-6 Reading or in the specific courses required to complete the certification. Dyslexia instruction required for institutions of higher education was covered in EDCI 4993, EDEC 4362, and EDSE 3305.

Based on the course descriptions in the TAMIU 2012-2013 catalogue, various activities to be assessed were e-portfolios, written assignments, case studies, research projects, and exams, and service learning projects. Documentation was available of assessment activities, timelines, and person responsible in each syllabus.

TAMIU student teachers were asked to respond to an electronic questionnaire in order to verify aspects of the curriculum, its delivery, and its effectiveness. Below are the results to the question "Do you feel the educator preparation program prepared you for the teaching experience in the following areas?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Strategies Across the Curriculum for all Grade Levels</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Educators’ Code of Ethics</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and/or Adolescent Development</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Methods for Motivating Students</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of How People Learn</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) Organization, Structure, and Skills</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing TEKS in the Content Area(s)</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Responsibilities for Administering the STAAR Examination</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Lesson</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Curriculum Development</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing a Variety of Classroom Assessments with Your Students</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Formative Assessments to Diagnose Student Learning Needs</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and Methodologies in Classroom Management Prior to Placement as a Teaching Candidate</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Standards Regarding Students with Special Education Needs</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Teaching Strategies for Students Designated as Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Teaching Strategies for Students with Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Parent Conferences</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a Variety of Instructional Strategies in Your Classroom</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating or Changing Instruction to Meet Individual Student Needs</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Instructional Technology in the Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In responding to the same question, the cooperating teachers indicated how they perceived the candidates’ preparation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Strategies Across the Curriculum for all Grade Levels</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Educators’ Code of Ethics</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child and/or Adolescent Development</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Methods for Motivating Students</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of How People Learn</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) Organization, Structure, and Skills</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing TEKS in the Content Area(s)</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Responsibilities for Administering the STAAR Examination</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a Lesson</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process for Curriculum Development</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing a Variety of Classroom Assessments with the Students</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Formative Assessments to Diagnose Student Learning Needs</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and Methodologies in Classroom Management Prior to Placement as a Teaching Candidate</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Standards Regarding Students with Special Education Needs</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Teaching Strategies for Student Designated a Gifted and Talented</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Teaching Strategies for Students with Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Parent Conferences</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a Variety of Instructional Instruction to Meet Individual Student Needs</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Instructional Technology in the Classroom</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The principals’ questionnaires reflected the following in evaluating the Texas A&M International University program:

Collaboration between program and school: Satisfactory – 33.3% Very Good–33.3% Excellent –33.3%
Concerns about training and preparation of candidates: yes –25%  no –75%

Areas of candidate preparation:

- Classroom management: yes – 100%
- Academic and behavioral needs of students with disabilities: yes – 100%
- Communicating expectations for achievement and behavior: yes – 100%
- Appropriate use of multi-media and technology to support and extend learning: yes –75%  no – 25%

Addressing academic and behavioral needs of limited English proficient students:

yes – 100%

Developing and interpreting formal and informal assessments: yes – 100%

Based on evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is not in compliance with Texas Administrative Code Section §228.30 – Educator Preparation Curriculum.

Component IV: Program Delivery and Ongoing Support - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.35

Findings:

Currently, the Texas A&M International University’s initial teacher preparation program is delivered in face-to-face format. According to the self-report, the total program hours are as follows: elementary and middle school certification hours range between 1,797 to 1,932 clock-hours, secondary and all level certifications range from 1,797 to 1,842 clock-hours. According to the self-report, candidates received a minimum of three hours of test preparation prior to student teaching (Block III) and a minimum of three hours of practice test sessions during student teaching to complete the required six clock hours of certification test preparation. Candidate hours were verified by review of the degree plans in the candidates’ records, review of the degree audit report, and candidates’ records [TAC §228.35(a)(3)].

