Contact Information: Dr. Grant Simpson

County/District Number: 227-504

SBEC Approval Date: January 6, 1969

Texas Education Agency Education Preparation Program Specialist, Vanessa Alba, conducted a desk compliance audit of St. Edward’s University Educator Preparation Program (EPP), located at 3001 S. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78704, on October 1-31, 2015, as required by Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.10(c) and TAC §229.6(a) which states that educator preparation programs “shall be reviewed at least once every five years”. The focus of the audit was the traditional undergraduate program. The program’s accreditation status is “Accredited”. The following are the findings of the desk audit.

Scope of the Compliance Audit:

The scope of this audit is restricted solely to verifying compliance with Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §227, §228, §229, and §230.

Data Analysis:

Information concerning compliance with TAC governing educator preparation programs was collected by various qualitative means. A self-report was submitted to TEA on September 15, 2015. A TEA review of documents, student records, course material, and curriculum correlations charts provided evidence regarding compliance. In addition, TEA sent electronic questionnaires to St. Edward’s University EPP stakeholders. A total of 43 out of 118 (36%) responded to the questionnaires as follows: 4 out of 7 (57%) advisory committee members; 4 out of 36 educator candidates (11%); 7 out of 21 (33%) principals; 24 out of 50 (48%) cooperating teachers/mentors; and 4 out of 4 (100%) field supervisors. Qualitative methods of content analysis, cross-referencing, and triangulation of the data were used to evaluate the evidence. Evidence of compliance was measured using a rubric aligned to Texas Administrative Code.
Findings, Compliance Issues, and Recommendations:

“Findings” indicate evidence collected during the compliance audit process. If the program is “NOT in Compliance” with any identified component, the program should consult the Texas Administrative Code and correct the issue IMMEDIATELY. A “Compliance Plan” may be drafted during the audit that identifies compliance issues to be addressed and a timeline for completion. “General Recommendations” are suggestions for general program improvement and no follow up is required.

Ongoing Communication and Compliance Plan:

Communication between the TEA program specialist and the St. Edward’s University EPP Dean and staff occurred via phone conference on November 13, 2015 to discuss findings and request additional information. A follow-up email with the Dean occurred on December 5, 2015.

The Compliance Plan was received and accepted via email on December 4, 2015. The action plan was developed to guide implementation of compliance issues. General recommendations are incorporated into the report.

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

FINDINGS:

- Dr. Grant Simpson, Dean of the College of Education, and his staff participated in all aspects of the desk audit, including the audit conference. Dr. Simpson provided support and is accountable for the quality of the educator preparation program and the candidates whom the program recommends for certification [TAC §228.20(c) and TAC §228.2(8)].

- The advisory committee currently consists of seven (7) members, with one (1) member representing two groups. Three (3) members represent public/private schools, two (2) members represent higher education, two (2) members represent business/community, and one (1) member represents an ESC. St. Edward’s University EPP meets TAC §228.20(b) minimum requirements for advisory committee composition.

- Advisory committee meeting dates for the past three years were held as follows:
  
  December 12, 2011 - 5 members present
  
  May 23, 2012 - 4 members present
  
  December 13, 2012 - 5 members present
  
  May 14, 2013 - 7 members present
  
  January 9, 2014 - 4 members present
  
  May 13, 2014 - 6 members present
  
  St. Edward’s University EPP meets TAC §228.20(b) minimum requirements for advisory committee meetings twice during each academic year (September 1-August 31).
Agendas, minutes, and attendee records indicated that the members assist in the design, delivery, evaluation, and major policy decisions of the EPP and meet the minimum requirements of TAC §228.20(b) and TAC §228.1(a).

There was limited evidence that advisory committee members understand their roles and responsibilities as noted by a lack of Advisory Committee Training. St. Edward’s University EPP did not meet minimum requirements of TAC §228. 20(b).

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

• Approve the roles and responsibilities of each member of the advisory committee by requiring yearly Advisory Committee Training per TAC §228.20(b).

General Recommendations:

• Utilize the TEA Advisory Committee PPT to train members yearly. The PPT can be sent to each member via email attachment with read receipt;
• Rotate the terms of the Advisory Committee members and consider adding a former student to the membership to bring fresh ideas and insights to the group;
• Consider an Advisory Committee Handbook and/or Bylaws for the purpose of ensuring strong continuity of the Advisory Committee as membership changes; and
• Provide an incentive to the members of the Advisory Committee for their involvement and assistance with the St. Edward’s University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) by providing Continuing Professional Education (CPE) credit to members who need CPE hours for the renewal of their Texas certificates.