Thirty clock-hours of field-based experiences prior to student teaching is required by TAC §228.35 (a)(3)(A). However, Texas A&M International University requires 117 clock-hours of field-based experience for all certification programs. Forty clock-hours of field-based observations are conducted during Block I courses, and 77 clock-hours of field-based observations are conducted during Block II courses. The field-based observations are conducted in conjunction with specified education courses which require that the candidates assist in the classroom and teach four lessons in Block I and eight lessons in Block II. For in-school observations, the candidate must complete the classroom observation log which requires the candidate to record the date, name of teacher observed, campus, content/grade level, beginning and ending time as well as secure the observed teacher’s signature. Copies of the logs, and activity sheets and other associated documentation were found in the candidates’ records.
Student teaching [TAC §228.35(d)(2)(B)] during Block III is a full-day assignment in a school for twelve (12) weeks. Documentation in the individual candidate’s record indicated the date of student teaching placement, campus name, the cooperating teacher/mentor’s name, and the field supervisor assigned. Student teaching occurred in an actual school setting in area school districts rather than in a distance learning lab or virtual school setting as prohibited by TAC §228.35(d)(2)(C)(ii). In addition, campus demographic information was included in each student teacher’s portfolio. Candidates were provided a Student Teacher Handbook which included the following: Student teaching learning outcomes, qualification requirements for cooperating teachers and university (field) supervisors, responsibilities of the student teachers, cooperating teachers, university (field) supervisors and principals, and other policies governing the student teaching experience.

According to TAC §228.35(e), Texas A&M International University is responsible for providing cooperating teachers training that is evidence–based or verify that training has been provided by a school district or education service center. Texas A&M International University documented by original signature on sign-in sheets that training had been provided. During the training session, teachers were also asked to sign their contracts. The next cooperating teacher training is scheduled for January 24, 2013.

TAC §228.35(f) states that supervision of each candidate shall be conducted with the structured guidance and regular ongoing support of an experienced educator who has been trained as a field supervisor. Seven field supervisors were identified in the email list submitted by the university. Sign in sheets for training were presented for January 11, 2012, and November 2, 2012. However, because of the few students participating in the fall 2012 student teaching experience, only one field supervisor was utilized. A review of the potential field supervisors’ credentials reflected that all have Texas certification with public school experience. The sole field supervisor for the fall 2012 was provided with training as evidenced by a memo which listed topics covered and original signatures of the Dean and field supervisor. Initial contact by the field supervisor was made within the first three weeks of the assignment as required by TAC §228.35(f) during the first day of class for the semester. A total of three formal observations [TAC §228.35(f)(4)] must be conducted during the student teaching assignment and must be at least 45 minutes in duration [TAC §228.35(f)]. Evidence found in candidates’ records indicated three to six observations were conducted depending upon the certification field. Candidates who were instructional aides and received the Teacher Aide Exemption were also observed. The Texas A&M International University’s observation form included the student teacher’s name, the date, and the start and stop time of the observations. In addition, the mentor’s signature was required and a copy of the observation form was given to the student teacher and mentor. The specific indicators of the student teacher observation form focused on teaching effectiveness, classroom management, classroom organization, and student behavior. The observation form was not signed by the student teacher or the field supervisor. In accompanying documents, there was a walk-through evaluation form and the field supervisor’s conference log which recorded the conference start and stop time, notes and signatures of the student teacher and mentor. Documentation of the formal observations was found in the candidates’ records. TAC §228.35(f) also states that the first observation must be conducted within the first six weeks of student teaching. Evidence was available in the candidates’ records that the observations were conducted on the schedule prescribed by TAC.

It is the responsibility of Texas A&M International University to provide a copy of the written feedback to the candidate’s campus administrator as required by TAC §228.35(f). Seventy-five
percent (75%) of the principals responding to their questionnaire indicated that they have received feedback on student teachers’ observations, but twenty-five percent (25%) indicated that the semester was still in process and had not received any feedback during the TEA data gathering period. The campus administrator or his/her designee was asked to initial the observation form. These were evident on the TAMIU completed observation forms.

Additional informal observations and coaching were provided by the program as specified in TAC §228.35(f). The field supervisors’ logs recorded all interactions with candidates including additional coaching. If beneficial, additional observations were completed and recorded.

Based on evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code Section §228.35 – Program Delivery and On-Going Support.

**COMPONENT V: PROGRAM EVALUATION – Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.40**

**FINDINGS:**

Texas A&M International University benchmarks candidates’ progress by maintaining a certification check list. It records TExES testing, status of coursework, classroom observations, total hours, and degree plan audit. Evidence of detailed hardcopies was found in candidates’ records [TAC §228.40(a)].

Readiness for TExES testing [TAC §228.40(b)] is determined by the candidates’ completion of test preparation review. The Bilingual Generalist EC-6 and Generalist EC-6 content review is conducted during Block II prior to student teaching. Test preparation using practice tests is completed during Block III. Dated documentation was found in the candidate’s records of meeting the criteria for testing.

Evaluation of the program’s design and delivery of the curriculum should be continuous per TAC §228.40(c). Information such as performance data, scientifically-based research practices, and the results of internal and external assessments should be included in the evaluation process. The university submitted an overall plan for evaluation in their self-report which detailed the evaluation indicator, program’s measurement tool/procedures, the timeline for data collection, and the personnel responsible. Data used to evaluate the program include assessments of candidates’ performance, descriptive data, and surveys. Minutes of the advisory committee meetings confirm that Texas A&M International University regularly shares evaluative data with the advisory committee members.

According to TAC §228.40(d), the program retains documents that evidence a candidate’s eligibility for admission to the program and evidence of completion of all program requirements for a period of five years after program completion. Texas A&M International University maintains records electronically and hard copies in a safe and secure environment.

Based on evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.40 – Assessment and Evaluation of Candidates of Candidates for Certification and Program Improvement.

**COMPONENT VI: Professional Conduct (TAC) §228.50**
TAC §228.50(a) states that during the period of preparation, the educator preparation entity shall ensure that the individuals preparing candidates and the candidates themselves demonstrate adherence to Chapter 247 of this title (relating to Educators’ Code of Ethics). Candidates are provided a copy of the Code of Ethics and are required to initial by each standard and sign and date verifying that they have read and understand it. Evidence of the Code of Ethics was found in candidates’ records. Faculty and staff are provided information at staff meetings and sign a similar document as the candidates.

Based on evidence presented, Texas A&M International University is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.50 – Professional Conduct.

Texas Administrative Code §229

Current Accreditation Status
Texas A&M International University currently has a status of “Accredited - Warned”.

Standard I: Results of Certification Exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass Rate Performance:</th>
<th>2009-2010</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>2011-2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall:</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification Areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual Generalist EC-6</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Recommendations:
The following are recommendations based on the findings of the Texas Education Agency. If the program is NOT in compliance with any identified component, consult the Texas Administrative Code and correct the issue IMMEDIATELY. A Compliance Status Report will be required every sixty (60) days until the compliance issues are totally corrected.

Other program recommendations are suggestions for general program improvement and no follow up is required.

PROGRAM COMPLIANCE ACTIONS:

Texas Administrative Code 228.20(b) Governance of Educator Preparation Programs

- Conduct a minimum of two advisory committee meetings per academic year.
Texas Administrative Code 228.30(a) Educator Preparation Curriculum

- Conduct a thorough review of syllabi, educator standards, course content outlines, and assessments for all certification areas offered by Texas A&M International University with an emphasis on the Generalist EC-6 Reading and the Generalist EC-6 Bilingual certificates. It was noted in both areas that there were major gaps where educator standards were not addressed for all EC-6 candidates. The required educator standards for theater must be included. This must be initiated immediately;

- Meet with all Texas A&M International University faculty instructors to review the educator standards to ensure all understand and address standards required for certification.

OTHER PROGRAM RECOMMENDATIONS:

Component I: Recommendations:

- Seek creative ways to conduct advisory committee meetings to involve more stakeholders such as through online meetings, conference calls, Skype, etc.;

- Expand the advisory committee to include more school district participation such as cooperating teachers, human resource staff, and current and past candidate representatives in order to secure a variety of perspectives of the program.

Component II: Recommendations:

- Create an interview which utilizes questions/situations that are directed toward articulating the skill set and dispositions that are needed in teaching;

- Develop a Spanish language test similar to the THEA that is an assessment of the candidates’ level of proficiency in Spanish reading, listening, speaking, and writing.

- Ensure the TOEFL is utilized for all candidates instead of coursework provided by TAMIU language institute;

- For a candidate seeking bilingual certification, identify what language is spoken in the home. If the language is other than English, require the TOEFL examination to ensure that the candidate is proficient in both English and the other language. If the candidate is not proficient in both English and the other language, do not admit them into the program for bilingual certification;

- Consider utilizing the Accuplacer Reading test with a score of 98 or higher as a screening device for candidates entering the teacher certification program.