Based on the evidence presented, St. Edward’s University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) 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:

1. The St. Edward’s University EPP admission requirements as identified on the website require the applicant to:

   A. Be enrolled in an educator preparation program from an institution of higher education that is accredited by a regional accrediting agency, as recognized by the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board (THECB) [TAC §227.10(a)(1) and TAC §230.11)];

   B. Have a minimum 2.5 GPA or at least a 2.5 in the last 60 semester credit hours [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(A)];
C. Demonstrate basic skills in reading, written communication and mathematics by a satisfactory scores on the Texas Higher Education Assessment (THEA) or an approved exemption [TAC §227.10(a)(4) and TAC §230.37(a)];

D. Demonstrate oral communication skills as listed in TAC §230.11(b)(5), a TOEFL oral speaking score of 26 and a foreign transcript evaluation by a TEA approved evaluation service [TAC §227.10(a)(5)];

E. Submit an application [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

F. Complete an interview [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

G. Submit two letters of recommendation [TAC §227.10(a)(6)]; and

H. Complete a Fitness Alert Form, if student exhibits problematic behavior and can lead to a formal growth plan.

2. Ten (10) candidate records verified that admission requirements are followed.

3. Transcripts for each of the ten (10) candidates were provided to verify GPA at the time of admission. A GPA range of 2.81-3.82 was noted in files reviewed [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(A)];

4. Files were provided for review to document that candidates met the basic skills requirement in reading, written communication and mathematics as verified on transcripts by SAT, TAKS, STAAR, ACT, GRE, or THEA [TAC §227.10(a)(4) and TAC §230.37(A)].

5. There were no out-of-country candidates admitted in the past three years. However, Kathy Jackson, International Student Support coordinator, and Frank Smith, Certification Officer review applicant records if the need arises [TAC §227.10(a)(5); TAC §227.10(e); TAC §230.11(b)(5)].

6. All files reviewed contained a completed signed and dated application [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

7. An interview was completed by all applicants. A sample Interview scored with a rubric was provided as well as each file was reviewed noting dated interview with notes and signature from the interviewer [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

8. A Fitness Alert Form is required as an additional screening tool if an applicant does not meet admission requirements. None of the files reviewed required Fitness Alert Form [TAC §227.10(a)(6)];

9. Two letters of recommendation are required of each applicant. Each of the files reviewed contained evidence of two letters of recommendation [TAC §227.10(a)(7)];

10. There were no candidates admitted who needed the exception to the minimum GPA requirement [TAC §227.10(a)(3)(B)];

11. It was verified in student records that evidence of a candidate’s eligibility for admission to the program and evidence of completion of all program requirements are kept for a period of 5 years. Student academic files are kept in the School of Education’s file room on the second floor of Fleck Hall. The file room is open for faculty and administrative
staff only and is locked nightly. St. Edward’s University files go back several decades [TAC 228.40(d)].

Compliance Issues to be addressed:

None

General Recommendations:

None

Based on the evidence presented, St. Edward’s University EPP is in compliance with TAC §227.10 - Admission Criteria.

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

**FINDINGS:**

1. The curricular scope of the desk audit focused on the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) EC-12 content;

2. The PPR EC-12 alignment chart, Tech Apps Alignment Chart, syllabi, course outlines, and focused field-based experiences verified that the content is taught in the PPR coursework [TAC §228.30(a)];

3. A TEKS Correlation Alignment Chart completed by the program served as evidence that the relevant Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) are taught to all candidates [TAC §228.30(a)];

4. Documentation detailing the structured assessment activity, timeline for completion, and person responsible and syllabi detailing the assessments used in each course were provided for each course offered. There was specific evidence, such as a transcript) to document that each candidate had met the requirement [TAC §228.40(a)];

5. A review of curriculum, course outlines, activities, and assessments served as verification that the curriculum for each educator preparation program relies on scientifically based research to ensure teacher effectiveness and aligns to the TEKS [TAC §228.30(b)];

6. It was noted that reading instruction was taught in EDUC 4334; EDUC 2332.01 FA14; READ 4334/40201/40202; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; Ling 3330; Ling 3339; READ 2341; READ 4343/40201/4202; READ 3349; READ 3348. Theses courses also provided evidence of compliance that all five components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) are taught within the specific reading courses [TAC §228.30(b)(1)];

7. The code of ethics and standard practices for Texas educators, pursuant to Chapter 247 of this title (relating to Educators’ Code of Ethics) is provided in the following courses:
EDUC 4334 FA15; EDUC 4338 SP15; and EDUC 4649/4652/4655. It was also noted that a signature process to ensure that all candidates have read and understand the Code of Ethics began in 2012 [TAC §228.30(b)(2)];

8. The coursework and training is sustained, interactive, student-focused, performance-based and included the required subject matter as required in TAC §228.30(b)(3)(A-E). PPR alignment charts, syllabi, and course outlines provided evidence of compliance. This specifically included instructional planning and delivery taught in the following courses: EDUC 2331.01 Sp15; EDUC 1330 SP 15; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 4334; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(A)]; knowledge of students and student learning was addressed in the following courses: EDUC 2331 FA14; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 3337 FA14; EDUC 3333.01 FA 14; EDUC 4334; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339; PSYC 2307; PSYC 2308 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(B)]; content knowledge and expertise was addressed in the following courses: EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 4334 FA15; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339; READ 4343/40201 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(C)]; and learning environment was addressed in the following courses: EDUC 1330 SP 15; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 3337 FA14; EDUC 3333.01 FA 14; EDUC 4334 FA15; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(D)];

9. Evidence that data-driven practice was addressed in the following courses: EDUC 2332.02 FA14 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(E)];

10. Professional practices and responsibilities are adequately addressed within the following coursework: EDUC 1330SP 15; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 4334 FA15; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339; READ 4343/40201 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(C)]; and learning environment was addressed in the following courses: EDUC 1330 SP 15; EDUC 2332.02 FA14; EDUC 3337 FA14; EDUC 3333.01 FA 14; EDUC 4334 FA15; EDUC 4338 SP15; EDUC 4649/4652/4655; EDUC 4650/4651/SPED 4648 SP15; Ling 3339 [TAC §228.30(b)(3)(D)];

11. Instruction in detection and education of students with dyslexia as indicated in the Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.044(b) was provided to candidates in READ 3348; SPED 3345 [TAC §228.35(a)(4)]; and

12. Instruction in detection and education of students with mental and emotional disorders, as indicated in the Texas Education Code (TEC), §21.044(c-1) and (c-2) was provided to candidates beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year in the following course: SPED 2338 [TAC §228.35(a)(5)].
Educator candidates and mentor/cooperating teachers reported the following regarding instruction in their respective questionnaires:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruction Provided in the Following Areas:</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
<th>Mentor/Cooperating Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Instruction for all certification areas at all grade levels</td>
<td>75% Yes/25% Don’t Know</td>
<td>91% Yes/9% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyslexia Training</td>
<td>75% Yes/25% Don’t Know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child/Adolescent Development</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Methods for Motivating Students</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>96% Yes/4% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories of How People Learn</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>96% Yes/4% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEKS Organization, Structure, Skills</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>96% Yes/4% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing TEKS in Content Areas</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>96% Yes/4% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Responsibilities for Administering the STAAR or End of Course Exams</td>
<td>75% Yes/25% No</td>
<td>73% Yes/27% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Develop a Lesson Plan</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process of Curriculum Development</td>
<td>75% Yes/25% No</td>
<td>91% Yes/9% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Utilize A Variety of Classroom Assessments with Students</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>91% Yes/9% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to Use Formative Assessments to Diagnose Student Learning Needs</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>82% Yes/18% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and Methodologies in Classroom Management Prior to Placement as a</td>
<td>100% Yes</td>
<td>91% Yes/9% No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Candidate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No/No知</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laws and Strategies Regarding Students with Special Needs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>86% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Strategies for Students Designated as GT</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77% 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards and Teaching Strategies for Students with Limited English Proficiency</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting Parent Conferences</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55% 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of Instructional Strategies in Your Classroom</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiating or Changing Instruction to Meet Individual Student Needs</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>95% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics and Identification of Students with Mental or Emotional Disorders</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus principals reported the following in their questionnaires regarding the teaching candidates:

- 100% indicated that candidates were prepared by the program in the following areas: classroom management; to meet the academic and behavioral needs of students with disabilities; to communicate clear expectations for achievement and behavior; to collaborate with others in meeting the academic, developmental, and behavioral needs of students; to address the academic and behavioral needs of limited English proficient students; and to develop and interpret formal and informal assessments that track student progress;

- 100% indicated that candidates were prepared to use appropriate multimedia and other technology to support/extend student learning; and

- 67% indicated that candidates were well prepared by the program and 33% indicated that they were sufficiently prepared.