Component III: Recommendations:

- Continue with plans to restructure the core content for teacher certification;
- Evaluate the curriculum for rigor and depth of coverage and overlapping content instruction. Much information needs to be covered and this will ensure adequate and efficient delivery;

- Remove attendance and participation as a percentage of a candidate’s final grade and replace with “graded active engagement” and define what this looks like in the classroom;

- Implement content methodology into courses that reviews the candidate basic content knowledge (such as adding columns of numbers) as well as strategies to teach this skill to children;

- Convert coursework from lecture to performance-based activities;

- In future hiring situations, consider candidates who have substantial public or private school teaching experience as a factor in making hiring decisions;

- Use the coursework instruction provided by the faculty as a vehicle to model best teaching practices;

- On an annual basis, require instructional faculty go to public and private classrooms for the purpose of both observation and demonstration teaching;

- In a designated initial education course, have students locate, review and print the educator standards, TEKS, test domains and competencies for the area where the candidate is seeking certification. This should be organized in a notebook which is maintained and utilized throughout the entire teacher preparation program;

- Utilize the TEA developed training for meeting “Teachers' Responsibilities for the STAAR test administration at http://texas.testsecuritytraining.com/TestAdministratorTraining.aspx. It may be used for a whole group or individually. A certificate can be printed upon completion. This is the same training that certified teachers must complete each year prior to STAAR testing;

- Utilize the dyslexia information found on the TEA website at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/index2.aspx?id=4434 or at http://www.region10.org/dyslexia/;

- Consider utilizing the TEA approved Ethics training for both candidates and staff within the program to ensure that this topic is adequately addressed by the program & maintain evidence that that the training has occurred. For more information visit http://www.tea.state.tx.us/ethics/;

- Consider utilizing the T-CERT test preparation to determine the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate TExES exam and ensure that the program maintains the certificate of completion verifying (6) clock-hours of test preparation that is not embedded in any other curriculum areas - or create another indicator for test prep not embedded in any other curriculum areas and ensure that the program maintains the certificate of completion verifying (6) clock-hours of test preparation. The T-CERT address is https://pact.tarleton.edu/TCERT and for questions email weiss@Tarleton.edu.
Component IV: Recommendations:

- Bring terminology into alignment with TEA definitions (i.e. University Supervisor vs. Field Supervisor);
- Actively include the cooperating teacher as an integral part of the student teaching team;
- Examine ways to facilitate communication among students, cooperating teachers/mentors, and principals.

Component V: Recommendations:

- Develop and utilize evaluative instruments that use performance-based assessments in order to ensure skill attainment as well as content knowledge attainment for candidates.
- Expand data collection for evaluation to include more internal and external sources for a more rounded and complete review of the program.

Consider implementing the following programmatic changes:

- Open discussions with Laredo Community College to revise and strengthen their core course content in order to ensure that students are prepared for upper level work;
- Offer a single Generalist EC-6 certification with either ESL or bilingual supplemental;
- Initiate a MAT graduate studies program in the bilingual area that allows a supplemental attachment to a content area;
- Discuss with the Registrar’s Office the process for identifying students needing developmental courses;
- Continue with plans to restructure the professional core content for teacher certification;
- Ensure all leadership faculty in Traditional, Post Baccalaureate, and ACP programs have PK-12 backgrounds;
- Transition the ACP program to a post-bac program offering both a MAT degree and/or certification;
- Bring terminology into alignment with TEA definitions (i.e. Field Supervisor);
- Institute peer placements in student teaching assignments as appropriate.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

- Follow Texas Administrative Code in order to keep up with changes to rules that pertain to the operation of the teacher education program and certification of educators;
- Participate in stakeholder meetings on Texas Administrative Code for rule revision;
• Continue to participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Certification & Standards to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current requirements and changes in Texas Administrative Code;

• Continue to maintain communication with the assigned program specialist for the purpose of asking questions about current requirements in TAC for governance, admissions, curriculum, program delivery & on-going support, and program evaluation (TAC § 227-229);

• Ensure that the Dean/Director/Program Staff utilizes the EPP Staff Information page http://www.tea.state.tx.us/eppinfo.aspx to access pertinent information that EPP’s frequently request;

• Ensure that TEA staff has the most current & up-to-date contact information by sending an email to victoria.ellis@tea.state.tx.us as well as notifying the program specialist assigned.