**Compliance Issues to be addressed:**

- None
General Recommendations:

- None

Based on evidence presented, St. Edward's University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code Section §228.30.

COMPONENT IV: PROGRAM DELIVERY AND ONGOING SUPPORT - Texas Administrative Code (TAC) §228.35

FINDINGS:

1. St. Edward’s University EPP undergraduate program curriculum review revealed that the program has a total of 936 clock-hours in the EC-6 program, 572.5 clock-hours in the Secondary program, and 492 clock-hours in the post-bac program [TAC §228.35(a)(1) and TAC §228.2(5)]. The program requires that candidates complete 165 clock-hours of coursework, training, and field-based experiences (EC-6), 152.5 (Secondary), or 30 clock-hours of coursework and training (Post-bac program) [TAC §228.35(a)(3) and TAC §228.2(5)] prior to student teaching or internship. The total program hours and program hours prior to student teaching provided in the document review were verified in the degree plan and program hours chart;

2. Candidates are required to complete clock-hours (varies by certificate area) of field-based experiences prior to student teaching, documentation for the 10 files reviewed was provided as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.35(a)(3); TAC §228.35(d)(1); TAC §228.2(9)];

3. The Field-based experiences candidate records and time logs signed by the observed teacher served as documentation that the field-based experiences were completed prior to student teaching. Field-based experiences are provided in Del Valle or Austin ISD in ½ day blocks and completion with an A or B is required for admission to student teaching. Field-based experiences were noted in transcripts for each of 10 files reviewed [TAC §228.35(d)(1)];

4. The program provided sufficient evidence to document that field-based experiences prior to student teaching were in a variety of educational settings with diverse student populations, including observation, modeling, and demonstration of effective practices to improve student learning. [TAC §228.35(a)(3)(A); TAC §228.35(d)(1)(A-E)];

5. The program requires all coursework and training to be completed prior to educator preparation program completion and standard certification. Evidence was found in the candidate records noting where each candidate was in the process of program completion. This included benchmarks and a review of the program’s schedule of coursework. Degree plans, and transcripts for each candidate reviewed were provided as evidence [TAC §228.35(a)(4)];

6. The program requires candidates to complete student teaching in both the initial and post-bac certification track within St. Edward’s University EPP. All files reviewed were for
candidates that had completed student teaching. Program requirements in the Student Handbook and degree plans were offered as evidence. Specific candidate files were provided for review [TAC 228.35(d)(1); TAC §228.35(d)(2)(A); TAC §228.2(4);]

7. Documentation that was provided that student teaching occurred in an actual school setting was provided for the candidates reviewed. Student teaching placement lists with start and end dates were provided as evidence [TAC §228.35(d)(2)(C)(ii)];

8. There was evidence provided that each candidate was assigned a cooperating teacher in an actual public/private school setting. An email to each cooperating teacher with the name of candidate assigned was provided as evidence for 9 out of 10 files reviewed [TAC §228.35(e); TAC §228.2(6)];

9. There was evidence that St. Edward’s University EPP provided mentor/cooperating teacher training. A Handbook was provided as evidence [TAC §228.35(e)];

10. It was documented by the program and verified that there are 9 field-supervisors at St. Edward’s University. All hold an appropriate in-state or out-of-state teacher/mid-management certificate. It was verified that the field supervisors met the requirements as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].

11. The field supervisor did receive yearly training as prescribed. Field supervisor training, dated sign-in sheets, minutes, and the TEA Field Supervisor PPT Training were provided as evidence [TAC §228.35(f)];

12. St. Edward’s University EPP did provide evidence that field supervisors made initial contact within the first 3 weeks of assignment as required. Documentation was provided for the files reviewed. Field supervisors meet with candidates weekly during student teaching. The program did meet the requirements of initial contact by the field-supervisor as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)];

13. The documentation provided documenting 3 observations for each candidate within the 12 week student teaching assignment was provided. Observation forms signed by the candidate and field supervisor and field supervisor were provided as evidence for 9 out of 10 files reviewed. The program did meet the requirements of field-supervision [TAC §228.35(f)(4)];

14. Observation Forms with start and stop time noted were provided as evidence that observations were 45 minutes in length. It included student teacher name/Field Supervisor name/Date/Start and Stop Time/Duration. Documentation was provided for 9 out of 10 files reviewed [TAC §228.35(f)(1)];

15. It was verified that the first observation occurred within the first 6 weeks of assignment for each candidate reviewed (9 out of 10 files) [TAC §228.35(f)(2)];

16. It was verified that each field supervisor documented instructional practices observed, provided written feedback through an interactive conference with each candidate (9 out of 10 files reviewed) [TAC §228.35(f)];

17. There was evidence that the program provided a copy of the observation to the campus administrator (9 out of 10 files reviewed) [TAC §228.35(f)];
18. There was documentation provided for one candidate to verify that additional observations and coaching are provided as requested by TEA. The field supervisor documentation and a narrative for that candidate were provided as evidence. The program met the requirements of informal observations and coaching as prescribed [TAC §228.35(f)].

1) Compliance Issues to be addressed:

- None

General Recommendations:

- None

Based on evidence presented, St. Edward’s University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) 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:

1. St. Edward’s University EPP has established benchmarks to ensure that candidates are prepared to receive standard certification [TAC §228.40(a)]. Documentation detailing the benchmark activity, timeline, and person responsible and the candidate record showing progression through the program by verifying benchmarks was provided as evidence for for 10 files reviewed. Additionally, a candidate practicum success, candidate satisfaction documents, candidate employment success, school district satisfaction, curriculum quality documents, and field supervisor quality documents served as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.40(a)];

2. The program provided evidence that the readiness of each candidate to take the appropriate certification assessment of pedagogy and professional responsibilities, including professional ethics and standards of conduct was determined as required. It was noted by the program that all 10 candidates. The candidate rates their advisor in terms of whether or not TExES or BTLPT status was reviewed, an email is sent to candidates noting the date of test review, and the 2014-2015 Student Undergraduate Bulletin discusses Teacher Certification and Practice Exams. Finally, a letter of admission signed and dated by each candidate reviewed and the candidate record with the date of PPR test approval were submitted as evidence. St. Edward’s University met the requirement of determining each candidate’s readiness to test as prescribed [TAC §228.40(b); TAC §230.21(c)];
3. The program continuously evaluates the design and delivery of the educator preparation curriculum based on performance data, scientifically-based research practices, and the results of internal and external assessments [TAC §228.40(c)]. The evidence provided included a candidate practicum success, candidate satisfaction documents, candidate employment success, school district satisfaction, curriculum quality documents, and field supervisor quality documents served as evidence of compliance [TAC §228.40(c)].

Compliance issues to be addressed:
  - None

General Recommendations:
  - None

Based on evidence presented, St. Edward's University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) 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

Findings:

1. 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).

2. St. Edward’s University EPP provided documentation indicating that Ethics is discussed in Staff Meetings/Ethics Video link with FS in attendance as verified by agenda and Ethics Training Quiz for Staff. Also a signed statement of reading and understanding was provided for staff and field supervisors.


Compliance issues to be addressed:
  - None

General Recommendations:
  - Utilize the TEA Ethics Training videos for both students and staff. Utilize a dated sign in sheet for all. This will ensure that training has consistently occurred.
Based on evidence presented, St. Edward’s University Educator Preparation Program (EPP) is in compliance with Texas Administrative Code §228.50(a) regarding Professional Conduct.

Standard Recommendations for St. Edward’s University EPP:

- Continue to align the verbiage of St. Edward’s University EPP to the verbiage of Texas Administrative Code (TAC) (ex. Field supervisor, cooperating teacher, candidate, etc.);
- Continue to follow the State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) and the State Board of Education (SBOE) meetings and/or review the minutes to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current Texas Administrative Code;
- Continue to participate in webinars provided by the Division of Educator Preparation to ensure that the program staff is knowledgeable about current requirements and changes in Texas Administrative Code;
- Continue to maintain communication with the program specialist assigned to the program;
- Ensure that St. Edward’s University EPP submits their Complaint Process to TEA by January 1, 2016 and indicate where it will be posted in a conspicuous place that is visible to all; and
- Ensure that TEA staff has the most current contact information by sending update emails to the assigned program specialist.